

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 30 April 2019

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

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: As there is an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

Motions

SRI LANKA TERRORIST ATTACKS

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:02): I move:

That this house—

- (a) expresses its deepest sorrow and abhorrence at the senseless killing of innocent men, women and children in coordinated terrorist bombings at Christian churches and hotels in Sri Lanka on Easter Sunday 2019;
- (b) mourns the extensive loss of life, including two Australians, and hopes for a full recovery of the many injured;
- (c) expresses its deepest sympathy to the families and friends of all those who have been affected by this appalling event;
- (d) stands in solidarity with the people of Sri Lanka and South Australia's Sri Lankan community;
- (e) condemns terrorism and extremism in all its forms; and
- (f) reaffirms its commitment to an inclusive and harmonious multicultural society.

Just six weeks ago, this house adopted a motion in very similar terms to the one I have just moved following the horrific terrorist attack in Christchurch. These two appalling events have some terrible, tragic similarities: men, women and children murdered as they arrived for prayers; innocent people going about their lives in peace only to be senselessly struck down in calculated, coordinated carnage, victims of violent extremists driven and demented by mindless hatred.

These two events may constitute tit-for-tat terrorism, the second claimed by its evil perpetrators as revenge for the first, making such despicable deeds even more deeply repugnant. The whole world has reached out to Colombo, as it did to Christchurch, as this house now does, to show again that we will not be wedged by the terrorists, that we stand in solidarity with the citizens of Sri Lanka, as we did with those in our sister city, to offer what we can to aid their recovery as we honour their resilience. Last week, *The Advertiser* quoted these words of an office worker in Colombo:

We have seen so much violence during the Civil War. For the outside world it may be big. But for us, life goes on.

It is terrible to think that, just to survive, some places in the world and their citizens have to become almost immune to the consequences of the most vicious violence imaginable. On behalf of this office worker in Colombo, the rest of the world has to show that we stand united with him and with fellow

Sri Lankans in resistance to terrorism, in the rejection of any form of politically or religiously motivated violence, that we bind together, just as we did after Christchurch, sharing sorrow, just as the world also has following the devastating fire of Notre Dame, showing the power of unity, the triumph of determination over despair.

Earlier today, I met with the Sri Lankan honorary consul in South Australia, Dr Charitha Perera, who is with us here today in the gallery, together with Mr Prabath Perera, the former chair of the Sri Lankan Catholic Association of South Australia. We welcome them to this parliament. I have offered our Sri Lankan community our prayers and our support.

This was demonstrated very practically on Sunday night at St Francis Xavier's Cathedral, when a mass was held and attended by the range of senior South Australians and the Sri Lankan community of our state. I think almost 900 people were present in the cathedral. This mass was attended by His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le, Governor of South Australia, the Leader of the Opposition, many members of parliament, many members of the consular corps in South Australia and faith leaders across our state.

I would particularly like to commend the words offered by Father Philip Marshall in his homily, which really provided an excellent overview of the issues and the response that we should all have here in South Australia and, indeed, around the world. As I said, this mass was extraordinarily well attended. There were many speakers who came from not only the Sri Lankan and Catholic community but also from the Buddhist community and the Islamic community, and I think that it was a great demonstration of our wonderful multiculturalism in South Australia coming together in that wonderful mass to celebrate diversity and tolerance.

The last census reported that almost 3,800 Sri Lankan-born people are living in South Australia. This represents an increase of almost 42 per cent in just five years. Our growing Sri Lankan community includes many highly skilled people—doctors, engineers and accountants in particular. They brought not only their skills but their culture, customs and identity to enrich the South Australian community. Our Sri Lankan citizens come from an island nation that has experienced terrorism before, as it lived through almost three decades of a civil war, which only ended in 2009.

Since this time, Sri Lanka has recovered and rebuilt during a decade of hard-won peace, a period when tourism in this beautiful country has boomed, when foreign investment has picked up and the economy has accelerated, giving Sri Lankans a new sense of self-confidence and encouraging international confidence in their nation. The events of last week are a tragic setback to all this progress over the past 10 years, but the international community must ensure that the setback is not permanent, that Sri Lanka is supported in this time of great need and is able to recover as quickly as possible so that terrorists are never the winners.

Australia lies in the middle of a direct flight path between Christchurch and Sri Lanka. We must not be complacent and believe that what happened in Colombo last week and Christchurch last month cannot happen here. All civilised people of all faiths and of no faith must confront and condemn such barbarity. Racism and religious intolerance are abhorrent. Terrorism, their most evil manifestation, places no value on human life. As the attacks on peaceful, innocent people in Colombo and Christchurch during the past six weeks confirm, we must conquer this evil, this hate.

With this motion, we focus on tolerance, on respect and on our multicultural and inclusive society in which our Sri Lankan-born community is welcomed and valued for its wonderful contribution to our state. I have been informed this morning by Dr Perera that there is a fundraising effort here in South Australia to aid the people of Sri Lanka most affected by the tragic events. There will be a fundraising event, about which we will be informed, in the coming weeks. I commend this effort to all members of this house, and I encourage every person, where they can, to actively support this important work. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (11:10): Mr Speaker, allow me to second the motion and thank the Premier for his heartfelt words regarding this tragic event. Our hearts are saddened by the recent events in the island nation of Sri Lanka. Sri Lankan families now living in South Australia are sincerely aghast at the actions that have taken 359 lives in the most horrific way.

CCTV footage has shown the shocking impact of the bombings of churches and hotels, including the obscene, contradictory behaviour of one suicide bomber, who patted a child's head before entering a church and detonating his backpack. We heard in the news reports that followed that these were not the actions of fringe-dwelling misfits but, rather, the considered actions of middle-class, educated people who have chosen a path that literally defies logic. To those local families with friends and relatives back home, who are feeling the pain and loss from those killed and injured, we share your thoughts and feelings.

Many members of the South Australian Sri Lankan community have connections back to international cooperation agreements of the 1950s, embodied in the international cooperation agreements known as the Colombo Plan. South Australia's education institutions were key players in that plan, providing education services to scholarship holders from what was then known as a different independent nation. The plan was the beginning of international education plans that underpin similar arrangements at our universities. Even today, the University of South Australia and Flinders and Adelaide universities have ongoing outward and inward commitments to education cooperation with Sri Lanka under the new Colombo Plan.

As a long-time close friend of Sri Lanka, we are heartbroken by the attacks of Easter Sunday. We will continue helping Sri Lanka as it emerges from this crisis stronger and more confident that its values are worth holding on to. The island nation is home to many cultures, languages and ethnicities. The targeting of minority Christians has been condemned by the country's other religious groups—and we stand with them.

The emergence of mass terrorism since September 11, 2001, has resulted in two decades of tragedies, each reaching into our local community. We lost many Australians in New York, London, Bali, France and, now, Sri Lanka. As recent events in Christchurch and Colombo have shown, and as the Premier said, no city is safe. Sri Lanka has enjoyed a prolonged calm following the end of the civil war in 2009, so much so that, this year, travel guide publisher Lonely Planet named it one of the best places in the world to visit. South Australia enjoys similar plaudits. Christchurch, our sister city, enjoyed a similar reputation.

However, our peace can be shattered in an instant. It is important, therefore, to learn the lessons of recent events and be ever vigilant against radicalism, extremism and terrorism. We must continue to promote diversity, tolerance and understanding. If we rail against one group or another, we undermine the cooperative gains made under the Colombo plans. If we rail against one group or another, we provide comfort to extremists. If we rail against one group or another, we lose the chance to build stronger communities.

Compassion and tolerance are our weapons, not guns and bombs. We grieve for Sri Lanka and, today, we stand in solidarity with the people of Sri Lanka and South Australia's Sri Lankan community. As the Premier alluded to, tragically this is not the first time we have dealt with a condolence motion of this nature this year. I sincerely hope that this is the last condolence motion that we deal with in this parliament of such a nature. Of course, there are no guarantees that will be the case, but we can remain hopeful.

The Premier referred to an appropriate and poignant mass on Sunday night that I was able to attend with him. It always fills one with confidence and hope, and indeed pride, when one sees people from a range of different cultural and religious backgrounds coming together in solidarity with one another with a mission of celebrating diversity and tolerance.

Sunday night gives us hope, not that this will be the last of such attacks, but hope that we will always triumph over evil. Love always trumps hate. Hope is always superior to despair. Wherever one of these attacks occurs, the perpetrators should know this: they will not succeed. Their mission will never be justified. We will always stand together, across an aisle, across faiths, across cultures, to ensure that this world is a peaceful one where everybody can enjoy a happy and prosperous life.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:16): Here in parliament today I also take the opportunity to commend the Premier for moving this motion and to express my deepest sorrow and abhorrence at the senseless killing of innocent men, women and children in coordinated terrorist bombings at Christian churches and hotels in Sri Lanka on Easter Sunday in 2019.

These terrorist attacks consisted of six coordinated bomb blasts, including at Christian churches in the east and west of the country and also a church in the country's capital, Colombo. Three luxury hotels in Colombo were also targeted. The blasts were timed for Easter Sunday, one of the most important days on the Christian calendar, when churches would be full of worshippers. The almost simultaneous blasts left no time to warn other churchgoers.

The other three bombings were at hotels in the country's economic capital, Colombo, where the targets were a mix of businesspeople, wealthy locals and tourists, including Western tourists, which would lead to a large amount of international media coverage for the terrorists. In fact, the alleged ringleader blew himself up at one of the hotels, killing dozens of tourists as they ate breakfast in a cafe overlooking the waterfront. The attacks left more than 250 people dead and at least 500 wounded. It was the deadliest attack in the island nation since the end of the deadly civil war in 2009.

Today, this parliament mourns the extensive loss of life, including two Australians, and hopes for the full recovery of the many injured. Sri Lanka's government says that the attacks were carried out by a radical national Islamic group. These were acts of pure evil. For example, one of the attacks took place at the Zion Evangelical Church in the city of Batticaloa in the east of Sri Lanka where children gathered for Sunday school on Easter Sunday. Afterwards, the children went outside onto the church grounds to play, as kids do, happy and enjoying the sun. One of the terrorists, who had attempted to get into the church itself but failed, walked among this group of happy children and blew himself up. Twelve children were killed, along with their teachers.

For these terrorists, there is no moral code or human impulse which might otherwise spare innocent children from the atrocities that these radicalised minds seek to dispense. It is increasingly across the world in other terrorist attacks as well that the targets of their extremist terrorism seem to be women and children, with the principal aim being to kill as many people as possible. They are nothing more than barbaric acts based on race and religion, which dehumanise people, which our society must fight against.

This parliament, again, condemns this extremism and the terrorism which results. This community condemnation has an important role to play in not accepting extremist behaviour that leads to terrorist acts. Out of these attacks, many emotions spring to mind and are no doubt different for each one of us. Some of these raw emotions are fear, anger and sorrow: fear of copycat attacks and fear of reprisals. Around the world we have seen Christians, Jews, Muslims—people just like us who have families, who love and come together to enjoy sport, holiday and to pray—all destroyed by terrorism.

In March, the Premier spoke about the Al Noor and Linwood mosques in Christchurch and an extremist terrorist motivated by hate who walked into the Christchurch mosques and massacred innocent men, women and children, leaving many others injured and ripping families and friends apart. These mosques in New Zealand and the churches in Sri Lanka were easily accessible from the street for worshippers attending prayers. Similar scenes occur in Australia on Fridays and Sundays as congregations worship peacefully in mosques and churches, which are, again, easily accessible and welcoming. These events do instil fear, but we need to overcome this fear and continue our way of life. At the same time, as a community we must be vigilant and alert to strange behaviours.

Anger is another emotion that springs to mind, and this is where the community must be careful not to turn against each other, for in so doing it is exactly what the extremists hope for: dividing communities and inciting violence against each other. At times like these, it is more important than ever that parents spend time with their children, or grandparents with their grandchildren, firstly to reassure them but also to seek out family involvement so that people do not become isolated at a time when social media and the internet are used by extremists to amplify their voices and creep into the minds of the isolated and disenfranchised. Susceptible people looking for a sense of identity and self-worth are preyed upon by these extremists, who give them a warped version of it.

In an interview with a Sri Lankan man in the aftermath of the attacks, he said that one of his fears was that if educated children of seemingly wealthy parents could be radicalised to commit such barbarous acts then this radicalisation could happen to his children as well. This is where the family unit becomes so important in providing a guard against this but also for the wider community to call

out extremist behaviour. In these tragic times, the importance of family is always brought to mind and brings about feelings of sorrow. We mourn the tragic loss of life and extend our deepest sympathy to the families and friends of all those affected by this appalling event.

This time of year is usually a time of celebration in Sri Lanka. At the start of April, I was invited by the South Australian Sri Lankan community to attend their new year celebrations, organised by Dr Sarath Senadeera, President of the Adelaide Sri Lankan Buddhist Vihara society. At this time, Sri Lankans celebrate the new year, when the sun transits from the constellation of Pisces to Aries, which occurs around mid-April. It is the time in Sri Lanka when the paddy harvest is taken into the houses and the whole country comes together to celebrate this event. It is a colourful time that brings the whole family together to mark the end of the current year and to look forward to the year ahead.

During the transition of the sun, the Sri Lankan people stop all work and visit their local temples. When the new year dawns, the families cook food that the whole family eats at the same time, and then they begin work again. Part of the tradition is to respect adults, enjoy feasts and participate in games within the community. The celebrations in South Australia showcased those feelings by traditional dances, which were warm and friendly.

As the Premier said, the Sri Lankan community in South Australia is a young community with nearly two-thirds being families with children. The Sri Lankan community is also a well-educated community, with many having come to South Australia as skilled migrants, while many others are studying at TAFE. Many have become very active in the life of the South Australian community. We stand in solidarity with the people of Sri Lanka and South Australia's Sri Lankan community.

This was particularly evident when, last Sunday, the Sri Lankan Catholic Association of South Australia held a memorial service at St Francis Xavier's Cathedral in Adelaide. It was attended by the Governor, His Excellency Hieu Van Le, the Premier and many members of this parliament, the Sri Lankan Catholic Association, the wider Catholic community and the wider South Australian community of multiple faiths and ethnicity. The Sri Lankan honorary consul was also in attendance, and he said at the time that he happened to be in Colombo on the day of the attacks and experienced the devastation they caused.

On arrival at the church, many people lit a candle as a mark of respect for all the victims and their families. I spoke with a couple who had moved to Australia from Sri Lanka seven years ago, and they knew friends whose loved ones were caught up in the attacks. Father Philip Marshall led the service and spoke of the need for elders to be present to guide impressionable minds. He said that the people present at the memorial demonstrated the condemnation of these terrorist acts and the greater desire for peace—not a peace that comes after war and atrocity but an inclusive peace where people can live together and respect each other's differences.

There were also people present from other faiths, including members of the Buddhist community and imams from Adelaide's mosques. Professor Mohamad Abdalla spoke of going over to Christchurch after the recent terrorist attacks there and seeing the pain of the families affected and so could imagine that same pain being experienced by families in Sri Lanka.

The memorial service itself sent a clear message to those present and the wider community in South Australia that the government, the parliament and the people of South Australia condemn extremism and terrorism and stand together with the Sri Lankan community and the wider Christian community. Today is a chance for this parliament to reaffirm its commitment to an inclusive and harmonious multicultural society. After the Christchurch attacks, one of the messages of support from South Australians was a poem that remains true on this terrible occasion: 'Evil will not divide us, love will unite us, compassion will be our comfort.'

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:26): I, too, rise to speak in wholehearted support of this motion. I acknowledge all who have spoken and are speaking on this motion and thank them for their words and for their willingness to speak and act together here in this place and beyond in unity and in solidarity with Sri Lanka.

In speaking, I also acknowledge and offer my deepest condolences and love to the people of Sri Lanka and our beautiful Sri Lankan community in South Australia; people who are kind, peaceful, loving and accepting and who contribute so much and so generously to the fabric of South

Australian community life people who should never have to mourn their loved ones nor suffer the devastation that these appalling evil acts have caused or the fear that those who perpetrated them hope to engender, mourning and suffering that we recognise will last for many long days, weeks, months and years ahead. We do and will all stand with them in those difficult times ahead.

As are we all, I am absolutely dismayed that again we mourn innocent people who, whilst peacefully going about the practising of their faith, were tragically and violently killed and that again we see hundreds injured and families and communities devastated. Like billions of people around the world and many of us in this place, my family and I attended various masses at Easter; masses that were conducted in a peaceful, sacred environment, where people gathered only for good, to reflect on what the Easter period means to them, to celebrate the holiest of times that Easter is and to connect with others in our community; masses that were conducted in an environment where we felt safe and would never have dreamed of being anything but.

To contemplate such atrocities being unleashed in that type of environment, and indeed anywhere, where children, families and friends sat together, prayed together and enjoyed each other's company is truly shocking. To contemplate them as the world still reels from the atrocities carried out in Christchurch, again in a place of worship, is truly heartbreaking. Our hearts are all so heavy as we reflect on them. These are acts that deeply, deeply trouble all of us. These are acts that must and should only elicit responses, words and actions that utterly defy and stand in complete opposition and contrast to the hate, the division, the racism and the lack of acceptance that drive and characterise those acts.

This contrasting spirit of love, unity, solidarity, compassion and peace was absolutely on display when, as others have spoken about, we gathered with the Sri Lankan Catholic Association of South Australia, and the Sri Lankan and broader South Australian community for mass on Sunday night at St Francis Xavier's Cathedral. I wholeheartedly thank all who organised this mass and the Sri Lankan community leaders here in South Australia, some of whom join us today, whose courage in the face of such adversity, whose dignity and whose willingness to reach out in an open way at such a difficult time to others is remarkable and evidence of that courage, that kindness and that resilience.

Together, in the lead-up to mass, hundreds lit candles and offered prayers, and together, throughout mass, we heard from Father Philip Marshall about the need for us all to deeply consider and to find, recognise and embrace each other's humanity and to find togetherness, no matter what. Muslim faith leader Professor Mohamad Abdalla, whom our South Australian community is so blessed to have with us, was joined by many imams and members of the Muslim community here in South Australia and the Buddhist community, all there in solidarity and in the spirit of love.

Professor Abdalla addressed our gathering and spoke about the fact that this hatred, this killing, is never carried out in the name of anyone, nor any religion, and that this hatred and this killing have no place anywhere. Both these leaders and other faith leaders also spoke about the precious unity that we create together in South Australia. It is a unity that sends a message to our community and the world that together we stand for love and for peace and that we will continue to do so in the face of adversity and in the face of any form of hatred or racism or extremism that threatens to divide us.

It is hard to put into exact words the very special feeling present in the cathedral on Sunday night. It was a feeling of unity and of deep determination to ensure that we here in our community will work to always express love and peace in our hearts, our thoughts and our actions. It was a feeling that made all of us there know that love will always triumph over evil.

Today, together as a parliament, we offer our deepest sympathy, our love and our solidarity as we stand shoulder to shoulder with all who have lost loved ones in such horrific, tragic circumstances, with our local Sri Lankan community and with all in Sri Lanka. By supporting and speaking to this motion together and by speaking out together, we reflect that unity that was spoken about and felt so deeply in the cathedral on Sunday night. Together, we reflect our determination to continue to speak and reach out together into our communities in a way that shows that love, peace and togetherness are the only way for our community, for our world and that love and peace must be the very core of our future of what we teach and show our children.

Together, we must, and together we will, as we do today, utterly reject the hatred and extremism that motivated those who committed these atrocities and that motivates those who seek to fan division rather than embrace diversity and recognise that we are one in humanity. We must draw a line under the hatred and racism of these terrible events in both Sri Lanka and Christchurch and relegate them to our past through the love and unity demonstrated in every corner of the globe in the wake of them.

We know that sadly not everyone in our nation believes that welcome, understanding and peace are the way forward. We know that there are those who wish to peddle hatred and division, sometimes shamefully for their own purposes, but we know that this hatred and division are not, and nor will they ever be, our future. Together, we will not let it be so. Our future is deeply strengthened by our cultural diversity, and the embracing of this diversity is fundamental to the strength, the fairness and the future of our state and our world.

A different way forward can and must be born from this tragedy and, together with love, understanding and acceptance and a rejection of hate, we can and will walk that path forward. Together, we will not let this define us. We will be defined by love, unity and hope. Our unity, our love and our connection through our humanity must and will triumph and prevail.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (11:34): I also rise to support the motion moved by the Premier and to give my sincere condolences to the Sri Lankan community and all those who are affected. Easter Sunday is the day Christians around the world celebrate the resurrection of Jesus. However, for those worshipping in the shrine of St Anthony, St Sebastian's Church and the Protestant evangelical Zion Church in Sri Lanka, their day of celebration turned into horror the moment suicide bombers entered each of those places, detonating their devices.

At the same time, a number of foreign tourists were enjoying Easter Sunday breakfast in restaurants located in the Shangri-La Hotel, the Cinnamon Grand Hotel and The Kingsbury. As guests were enjoying their holiday weekend with family and friends, three suicide bombers destroyed their tranquillity, killing many and delivering to the survivors nightmares for years to come. The six coordinated attacks killed more than 250 people. Each of those people had a story and leave behind loved ones. These attacks have been described as one of the most lethal and serious terrorist operations since the September 11 attacks in the US, outside of attacks within active conflict zones.

But we cannot lose hope. At the evangelical Zion Church, worshipper Mr Ramesh Raju, a 40-year-old father of two, challenged a man carrying a backpack who wanted to enter the church. The man explained that he had come to make a video of the church; however, Mr Raju was rightly dubious of that explanation and led the man away. Shortly after, the man detonated a bomb. Tragically, 29 people, including 14 children, died at that location. Mr Raju also lost his life, but his actions and instincts most definitely saved the majority of the 600 worshippers inside. The actions of civilians such as Mr Raju, the first responders, the three police officers who lost their lives in explosions while looking for the suspects, and the medical teams who treated the injured remind us that there is far more good in the world than evil.

Any act of terrorism and extremism should be condemned. Religious ideologies have no place in this world and no place disrupting and destroying the majority of the population who desire to live in harmony. Last week, the national colours of Sri Lanka lit up the exterior of Adelaide Oval, a wonderful tribute on a landmark in our city and in my electorate but a poignant one, given the battles over the years between Sri Lanka and Australia on the cricket pitch.

It was also moving to see the hundreds who joined the Sri Lankan Catholic Association of South Australia at the mass on Sunday evening at St Francis Xavier's Cathedral for a service led by Father Philip Marshall. It was a privilege to stand alongside the Governor, the Premier and many other MPs in solidarity with our South Australian Sri Lankan community members. To those in Sri Lanka and those closer to home who have been impacted, we stand with you today, united and resolute in condemning the attacks in your country and extend our sincere and heartfelt sympathies. I commend the motion to the house.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (11:38): I rise to add my support for the motion before us today and in doing so offer my sincere condolences to the families who lost loved ones and to those injured

in the tragic and devastating events in Sri Lanka. I also extend my condolences and support to the South Australian Sri Lankan community, some of whom I have met with in recent days and shared with me their concern for the safety of family and loved ones in Sri Lanka and the impact that it has had on their lives. I would just like to read a message that goes some way to saying how some of these families are feeling here in South Australia. It reads:

After I met with you the other day, I was telling you about my sister who lives in Sri Lanka. She was about to go for an event on the day of the attack to one of the hotels with my mum. They were getting ready to go and this happened before they left. They live in Colombo full of fear at the moment. There are more bombs hidden everywhere. My sister lost seven of her friends in the attack.

As leaders in the community—whether as members of parliament or local councillors, as journalists in media organisations, as teachers in our schools or as coaches, referees or umpires in our sporting organisations, as employers and bosses in workplaces or as people in positions of authority in our community organisations and also in our own families—we must stand up against prejudice, discrimination and hatred.

We must commit to work even harder as individuals and collectively in our communities to achieve greater inclusion, tolerance, acceptance and understanding of the different cultures we live among. We all have a role to play. Words are not enough. I commend the motion before the house.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (11:40): I rise today to support the motion moved by the Premier. We are here to express our deepest sorrow and abhorrence at the senseless killing of innocent people in terrorist bombings—in this case, against Christian churches and hotels in Sri Lanka on Easter Sunday. Only a few weeks ago, we were speaking to a very similar motion moved in response to the attacks in Christchurch. Once again, we see abhorrent and senseless killing committed by radical extremists against innocent men, women and children simply going about their own lives. These were revolting acts committed against Christians while they prayed and where they stayed and timed to coincide with the most sacred time in the Christian calendar—Easter.

This was not just an attack against Sri Lankan Christians but an attack against the Sri Lankan nation as a whole, its people and peace-loving communities around the world. In particular, it was an attack against a wonderful community, part of our own community right here in South Australia. I would like to express my deepest condolences to the people of Sri Lanka and, in particular, the Sri Lankan community in South Australia. This is indeed a growing community in our state, making a wonderful contribution.

I have had the great pleasure of meeting many Sri Lankans calling Australia home in Australian citizenship ceremonies locally in the City of Tea Tree Gully. Earlier this year, on behalf of the Premier, and along with the member for Heysen, I also had the great honour of attending the 71st anniversary of Sri Lankan independence that was held at the Hectorville Catholic community hall. This was a fantastic event where the unity of the Sri Lankan community was on full display. The observance of the Buddhist, Hindu, Christian and Islamic faiths was a critical part of the celebrations.

As an aside, I should say that one of my favourite parts was when quite young children sang the Sri Lankan national anthem and also the Australian national anthem, including the second verse, which most Australians would struggle with. Today, we stand here together again against extremists in whatever form they come, extremists who seek to divide our communities. We stand in solidarity with Sri Lanka and the Sri Lankan community here in South Australia. I commend the Premier for bringing this motion to this place and all those who have spoken and will speak on it, and I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11:42): I rise today to support the motion as we stand in solidarity with the people of Sri Lanka and South Australia's Sri Lankan community. It was only last year, 14 months ago, that we came together to celebrate and observe the 70th anniversary of the Independence Day of Sri Lanka. This was a momentous milestone in a long history, representing seven decades of political independence. After 450 years of colonial rule, in 1948 Sri Lanka, or Ceylon as it was known then, emerged as a proudly independent and unique nation.

Since that time, Sri Lanka and its people have overcome significant challenges while making great progress and achievements along the way. Today, as a community, we are taking the time to mourn and reflect upon Sri Lanka's latest significant challenge: the coordinated terrorist bombings at

Christian churches and hotels in Sri Lanka on Easter Sunday 2019. Just as we were able to come together to celebrate Sri Lanka's Independence Day, we come together today, standing with the people of Sri Lanka and South Australia's Sri Lankan community.

This is a community that has grown to more than 4,000 people in South Australia, each contributing to our state in their own way. In my previous role as minister for multicultural affairs, I was welcomed incredibly warmly to experience the traditions and cultural heritage of our Sri Lankan community. We worked closely together to see the development of the Adelaide Sri Lanka Buddhist Vihara, and it was a wonderful day to be with many members of the Sri Lankan community and open this wonderful venue in Crafrers.

We come together often to celebrate. We pride ourselves in South Australia on being a welcoming and diverse multicultural community. Today, we come to support our Sri Lankan community because we know that, while they are a diverse community, they are peaceful and that their practices and prayers welcome all South Australians to come together.

We are committed to being an inclusive and harmonious multicultural society, one that condemns terrorism and extremism in all its forms. Terror, by its very nature, makes us frightened and makes us scared, but we know that together we are stronger. We know that together we speak out. We speak out to our community who are hurting and who have lost loved ones, but it is our actions and it is our words that we must continue to shout out. We are stronger together and diversity is our strength.

Today, I offer my deepest sympathy to the families and friends who have been affected by this event. I am greatly concerned about the economic impacts this will have on Sri Lanka, and we will continue to work with you into the future to fundraise and to support. We hope that we do not speak again in this house on a condolence motion for people who were praying, who were celebrating their religion in peace and who were attacked. It frightens all of us because we want to be able to live our lives with peace and freedom and we know that there are people out there who do not support that. My thoughts are with you.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:47): I am speaking today in support of the motion expressing sorrow at this latest attack in Sri Lanka, which has taken the lives of some 250 people, injured many more and changed many more people's lives forever. I am shocked and deeply saddened to be standing here talking about another mass murder. This cruel and heartless event took the lives of so many innocent men, women and children in Sri Lanka on what should have been a peaceful Easter Sunday. These bombings have come with little precedent. Sri Lanka may have endured a ghastly civil war and suicide bombings in the past, but nothing of this scale.

People have been stunned by the level of coordination behind these strikes and suggested that the attacks carried the hallmarks of an international plot. It was, of course, of no surprise when ISIS took credit for the despicable mass murder. The barbaric and twisted worldwide organisation claimed it was in retaliation for the killing of 50 Muslims during last month's mass shooting in Christchurch. The level of depravity of ISIS is beyond evil. There are no words that can be used to explain the hatred that this organisation thrives upon, but there are words I want to use to express to leaders around the world, particularly here in Australia: radical Islamic terror has no place in our society.

I have had enough. Since September 11, 2001, an event that shocked the world, the Muslim community—the peaceful Muslim community—has been persecuted through the actions of extremists and fundamentalists. They have been forced to explain their faith as it has been attacked across the world. They have been forced to apologise for the despicable acts of a few.

The victims of the Christchurch attacks, their families, their friends and their peaceful community would be absolutely horrified to think that a revenge attack has taken place in their names, claiming even more lives. The people of New Zealand do not want revenge; they want peace and harmony. We have seen the peaceful and culturally encompassing actions of the wonderful Prime Minister Jacinda Ardern. How devastating it must be for her to learn that even more people have died as a result of what happened in her peaceful country.

While leaders need to stand strong and be resilient, what about parents? What about our children? What do we as parents say to our children who want to spread their wings and enjoy the world, be that through the internet or in real life, as they grow up? It is so difficult for parents and caregivers to protect our children, to let them maintain their innocence and be young for longer when we are constantly being exposed to this kind of hatred in our own lounge rooms.

To watch a child board a plane to travel to the other side of the world should not fill a parent with fear: it should be seen as an exciting adventure. As a parliamentarian and as a parent, my hope is simple: for peaceful change and strong leadership. Strong leaders need to emerge and shut down this racist and dangerous riffraff, particularly those in Australia's parliament. I am talking about people who express hate to others, hate amongst and between cultures. I am talking about people like Pauline Hanson and Fraser Anning. People like that have no place in our society and most definitely have no place in our parliament.

I call on my parliamentary colleagues to continue to call these people out. I call on the public and community leaders to call these people out. Racist and hate-filled rhetoric designed only for their mindless and moronic political purposes simply has to stop, and it is up to us to help lead that charge. We must insist that it stops now. As leaders, we can change the pathway of modern society. We can lead by example. We can lead our young people and let them lead us on this pathway.

When I speak to people in my community, no matter their age, race or religion, it is reinforced to me every day, especially by young people, that they want a sustainable, caring, loving world. No-one wants hate. Because of another life-changing event where our trust, sense of fun and carefree spirit have taken a beating, our world is never going to be the same. When bigots and racists take control, there is no stopping the fear of what could happen next.

I extend my heartfelt condolences to the global family of Sri Lanka. To the victims, families and friends affected by that act of mass murder, I say sorry. I am truly, truly sorry. It breaks my heart to stand here and talk about another tragedy so soon after the events in New Zealand. To the Sri Lankan community in Adelaide who have family and friends in Sri Lanka, we reach out to you.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (11:54): The coordinated attacks on Easter Sunday shocked me and my community for so many reasons. It is a sad fact that we have become somewhat desensitised to terrorist attacks in countries across the world in recent decades, but as the news broke I had a strong gut reaction—an instant, deep sadness.

Sri Lanka is not just another place to me. It is of course the birthplace of many people in my community. I visited Sri Lanka in 2005 and 2006, first arriving on the nation's independence day. It was about a year after the tsunami, and I volunteered on recovery works, which, even a year later, were still desperately needed. I remember the high security in what turned out to be the dying days of the civil war that had plagued the country for something like three decades.

Despite the police with high-powered weapons patrolling the streets and the airports, I found Colombo, Kandy, the Galle district, and the other places that I travelled to tranquil, naturally stunning and very friendly. As a young white woman in my 20s travelling alone, I always felt safe and welcome. My memories of those six or seven weeks in Sri Lanka are now frequently refreshed when I talk with local Sri Lankan people in Badcoe who have chosen to come to live in Adelaide.

It is a privilege for me to attend community events with the Sri Lankan people and to feel so welcome again. It is a great joy for me to converse with Sri Lankans about eating far too many hoppers at the Kandy markets, shopping for handmade leather goods that I still own and use today, swimming in a stream with orphaned baby elephants at Pinnawala Elephant Sanctuary—yes, that really happened; if you go to Sri Lanka, make sure you go there because it is incredible—or staying with local families who were so generous as to open their homes to me.

I have been very lucky, mainly through my previous life as a journalist, to travel to many far-flung places that are off the tourist track. Of all the countries I have visited, Sri Lanka is absolutely my favourite and the one that I recommend to others, particularly young travellers. It has a stunning natural beauty that is only paralleled by the generosity of its citizens.

Having had that experience in Sri Lanka and knowing that many peace-loving Sri Lankans now live in my community, it was truly shocking to hear of the horror perpetrated on a most holy day,

Easter Sunday, a day that is meant to celebrate hope, love, forgiveness and faith. Like Australia, Sri Lanka is a multicultural nation with citizens of many faiths. That has not always been easy in Sri Lanka, and the deaths of some 250 people and injuries to many more is abhorrent.

I, too, attended the Sunday service at St Francis Xavier's Cathedral, attended by some 900 people. There was much said that was good and stirring and important at that service, but what really struck me were the words of Professor Abdalla. The presence of the Muslim leaders at the service on Sunday I think was important and really resonated with a lot of people who were there. Professor Abdalla said that hate begets hate and that violence begets violence, and he talked about the need for all of us to work towards breaking the cycle of violence. I think it was a really important message.

The other really important message that he talked about, far more eloquently than most of us can manage to muster, is that these attacks were not an act of religion. They were not the word of Allah and they were not committed as part of the Muslim faith. Indeed, the Muslim faith does not support murder in any way at all; in fact, it condemns it quite explicitly. I think it was really important to have Muslim leaders there to talk about that and to stand as one with members of our broader Adelaide community, particularly the Sri Lankan community.

To the Sri Lankan community in South Australia, I and all my colleagues here stand with you. We acknowledge the grief, the pain and the sadness that you feel. It is a pleasure to have had the chance to get to know you. You enrich our community. During this terribly sad time, we offer our sympathy and support.

I would also like to acknowledge the two innocent Australians who died in the attack. Manik Suriyaaratchi and her 10-year-old daughter, Alexendria, were attending a church service when this cowardly attack took place. Our deepest condolences go to those who knew and loved Manik and Alexendria. The Prime Minister of New Zealand, Jacinda Ardern, at a memorial for the victims of the Christchurch terror attack, recently said:

...we also ask that the condemnation of violence and terrorism turns now to a collective response. The world has been stuck in a vicious cycle of extremism breeding extremism and it must end. We cannot confront these issues alone, none of us can. But the answer to them lies in a simple concept that is not bound by domestic borders, that isn't based on ethnicity, power base or even forms of governance. The answer lies in our humanity.

As representatives of our community, let us stand firm in condemning this attack, an attack that took place on one of the most holy days for Christians. As terrorism once again impacts our region, let our parliament reaffirm the truth that an attack on any place of religion and on innocent people simply practising their faith is an attack on the freedom of us all and the faiths—or non-faith—of us all everywhere. It is an assault upon our humanity. These horrific attacks and the innocent lives lost are not forgotten. We stand with the Sri Lankan community during this terrible time.

The SPEAKER (12:00): I also rise to make a couple of remarks in support of the Premier's motion. I also acknowledge the presence of Dr Charitha Perera and Prabath Perera, who are with us today. All of us should have the right to attend a place of worship in peace, regardless of the faith that we have. The attacks in Sri Lanka on people at their most vulnerable are truly callous and shocking.

The Sri Lankan community in South Australia is a beautiful community. I know that members on both sides of the chamber have had the joy and delight of attending the various religious and cultural events that the Sri Lankan community have hosted. Such is the humility of the Sri Lankan people here that once they even had a function with the Twenty20 Sri Lankan cricket team. Such is the humility of the people that they were there mingling with as many people as they could. They are such a humble group. They have always opened their arms to me with warmth and friendliness and have always been extremely welcoming at their events.

As members have alluded to this morning, they truly enrich our state. As the Premier pointed out, more than 3,000 people in South Australia once called Sri Lanka their home. We should especially acknowledge those who may have lost relations in Sri Lanka during these terrorist attacks. I am informed that in my electorate of Hartley a further mass to the one that was held recently will be held this Sunday. I encourage members to attend it if they can.

Upon learning of the vigil, we as a parliament did what we could to show our deepest condolences. I know that members will certainly attend the fundraiser in due course, but we also lit up the outside of Parliament House to reflect the Sri Lankan colours—the colours of their flag—which represent the embodiment of multiculturalism and different faiths coming together. I know that this is a deeply sad time for the Sri Lankan people but that they will bounce back. We stand in solidarity with the people of Sri Lanka, as well as South Australia's Sri Lankan community. I invite all members present to rise for one minute in silence as a mark of respect.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Bills

MOTOR VEHICLES (COMPULSORY THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 April 2019.)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:05): I rise to speak on the Motor Vehicles (Compulsory Third Party Insurance) Amendment Bill, a bill introduced in the other place and now before us. It is a relatively straightforward one. I indicate from the outset the opposition's support for the bill and also that I am the opposition's lead speaker.

As you would be aware, in 2016 the former Labor government approved four private insurers to underwrite the compulsory third-party motor vehicle insurance scheme and established an independent CTP regulator to oversee the insurers and the scheme. This was the first time that private insurers had provided insurance in the motor vehicle market or, I should say more specifically, the compulsory third-party insurance market relating to motor vehicles.

As I mentioned, there are four insurers competing for business from 1 July this year, three years on from that reform in 2016. I was advised in the briefing I received from the government that they are QBE, Allianz, AAMI and SGIC. QBE, I am advised, has a 35 per cent market share; Allianz, a 15 per cent market share; AAMI, a 30 per cent market share; and SGIC, 20 per cent.

Those allocations to the different insurers were based primarily on the response to the invitations to tender from those insurers about what proportion of the market they sought. Since that time, motorists' CTP insurance policies have been automatically allocated to these approved insurers. This automatic allocation will no longer apply after the expiry of the transitional period, which ends on 30 June this year just before the commencement the following day of 'full competition'.

The need for this bill is to provide for some further arrangements, principally around the allocation of insurers to people purchasing new vehicles, usually from a dealer, and then more specifically about having a regime whereby somebody who was allocated an insurer and who wishes to change insurer to avail themselves of a different insurance product, or perhaps be insured by an insurer that they are more familiar with, for example, will allow them to change their insurer and provide a period of time and a process by which that may occur.

It has also been mooted that there will be a particular form that registration renewal notices will take that will give people a choice of insurer and indicate the price that each insurer is demanding for the insurance they are offering. There will also be a consumer satisfaction rating, which is to be derived from and administered by the CTP insurance regulator. That will not only give motorists an opportunity to choose a price but will also give the deemed performance of an insurer when selecting with whom they wish to be insured. This is all relatively straightforward and eminently sensible.

However, there is also a further change in the bill that provides for a regime of inducements that an insurer may be able to offer when offering a motorist the opportunity to be insured. This is commonplace in other insurance markets. With home and compulsory motor vehicle insurance and other forms of insurance there may be incentives that are not specifically related to that product to attract custom—for example, multipolicy discounts. If you insure your home and your car as well as perhaps a boat or another asset, then a discount can be applied across the value of all those insurance premiums.

I understand there are also in place in other jurisdictions reward program memberships. For example, gift cards and at-fault driver protection policies and so on are all offered as inducements to motorists who are seeking to have themselves insured for CTP insurance. This provides for those inducements to be offered here in South Australia. That, in itself, as far as the opposition sees, is not controversial and provides for a regime whereby the Treasurer can approve those inducements to be provided to the market.

The opposition did have some concern with that element of it and indeed did move an amendment in the other place requiring that those inducements be of a prescribed class, which essentially would mean that, rather than be merely approved by the minister, they would have to be approved via regulation. That was important for a couple of reasons: firstly, to provide transparency and assure transparency on what inducements had been sought and approved by the market and who had received approval for which inducements.

While during the briefing on the bill I was provided with an assurance that it was the intention of the CTP regulator to publish those inducements on the website, there is no legislative instrument that requires this at the moment. It is also important for the benefit of providing a level playing field. It is conceivable that the regime the bill introduces enables one insurer to approach the Treasurer and seek approval for an inducement, which can be approved without the remainder of the market, let alone the consumers, being aware of the availability of that inducement.

If that were to eventuate, that provides, how can I put it, an inside running to one insurer over another because the other insurers may also be able to offer that inducement; however, they are not aware of the approval of the inducement. The regulator assures me and has assured the other place that that would be ameliorated by publication on the website; however, as I just said, there is no requirement to do this. I thought it was a reasonable amendment to the bill in the other place to require this by regulation.

One of the strongest arguments against that proposition, I am advised, was the timeliness of managing the bill so that it can come into effect by mid-May—mid-May, of course, being approximately six weeks out from the end of financial year and government, for many years, seeking at least a six-week period in which to be able to start issuing new vehicle re-registration notices to the community—and here we are, of course, right on the cusp of the beginning of May.

To seek a regulation in this environment, we were advised, was not feasible or too onerous for the government. I do not really think this holds water. Such a regulation can easily be made at such short notice and, while the member for Morphett might be taken by surprise that I have mentioned him in the scheme of the bill, I will give an example about how quickly regulations can be made.

He and I, both in former roles, worked together to ensure that both the council of which he was mayor at the time—the City of Holdfast Bay—and the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure had a shared responsibility for the infrastructure, which comprised the breakwater jutting out not too far away from the Holdfast Shores Marina, near which, unfortunately, there was a tragic drowning some time ago. Hopefully, it is not even a footnote in history, given the tedium to which this anecdote must necessarily relate to.

The breakwater was a shared responsibility because the council governed access to the breakwater and the transport department managed the actual asset of the infrastructure, so if the council and the government had a mind, as we did, to ban pedestrian access to the breakwater to ensure that people could not swim off it and potentially come to ill, as that unfortunate person had done during that summer, then a regulation quickly needed to be made and rushed through in order to prevent access to that breakwater.

I do not mind telling you that I encountered some of the resistance, the treacle-like momentum, that can confront ministers from time to time due to some reluctance from the department to make that regulation. In fact, I was told that it certainly would not be possible. I asked this question on a Tuesday afternoon and to expect it to be considered, approved and made by the Governor by Thursday was wholly unreasonable.

It was not a particularly complex regulation to be made: merely a number of geographical coordinates needed to be ascertained and written into a document and there needed to be a brief supplementary cabinet meeting and presentation to the Governor and Executive Council. That was all able to be done at quite short notice; in fact, the regulation was in place by Thursday. That may only be of interest to the member for Morphett and I. It may only be of interest to me and not the member for Morphett, but it does illustrate the point that regulations can be made very quickly when need be, and sometimes there is an urgent need to make them.

Regulations can also commence by certificate of early commencement and hence may not be subject to the cursory 30 days laying before both houses of parliament to give any member the opportunity to move a motion of disallowance. All this could be achievable with such a regulation made in relation to this bill; however, we put those arguments. Those arguments were not supported by the other place, and my mathematics tells me that, if they are not supported by the other place, my chances of successfully moving them here are somewhat less than they were elsewhere.

Mr Pederick: Limited.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, they are somewhat limited, as the member for Hammond says, so I will not be progressing that regulation here, but I do think it is an important point and one that needs to be placed on the record. This is the first time these four companies will be touting for business. They will be in hard competition with each other. I made mention of those different market allocations between those insurers. Those insurers are of a different size and scale from one another.

Those insurance companies have a different size and scale from the CTP motor vehicle insurance market here and will be competing very hard for South Australians' business from 1 July. The offering of inducements will be a key strategy for them to attract new clientele. I believe it is important to note in this place that there should be a regime of greater transparency around this. I think it is regrettable that the government did not accept the amendment and did not seek to exert a little more energy as a result and make these approvals via regulation, but there we are.

We will have to wait and see what the behaviour of the market is over the coming months, and perhaps years, to see if all the insurers feel they have had equal, open and transparent access to the Treasurer for approval of these inducements so that they all feel they have an equal run at the market and that consumers feel that the insurer they are contemplating may be able to offer them the full suite of inducements that have been approved by the Treasurer. Nonetheless, I feel I am getting close to exhausting the argument in that respect.

I will leave my contribution there, notwithstanding any other members looking to make a second reading contribution. I indicate to the government our support and also that we will not require any time in committee—unless, of course, the government has an amendment or anything of that nature.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:20): I thank the member for his indication that the opposition will be supporting the bill and that it will not be necessary, as per his advice, for there to be any committee. On that basis, I indicate that the government will not be proposing any amendment and that therefore we will not seek to go into committee either.

There was one matter that was again raised by the opposition in this house, and it had been traversed in the other place during the debate of first instance on this bill, that is, the basis upon which there had been opposition to their opposition's proposal for an inducement model to be incorporated in regulations. It was presented to the other place as a measure that would add to the transparency of the model being proposed.

Again today we hear from the member, the speaker for the opposition, of their disquiet at the rejection of that in the other place. I put this to the house as some assurance: in other privately underwritten CTP schemes—in New South Wales, Queensland and the ACT—the types of inducements are not prescribed in law. The bill being presented by the government adds an additional requirement of controlling inducements by requiring the minister to approve the class or type of inducement allowed to be offered by the CTP insurers. This additional protection for the motoring community does not appear in other jurisdictions.

The minister-approved class of inducements will be publicly available on the CTP regulator's website. That was noted in the contribution from the opposition to be an indication by Ms Kim Birch, the regulator—who is present here today—and I am puzzled at the suggestion by the member that in some way this suggests there might be some failing on behalf of the regulator to do just that.

The imputation by the member in respect of the benefit of this disclosure on the website, or indeed the bona fides of the CTP regulator to both assume that responsibility and undertake the indication she has made, is, I think, quite disturbing. Nevertheless, as has been identified, this is a measure in the bill which does not apply even in other jurisdictions and which is an extra protection for consumers, in particular the motoring community.

Prescribing in regulation would remove the intended flexibility and is inconsistent with the intention of how a privately underwritten competitive scheme would operate. Direct policy holder inducements offered by one or some of the CTP insurers will be a lever used to win and hold market share and should be able to be released to market as soon as possible. The model outlined in this bill will enable the minister to approve within days any new class of inducement that becomes available. It also enables responsiveness to withdraw approval by the minister, should it become apparent that the inducement is not appropriate.

Examples of class of inducements are discounts off other insurance products, reward programs, gift cards, roadside services and crash and injury reduction products. The regulator, who, as I have indicated, is present here today, will be responsible to monitor the types of inducements being offered by insurers and to notify all insurers written into insurer contracts of changes to all classes of inducement.

I commend the honourable Treasurer of the government in another place for the presentation of this bill to ensure that there is an additional requirement in the model for controlling of inducements, and I also thank the CTP Insurance Regulator for both her current role and anticipated further responsibility in this important area.

I would hope that members would therefore appreciate the significance of the benefits of this legislation, the reason for it and the additional basis, relative to other jurisdictions, upon which it is offered. I am also mindful that there have been some considerable findings in the recent national royal commission and the highlighting in that commission of misconduct in the banking/superannuation/financial services industry surrounding the issue of commissions and inducements that impact on customer outcomes.

Recommendation 4.4 of that royal commission's final report proposed that there should be a cap on the amount of commissions that may be paid to vehicle dealers in relation to sale or add-on insurance products, and that is something of which this government is mindful. It may be that other jurisdictions that currently have these models, when they review the royal commission reports in detail, may make some advance in this area as well, but we have had the benefit of the opportunity to review the commission's recommendations before this bill was presented to the house.

A final point I would like to place on the record relates to the time frame and the significance of the timeliness of this legislation. The previous government some years ago now introduced the proposal to privatise compulsory third-party insurance in this state. That is a matter they determined back in 2015 in announcing a market-based model for the private sector to provide compulsory third party, and they set a number of parameters.

The first thing they did was enter into the whole process by contract. That came under severe criticism, both publicly and from our side of politics, because we felt that it was important, as happened in other jurisdictions, that this sale, the privatisation of this product, should be within the parameters of a statute, not a secret contract. As we know, the repeated conduct of the previous government, a standard they set themselves, was to enter into contracts, whether for the sale and privatisation of the lands titles services or other such—

Mr Cregan: Gillman.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, well, let's not even start on Gillman; that could really keep me here for days. It was a standard they set themselves, which, frankly, is a standard or threshold with which we do not agree. We take the view that, in respect of this whole exercise, it should have

been under statute and it should have been something this parliament could scrutinise. However, having not done that and having announced that some years ago, whilst there was the establishment of the insurance regulator as an independent statutory authority—which we welcome, and I commend the regulator for her work to date and her continued commitment to this role—it is a model which was born within a contract.

Whilst this government embraces the establishment of the regulator and their obligations, we very clearly feel that it is important to add the extra protection in this legislation. The time frame we were given to deal with this was set by the former government. They are the ones who set 1 July 2019 as the commencement date for the new regime. So, please, spare us the suggestion in this parliament today that in some way the delay or obligation to deal with this matter expeditiously is the fault of the Treasurer or the government. The former government set the time frame for this.

The process was identified and taken through cabinet, which, as the member well knows, is the proper process. It was brought to the attention of the house in adequate time, complying with the rules in the other place, and earlier this month it was introduced to this place and available for consultation, briefings and debate in the parliament. It is fair to say that the opposition indicated, and maintain today, their support for the legislation. We welcome that, but please do not come in here with crocodile tears about being expected to in some way expeditiously deal with this matter as we are approaching 1 July 2019, given that the parameters of the implementation of this policy was set by the former government. With those words, I endorse the passage of the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 April 2019.)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:34): I rise to make a contribution on the Supply Bill introduced for this year, a very straightforward bill. As we would be familiar, it is to provide the government with sufficient money in order to conduct the business of government in the early months of the subsequent financial year, particularly as the budget is going through its parliamentary stages, with estimates committees still to come.

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am the lead speaker. I will make my customary brief remarks, Deputy Speaker, on this bill. This year's Supply Bill finds itself being introduced in an environment quite different from that in which last year's Supply Bill was introduced.

We have a significant change in the economic position of the state. We have had an increase in the trend unemployment rate in South Australia. We have had a dwindling of the number of new jobs that have been created over the past 12 months, and in particular in this financial year. Employment growth rates have plunged since March 2018, and that means fewer jobs are being created in this state.

We also have an increase in the number of unemployed in South Australia and, concerningly, a significant increase in the number of young people unemployed, those between 15 and 24 years of age. It is worth commenting a little more on those employment statistics because in the lead-up to the last state election South Australians were promised more jobs and more growth in South Australia. Unfortunately, what we have seen is a slowing of the jobs being created in our economy and a slowing of the state's economy.

We have also seen lower inflation, which may be welcome in itself. However, coupled with the fact that through the year inflation has stood at 1.3 per cent for metropolitan Adelaide, unfortunately it exceeds real wages growth in our economy, which means people have less money in their pockets to afford the higher prices being charged across the economy. We have also seen a significant decline in retail turnover growth. Of course, lower retail sales are an important indicator of the health and strength, and indeed the growth, of the state's economy.

Members will not be surprised to hear me comment on the dwindling number of building approvals that have been recorded over the past 12 months. Indeed, only this morning I was advised that the home builder Cubic has gone into administration, making it either five or six, I think, which have done so in the last six or so months. These are poor statistics at a time when South Australia should be continuing its economic recovery.

Much was made by those opposite about the state of South Australia's economy, particularly through 2016 and 2017, as employment growth slowed, as the state's economic growth rate slowed and as the unemployment rate continued to increase. Certainly, during that time there was a period when South Australia's economy was slowing. There was a dramatic reduction in confidence as our state was confronting the reality of losing one of its largest employing industries in automotive manufacturing.

However, it was very pleasing that in the 2017 calendar year, but particularly later in that year through the early months of 2018, the state was going through an economic recovery. The unemployment rate dropped month after month, the number of jobs created in the lead-up to March 2018 was well above 15,000, I think, and we saw the unemployment rate come down quite sharply.

This was good news for the state and it gave rise to media report after media report about a growing sense of confidence and optimism in the first half of last year. Unfortunately, that trend, as I have just described across those lead indicators, has all but evaporated and South Australia is now finding itself experiencing a time of very soft economic growth across those indicators.

I raise that because I am a firm believer that state governments can have a positive influence on the performance of the state's economy. I was previously a member of a government that invested very heavily in the economy to try to support a level of economic activity. That was done through a broad series of significant tax cuts, through a very large ramp-up in the state's infrastructure investment program, and it was also done through a regime of assisting businesses directly to grow employment and to make those investments necessary to enable them to achieve that.

Nearly all that effort, of course, was removed when the first budget from the Marshall Liberal government was handed down in September last year. That is unfortunate because that removal of such a significant level of support from the state budget to the state's economy is coinciding with this period of softer economic growth.

I know that there are a number of those on the other side of the chamber who believe that governments do not have a role to play in supporting businesses and that governments do not have a role to play in direct involvement in the economy, but I am not one of those because I firmly believe that the experience of 2016-17, and early 2018 in particular, shows the results of a government that is willing to invest in the state's economy.

The first budget brought down for the 2018-19 financial year was a fascinating budget, making spending decisions for that financial year and subsequent financial years. One of the great benefits experienced by that budget was a huge windfall in the forecasted amount of goods and services tax receipts—in fact, \$991 million over the four years from 2017-18 onwards, and we are talking north of \$300 million in additional GST revenue in those years. That is important because it provides some context for the complaints that we have from the current Treasurer and Premier about the reduction in more recent GST forecasts to be received by the state.

It is true that, if they draw a line in the sand from the release of their budget at the beginning of September last year, GST levels for the current financial year are down; however, the finances they inherited from the previous government are best encapsulated by the 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget

Review, which shows that for the current financial year this government is still well ahead in GST revenues, in the order, I understand, of approximately \$100 million in that year alone.

That provides some context and counterbalance to the argument at the moment from the Treasurer that this coming state budget is one that is being framed in a period when the government's revenues have suffered a massively damaging blow. Indeed, what we have seen is the regular—unfortunately regular, but regular nonetheless—ebb and flow of GST revenue forecasts, which all state budgets, of all jurisdictions around the country, must be mindful of, in particular a smaller jurisdiction like South Australia.

When a Treasurer is fortunate enough to receive a deluge of revenue, as Mr Lucas was for the benefit of last year's state budget, one would then suggest it might be imprudent to run out and spend all that money as quickly as possible, as he did in that budget, and only reveal a plan to deliver relatively thin budget surpluses in that context.

It is also true that that was not the only source of revenue that was significantly increased for the benefit of that budget. Members may be aware—certainly, the Minister for Water would be aware—that the South Australian Water Corporation has been shaken down for additional dividends in the most recent state budget, an extra \$128 million over three years. Also, of course, the Treasurer reached into the pockets of his own agencies, his own portfolio, and extracted an extra \$81 million in dividends from the South Australian Government Financing Authority.

You might think that having a strong and growing economy, having a huge increase in the forecast GST revenues and having an enormous additional deluge of revenues (pardon the pun) from SA Water, as well as from other government instrumentalities like the South Australian Government Financing Authority, might mean that the government could turn its mind to how best to support continual jobs growth. Unfortunately, that is not what happened, and I would argue that we see the state's economy suffering from the decision to deliberately pull back on the support for the state's economy.

We saw the boasting of the Treasurer that 29 job creation and job support programs were to be abolished, and we were told that the government would not be picking winners, that the days of direct financial or industry assistance to specific businesses were over, that that is not what this new Liberal government is about. It is a little incongruous, as members might have heard me comment before in this place, given the previous experience this state and the business community had of the Treasurer, when he was treasurer between late 1997 and early 2002, when direct financial assistance to businesses was very common.

We saw all sorts of grants being provided to all sorts of businesses, including to the infamous almond and tree harvesting regimes, which at that time benefited from significant taxation benefits federally. Nonetheless, we were told that this direct financial assistance would stop. Of course, we have a notable exception to that and that is the remarkable decision to provide a \$42 million taxpayer-funded loan to the Adelaide Oval hotel, which the Minister for Infrastructure laughs about.

Other hoteliers do not quite feel as chuffed as he does to see an organisation that already has a significant leg-up in the market continue to be supported by the state government. They are basically being told that they are not good enough or that they are not warranted to receive financial assistance from the government, but the close relationship between the Stadium Management Authority board, in particular the deputy chair, and the new Liberal government has somehow managed to facilitate this \$42 million loan.

I cannot go into that in too much more detail, of course, because there is a parliamentary inquiry underway, and we have already heard some startling revelations from that inquiry. Nonetheless, the environment that we have is a huge amount of additional revenue for the state government and a program of cuts to jobs growth and support programs. I say jobs growth and support, of course, because support has been important in recognising the role of those programs, given that over the last 12 months we have seen a number of notable businesses announce that they are having to close their doors in South Australia. I am not just referring to those builders of which I made quick reference to before; we have also had manufacturing businesses announce that they are having to close their doors.

I would also argue that there is a role for government to play when a company, particularly in an industry involving manufacturing, looks to close its doors, and that is in providing some assistance to the workers for an appropriate level of jobseeking support and retraining. It was certainly the policy of the former Labor government to try to give those workers the best possible opportunity of transitioning from their previous employment to a new job.

A good benchmark to recognise is the experience that Mitsubishi Motors Australia went through in their manufacturing operations in South Australia. They had two facilities: they had an engine plant at Lonsdale and they also had the vehicle manufacturing plant at Tonsley. Through what I guess we could call a protracted series of ongoing concerns about the viability of Mitsubishi's business making cars in Australia, that resulted in the closure of the engine manufacturing plant and then the subsequent closure of the vehicle manufacturing plant in late 2007 or early 2008, if my memory serves me correctly.

Those dates are important. In 2007 and 2008, South Australia, like much of the country, was experiencing a relatively high watermark for economic performance. This was, you will recall, in the months leading up to the September 2008 collapse of Lehman Brothers in the United States that precipitated the global financial crisis. In those months leading up to that, we had a very strong economy in South Australia. We had a very strong national economy here in South Australia and an unfortunately high exchange rate, which was not assisting Mitsubishi with their operations.

But it is important that we place the loss of those jobs in the context of a strong economy where there were many people leaving employment and seeking new employment. Sometime down the track, the workers representatives at the time told the story that there was a roughly one-third, one-third, one-third experience of those workers. Some of the older workers who may have been with Mitsubishi for many years, or indeed Chrysler before that, who were approaching retirement age took what redundancy provisions were available to them and they retired—about a third of them.

Another third took what redundancy provisions were available to them and sought other employment successfully. But the other third, in receipt of those redundancy provisions, despite seeking job opportunities, despite going through retraining and so on, were unable to find employment. That is when the economy is at its strongest. That is in an environment where the state's economic growth rate was getting up towards 4 per cent—almost double the range that we are in at the moment. That is when the unemployment rate was very, very low. We were not in that situation in the last 12 months. We certainly were not in that situation as Holden was winding down and closing its operations.

If we are not in such a strong economic position, then it stands to reason that many of those workers, coming from an industry similar to automotive manufacturing—these manufacturing businesses closing their doors—would need some assistance in transitioning to new employment. I think it is regrettable that the Minister for Innovation and Skills has repeatedly made it clear in his public remarks that he will not be providing any specific support for these workers above and beyond the redundancy provisions that those workers may be entitled to from their former employer.

That is very regrettable because it obviously means that we are likely to have fewer people in the jobs market for a longer period. Those workers who need support are less likely to be able to avail themselves of retraining, less able perhaps to even have the wherewithal to put their own shingle out and start a small business, for example. I think that is very short-sighted of the minister, particularly given that it comes at a time when he is boasting about the significant additional resources that the federal and state governments are putting into training and skills more generally.

That is a bit of an economic context of what we are looking for in this coming state budget. It may come as a surprise, in the face of having such a deluge of additional revenues into the state budget, combined with what we were assured by the Hon. Mr Lucas when he was shadow treasurer during the state election campaign, which was that all the funding promises of the Liberals would be able to be wholly funded, that they would not have to rely on any additional revenues, that there was, as the Premier called it, no agenda for privatisation and there was no need for swingeing cuts across the public sector.

However, that is the budget that South Australians were served with in September—a budget, as we have characterised, of cuts, of closures and of privatisations. There has been

understandable community outrage about many of those cuts—the cuts, for example, to the Service SA centres; the cuts to public transport services, the bus and train services, as the budget papers were particular to point out; the privatisation of the Adelaide Remand Centre; the cuts and, if not successful, the privatisation of SA Pathology. None of this was countenanced in the lead-up to the last state election, yet this is the environment in which this state budget is now to be framed in.

It is important to recognise that, while many of these cuts have been ventilated publicly, there are many, many more cuts that not only have not been delivered but are yet to be identified by the various ministers and their portfolios. If you add up the unallocated cuts task across the four years, we are looking at \$1.25 billion of cuts across the forward estimates. In particular, the locus of the greatest effort of those cuts finds itself in the purview of SA Health, which has taken the remarkable decision to bring in interstate corporate liquidators to administer hospitals.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Hear, hear!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Again, the member for Schubert cries out with a ‘Hear, hear!’ in strong support of the role of interstate corporate liquidators in administering our health system. That in itself is interesting not just for the fact that corporate liquidators might understand how to administer medical care to South Australians but that they have taken the view that not only is that important but there was no-one in South Australia who could possibly provide that support to SA Health, no other practitioner in our state who could possibly measure up to KordaMentha in providing those services. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

CRIMINAL LAW (HIGH RISK OFFENDERS) (PSYCHOLOGISTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

SERVICE SA MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 100 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

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—Update to the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2018—
Report 4 of 2019 [Ordered to be published]

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles)—Prescribed Offences
 Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery—Treatment Programs
 Public Interest Disclosure—General
 Rules made under the following Acts—
 District Court—
 Criminal—Amendment No. 7
 Criminal—Supplementary—Amendment No. 6
 Supreme Court—
 Civil—Supplementary—Amendment No. 12
 Criminal—Supplementary—Amendment No. 6
 Criminal—Amendment No. 7

By the Minister for Innovation and Skills (Hon. D.G. Pisoni)—

Training and Skills Commission—Annual Report 2018

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Controlled Substances—Poisons No. 3

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. T.J. Whetstone)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
 Fisheries Management—
 Demerit Points
 General

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

National Park Co-management Board—
 Ikara-Flinders Ranges Annual Report 2017-18
 Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges Annual Report 2017-18

Parliament House Matters

CHAMBER PHOTOGRAPHY

The SPEAKER (14:05): Members, please be advised that there may be a camera filming in the gallery above me, to my left.

Ministerial Statement

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

The SPEAKER: Leave is sought; is leave granted? There being a dissenting voice, leave is not granted.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I table the report.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:06): I bring up the first report of the committee, entitled 'An inquiry into heritage reform: heritage matters'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before I call for questions without notice, I welcome to parliament today students from years 11 and 12 from Grant High School, who are guests of the member for Mount Gambier. Welcome to parliament.

*Question Time***MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier support Clive Palmer's policy to abolish the Murray-Darling Basin Plan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): We have made it very clear over an extended period of time that we support the existing Murray-Darling Basin Plan. We think that this is the plan that should be implemented in full and on time. We in South Australia, being at the end of the Murray, are really subject to what those in other parts of the Murray-Darling Basin do, so we fully support that plan being kept in place and implemented in full.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, supplementary.

FEDERAL ELECTION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): Thank you, Mr Speaker. Why is the Premier supporting a preference deal of the Liberal Party to preference Clive Palmer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): Preference deals for the federal election, of course, have nothing to do with the Premier of South Australia, so I'm not sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —whether Kevin Naughton wrote that question or whether it was just a supplementary you thought you would freewheel along, but the reality is I don't have the responsibility for this. What I would be very interested in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is some sort of analysis of all the statements that the Leader of the Opposition has made recently regarding his federal counterpart's preference deal with the Australian Greens. We know what the Greens want to do. They want to cut defence spending—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in Australia. Cutting defence spending, of course, would be an absolute disaster for South Australia. As you would know, sir, we have been the happy beneficiaries of many federal Coalition government projects in defence—\$90 billion in shipbuilding alone. Those opposite have done a dirty deal with the Greens, which would see, if the Greens' policy is implemented, massive cuts to defence spending in Australia. Can the Leader of the Opposition point to any evidence where he stood up and said this would be a disaster? Can he point to any evidence where he has picked up the phone and spoken to his mate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —his union mate, Bill Shorten, telling Bill Shorten that he doesn't think that deal should be done with the Greens? I doubt that he can. The reality is the Murray-Darling Basin Plan needs to be kept in place. It is a strong policy for us here in South Australia in the Liberal Party. It is a strong position for the Liberal Party nationally and will remain so.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I am not sure that the Premier is responsible to the house for federal preference deals.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I give the Leader of the Opposition the call, I call the following members to order: the members for Badcoe, West Torrens, Waite, the Minister for Primary Industries, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Playford, the Minister for Education and the Minister for Innovation. The Leader of the Opposition.

FEDERAL ELECTION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier preference Clive Palmer when he votes at the federal election?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): I'm not really sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I'm not really sure whether the Leader of the Opposition knows the way our voting system works.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I'm going to be voting Liberal. I'm not sure who you are going to be voting for. It is slightly disturbing that you are wanting to understand how it works for somebody who wants to vote for one of the two major parties. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition isn't voting for the Labor Party. Maybe he wants to send his vote there circuitously via a whole pile of other ragbag political parties in Australia. I am very clear who I am voting for at the next election: I will be voting for the Liberal Party in Sturt.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier had any discussions regarding the Murray-Darling Basin Plan as part of the Liberal's preference deal with Clive Palmer?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education and the Minister for Energy and Mining are both called to order. The Premier has the call. Could you please repeat the question, thank you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am happy to, Mr Speaker. The question, of course, is to the Premier. Has the Premier had any discussions regarding the Murray-Darling Basin Plan as part of the Liberals' preference deal with Clive Palmer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): I refer the honourable member to my previous answer on this question.

Mr Murray interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is called to order. The member for Morphett. I will come back to the leader.

SMARTSAT CRC

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:13): My question is to the Premier.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: How was Easter Monday on Jetty Road?

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order. He has come back with some zeal following his Easter feasts. The member for Morphett has the call.

Mr PATTERSON: Can the Premier update the house about the federal government's investment in the SmartSat CRC and what it will mean for the space industry in South Australia and beyond?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): Can I just say that, five minutes into question time, thankfully we've got somebody sensible in the chamber who is asking a question about something—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —which is of such significance for our state. Can I just say that, on 25 April, the Morrison Coalition government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —announced that a cooperative research centre would be established in South Australia specifically focused on satellite technology. In fact, it is going to be called the SmartSat CRC, and it is going to be based right here in South Australia. This is a massive, massive win for our state—\$55 million from the Morrison government, and on top of that \$190 million from in excess of 80 different organisations and companies here in Australia and globally.

Some of those companies are start-ups, like Myriota in South Australia, a company with a fantastically bright future. Some of those companies—in fact, 10 of them—are global multinationals in the space sector. Some of them are the best universities in our country. Also, as partners in this project we have both NASA and the European Space Agency (ESA). This couldn't be a bigger win for South Australia, with \$245 million coming into South Australia over the next seven years to be looking at cutting-edge technologies around nanosat technology.

The good news is that this new facility will be based at Lot Fourteen. It's going to be based alongside the headquarters for the Australian Space Agency. This is really going to be an incredible precinct focused on key future industries like defence, like space, like cyber, like machine learning and critical areas for future jobs here in our state.

I would like to offer my congratulations on behalf of the people of South Australia to the people who brought together this bid, in particular, the University of South Australia, originally with Professor Tanya Monro and most recently with Professor Andy Koronios, working together with local firm Nova Systems. As we know with Nova Systems, this was a business which was founded by two South Australians: Jim Whalley (Chief Entrepreneur) and Peter Nikoloff.

Peter Nikoloff in particular worked with Andy Koronios at the University of South Australia for this very competitive and compelling bid to bring this wonderful research to South Australia. This research will support plenty of PhD students here in South Australia but, most importantly, it's going to be focused on bringing international investment for the commercialisation of this incredible technology, part of the \$500 billion international global space sector.

As I said, congratulations to everybody involved: the universities, the private sector, the start-ups and in particular the people who work within Defence SA. In that regard, I would like to acknowledge the work which is being done by the chief executive, Richard Price, and Nicola Sasanelli, who has been working so hard on this bid for a long period of time. I encourage all members to become familiar with the work of the SmartSat CRC. It will open later this year. It will be at Lot Fourteen. If you haven't been down there yet, get down there, get excited.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier made any representations to protect the Murray-Darling Basin Plan from any potential future Palmer-Liberal Coalition government?

Mr Pederick interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17): This is such a poor line of questioning, and it's difficult to understand—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —why the Leader of the Opposition is going down this path. We haven't been in this place for a couple of weeks. You would think that would have given the opposition leader some time to actually come up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —with some questions which might be important to the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For those opposite, maybe we can reiterate our commitment on this side of the house of just how important the Murray-Darling Basin Plan is for the people of our state. The Murray River is more than just a supply of water for the people of our state. It also supports many of our country communities across our state. Irrigation is extraordinarily important in terms of our river communities for creating the exports of wonderful food and also wine that we send from South Australia right around the world, bringing valuable dollars into our state. So it's important from an irrigation perspective. It's important from a drinking water perspective.

It's also incredibly important from a tourism perspective. We on this side of the house want to see regional tourism in South Australia continue to grow because we know that that's going to create many more jobs. The Riverland community, the Coorong community and the Lower Lakes community are vital tourism precincts for our state, so we will be doing everything we can to advocate for the health of the Murray-Darling Basin and we will be doing everything that we can to make sure that all the states—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —along the Murray, from Queensland to New South Wales, the ACT, of course, and Victoria, do their part, as they signed up to, as part of that Murray-Darling Basin Plan. I would like to commend the minister for the work that he has done to get all of the other states and the Territory back to the table. We know those opposite like to play political games. We know that they like to try to win some cheap political points. Quite frankly, this issue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is far too important to play political games with—far too important for all the reasons I have already outlined. I reiterate to this house our commitment to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. I note that it was a plan that was originally envisaged by John Howard, the former prime minister of Australia, when he put the act in place. The final negotiation for the deal was actually a deal signed up to when there was a federal Labor government in power—

Mr Malinauskas: Correct, and then it's been undermined ever since.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and a state Labor government in power.

Mr Malinauskas: That's right, and it's been undermined ever since.

The SPEAKER: Leader, order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We know that in the most recent royal commission report that was handed down, the commission report was very critical of that plan. He said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —it was unlawful, an unlawful plan.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford will not gesticulate.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He said it was an unlawful plan and it was signed up to by the previous government. We are absolutely convinced that we need every single drop of water envisaged in that plan delivered into South Australia and that's what we are working for every single day that we are in power.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): When will the government finally respond to the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission recommendations and findings?

The SPEAKER: That question is in order. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:21): Thank you, sir. I have responded to that previously. We are working through that report at the moment and when we are through that report—and, as I have stated in this house before, there are many people who we will be consulting with—we will present our response to that royal commission report. I don't have an exact date for the chamber at the moment. I would much rather have the right response rather than a quick response. So we will be providing a response to the royal commission report into the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

We note that originally the former government commissioned this royal commission in response to the *Four Corners* report that talked about water theft, in particular in New South Wales and I think Queensland also. The final report didn't address this issue—well, it did actually. It said, 'We are not going to address the issue,' so we didn't quite get—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —what was promised by the former premier. The Leader of the Opposition has asserted that the royal commissioner was going to look at that issue if he was given an extension of time. That's not correct.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: He wanted to look at the fish.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That's not correct whatsoever. I would ask the Leader of the Opposition at some point to reflect on those comments that he made incorrectly in this chamber and come back and correct the record.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I remind members that I have given some latitude for the first 15 minutes of question time. I ask for the standard to please lift. The member for Ramsay, the leader, the member for Giles and the member for Lee are all called to order, and the member for Playford is warned. The leader, then the member for Waite.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question again is to the Premier. Is the government delaying its response to the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission report until after the federal election in a bid to keep the plight of the Murray from embarrassing the Morrison government?

The SPEAKER: The Premier looks like he wants to have a go at that one.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): No.

CITY DEAL FUNDING

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister provide further details to the house on the key environmental projects that are now being funded as a result of the landmark City Deal between the federal Morrison Liberal government and the state Marshall Liberal government?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:23): I thank the member for Waite for that great question about the City Deal, which has been such a successful outcome for South Australia—\$551 million of investment in a range of projects around South Australia. Of course, we know a very significant component of the City Deal is to unfold on Lot Fourteen on North Terrace with investment in the Space Agency, investment in a whole range of activities there, which will draw innovation, will create jobs, will draw industry into the area and, of course, will attract interstate and international investment to South Australia as well.

As well as what is happening on Lot Fourteen, there is a whole part of the City Deal that is focusing on heritage, the arts and environmental sustainability. We see that demonstrated again on Lot Fourteen in a very substantial way with the investment in the national Indigenous art gallery, but beyond that there is also an amount of funding that has been worked up for the Nora and Hans Heysen gallery at Hahndorf in the Adelaide Hills. It has been good to talk to the member for Kavel as we see that project developed. There is also funding for a new visitor centre at Carrick Hill in the member for Waite's electorate.

Beyond that, there is an amount of funding to wrap together a whole range of sites of significance—cultural, heritage, artistic and environmental significance—to create a number of trails that will draw visitors into South Australia's natural environment to ensure that they have the opportunity to connect with heritage and cultural sites and sites of artistic importance in our state by linking these sites together with an amount of funding of \$2 million. It has been great to be able to work alongside the member for Waite and also the federal member for Boothby as we developed that project and worked with local communities, local councils and, particularly, volunteer groups that have so much stewardship for these sites.

One of the two trails that we are talking about, the Mitcham Hills Trail, connects Carrick Hill, moves down into the Mitcham Cultural Village and connects areas like Brownhill Creek and the recreation park there, which is an important area of open space. The bandicoot corridor, or superhighway, is found there. It has been good to visit that site with the member for Waite on a number of occasions. That builds on a \$100,000 commitment that our government made as we came into government.

The trail then connects through to Belair National Park. There will be \$65,000 put towards environmental restoration and amenity activities within Belair National Park and a further \$100,000 for Old Government House, an important heritage site within our state. It was great to visit it on the weekend for the second time in recent weeks and be able to talk to the many volunteers, particularly Tina and Wayne Gallasch, who the member for Waite put me in touch with, to talk about what this funding can do. The trail will then continue on to Wittunga Botanic Garden. We are investing \$750,000 on a nature play site at Wittunga Botanic Garden on Shepherds Hill Road.

We are connecting all of those sites together using digital technology, wayfinding signage and common branding to bring people into those communities. We want visitors from across our state and also from interstate having a similar connection across those sites and really being able to get into our natural environment by visiting these heritage and cultural places of significance and, of course, stimulating local economies as well.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier been successful in setting up the urgent meeting of heads of basin states' governments that he committed to do in January?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28): I don't have details of that, but I will find out how the progress—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is called to order, as is the member for Wright.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are a few issues that those opposite might not have appreciated. First of all, there was an election in New South Wales where the government went into caretaker mode and, believe it or not, there is a federal election on at the moment. I know that we were working as diligently as we could—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to try to bring together that meeting, but we are working—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: We have the question. Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —with a range of busy people and we will progress that as soon as possible. When I have an answer, I will come back to the house.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned. Deputy Leader.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is again to the Premier. Did any member of the federal Coalition raise with the Premier not granting an extension for the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission as requested by the royal commissioner?

The SPEAKER: Could you please repeat that?

Dr CLOSE: Did any member of the federal Coalition raise with the Premier not granting an extension in the timing of the royal commission, as he requested?

The SPEAKER: There is a fair bit in that one. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:29): As the minister responsible in respect of the royal commissions, I'm not aware of any request made to any of the ministers of the South Australian government. I had dialogue with the royal commissioner, Bret Walker SC, both in personal attendances and in correspondence in respect of the specific request as to any extension. There were no oral communications. There were certainly some written communications arising out of the abundant loss of fish in relation to a weather event arising out of that.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Attorney-General. Given all the evidence provided to the Murray-Darling royal commission about questionable water purchases that will not contribute to environmental flows—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: this question is not in line with standing order 97.

The SPEAKER: So 97 as—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. On previous occasions, minister, I have respectfully asked that I hear the entire question so that I can make a deliberation. I think I can see where this is going.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, Premier, I have the point of order and, despite not having the entire question, which I have asked to have been the case in the past, I will try to make a ruling. If a member is introducing a fact into the question, then there is a way and means to do that because then it leads to other issues such as me weighing into the veracity of facts without leave, so I will hear the entirety of the question. The deputy leader may want to improvise and come up with a question that is within standing orders, if it did contravene the standing orders. Thank you.

Dr CLOSE: In that case, Mr Speaker, to short-circuit, my question is to the Attorney-General. Why didn't the Attorney-General extend the timing of the royal commission, and inadequate answers previously—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

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

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

Dr CLOSE: Why didn't the Attorney-General extend the timing of the royal commission not about the fish kills but for the extension of time that he asked for to allow for the High Court processes?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:31): Those matters are a matter of public record. One of them was that the charter that had been expressed in relation to the terms of reference had been completed. I think some \$5½ million had been expended. I made a very clear public statement that we didn't consider the request for extension of time was appropriate in the circumstances. The role had completed—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and, indeed, the commissioner, in his report, outlined responses to all of the terms of reference that he had been asked, except a matter which he, early on in the inquiry—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —completely discounted, that is, a term of reference to identify illegal activity of parties. He made it very clear in a public statement that, notwithstanding the terms of reference that had been given by the previous premier, that was not a matter that he considered he would investigate. He made that very clear. He made a public statement to that effect. He considered other agencies should be responsible for that, and he confirmed that in this final report. Ultimately, he did make—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —a number of recommendations in respect of his assessment as to the legality, including of the water act. They are matters which the Crown Solicitor's Office are currently looking at.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order. I will come back to her. Member for Hammond.

LABOUR HIRE PRACTICES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:33): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney update the house on what commitments the federal government has made to protect vulnerable workers in high-risk sectors?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:33): I thank the member for Hammond—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —for this important question. I would think every member of the house would be interested to hear of the advances in relation to the protection of vulnerable workers in high-risk sectors, particularly the member for Hammond, who of course has a number of areas of industry in his electorate that require the services under the labour hire industry.

In March, the commonwealth government released the Migrant Workers' Taskforce report. It found that horticulture, cleaning, meat processing and security industries are particularly high risk for unscrupulous labour hire practices.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham and the member for Elizabeth are warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Of particular relevance to South Australia is the federal government committing to the establishment of a national labour hire scheme to ensure transparency—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and compliance with the Australian laws in the labour hire industry in high-risk sectors. I would think all members would find this welcome news. This is resourced by an allocation of \$19.8 million in the most recent federal budget—that's in the budget, identified, locked in, not a promise, in the budget. Many stakeholders informed the task force that the laws applying to labour hire were adequate yet needed to be better enforced.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The then state government back in 2017, with minister Rau leading the way, insisted we needed this state-based scheme. So I remind members of the house that the South Australian act was introduced in response to exploitative practices against migrant workers on farms and in food processing. It is even doubtful whether the workers most at risk are even captured by the scheme as it is currently written into law, as there is a risk that the laws only capture traditional triangular supply-type labour arrangements and not workforce contracting.

As it is currently legislated, it has high fees and would impose a significant regulatory burden on the businesses that have no record of exploiting workers. A well-targeted, industry-specific model capable of enforcement is the model that this government wished to see whilst they were in opposition. I also agree with the federal government: it is far better for the industry and for workers if we have a single national scheme rather than different and overlapping state-based systems.

In addition to providing the significant funding for a national labour hire registration scheme, heavier penalties will be introduced for sham contracting, increased resources will be made available to the Fair Work Ombudsman and a critical education campaign will take place for migrant workers. That is why I commend the federal Liberal government for committing to implement a national labour hire registration model that actually protects the most vulnerable workers most at risk and, importantly, does not add a surfeit of red tape to businesses that are already doing the right thing. I thank the federal government for the commitment in its budget.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to the gallery today Stan and Libby Kosmala, who are guests of the member for Hurtle Vale. Welcome to parliament.

*Question Time***MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION**

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question is to the Attorney-General. Before refusing the request to extend the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission, did the Attorney-General read the evidence of Ms Maryanne Slattery, a former employee of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:37): I don't recall reading the evidence at all, other than what was referred to in the final report.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Before the government refused to extend the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission, did the minister read the evidence of Ms Maryanne Slattery, a former employee of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:38): No, I hadn't.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): As a supplementary, has the minister now read the evidence by Ms Maryanne Slattery?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:38): Not the specific evidence, only that which was referred to in the report.

SPORT AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:38): My question is for the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister inform the house of how a re-elected federal Liberal government will build on the investment in our community sporting infrastructure already made by the Marshall government?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If this continues, certain members will be leaving the chamber. I put them on notice.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:38): I thank the member for the question, and what an important question it is, and what an important choice South Australians have to make over the next few weeks.

The member for Colton knows as well as anyone how important community sporting infrastructure is. The government knows the importance of community infrastructure, and our federal representatives do as well. That's why we are investing, that's why we will continue to invest and that's why the federal Liberal government is looking to invest in activities that we have already seen as being incredibly worthwhile.

One of those is at the Henley Sharks Football Club, a big club, a great club, and they have a lot of community support. Do you know who else they support, Mr Speaker? They support the member for Colton. He's a very good member out there fighting for his community; in fact, he's a bit of a hero in his local area. He really is. He has been delivering for the people of Colton from before he was in this place. He worked really hard with the local community. In fact, he has impressed them

so much that the President of the Henley Sharks Football Club thinks he is a superstar. The president, who was the former member for Colton, loves him; that's how good he's going.

The member for Colton has delivered, as the Marshall government at the last election committed to \$500,000 towards new change rooms for that footy club, and that is what the people of the local community were after. The Liberal candidate for Hindmarsh, a young whippersnapper, has been out and about, and he recognises how important this facility is as well. He has committed \$400,000 towards new lights at the oval to ensure that both cricket and football can continue to be played into the evening and hold training to get the best out of that facility. It's a great outcome for the local community.

It was not such a good outcome on ANZAC Day. I was at the Henley Sharks oval with the member for Colton. They played against the mighty Brighton Bombers in the A1s, and it's sad to say that the Bombers got up—the Sharks got rolled—so it was a good day for the Brighton Bombers footy club. Speaking of them, they have a wonderful complex down there at Brighton. We supported them at the last election. That had been left to fall into disrepair over many years under the previous Labor government. We have put \$2 million into upgrading their football, cricket, lacrosse and rugby clubs. They had that faux commitment, as the member for Black knows, from the Labor government previously to upgrade the rugby facility. It never came through, but we have delivered. We are very conscious of delivering good sporting infrastructure for our local community.

Someone else who is very keen on the Brighton community is the member for Boothby, a true local champion for her electorate. In fact, she is so keen that she has committed \$5 million towards stage 2 of that complex should the Liberal federal government be re-elected, and that is great delivery for her local community. That is a great example as well of state and federal governments working together to deliver true community outcomes.

Of course, how could we forget the Max Amber Reserve? The Marshall Liberal government invested in new floodlights at this facility ahead of the last election. The people of Hartley know a good project and they know a good local member, Mr Speaker, and that would be you, the Emperor of Hartley, delivering for the people, getting the light upgrade. I know it has been greatly appreciated.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The federal candidate for Sturt, another hard worker in his local area, has committed another \$5 million to upgrade that field because he knows how important it is for the Athelstone Football Club (the Raggies), the cricket club, the Athelstone Soccer Club, the Athelstone Tennis Club and the Australian Retired Persons Association. These are great achievements and great examples of the federal government working with the state government, working with the local government, to deliver for their communities.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee and the member for Reynell are warned. The deputy leader, and I see the member for Florey in the distance.

Ms Bedford: I was up first, sir, but I will sit down.

The SPEAKER: I'm glad you will. The deputy leader then the member for Florey.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister brief the Attorney-General before she refused the extension to the royal commission regarding evidence presented to the royal commission on three water purchases authorised by the former minister Barnaby Joyce?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:43): The Attorney-General and I had a number of conversations—in fact, the whole of cabinet did—about the royal commission, as I received regular briefings on its contents as it moved through that period throughout 2018.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: We had those regular discussions. We did not reflect on the conduct of any federal colleagues at any point.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister brief the Attorney-General that evidence presented to the royal commission questioned whether any water would be returned and water recovery would be overstated as a result of the purchases approved by the former minister Barnaby Joyce?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:44): There were many items of evidence provided to the royal commission, many hundreds. I did not relate them all to the Attorney-General. In fact, of course, the veracity of some of those items had to go through the royal commission process to establish whether they were accurate or not, so I did not provide a running commentary to the Attorney-General on each and every aspect of the royal commission's process.

GRAIN CLASSIFICATION

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister please update the house on the proposal by Long consulting regarding their grain classification project, which we spoke to the minister about at Tarlee some time ago?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:44): I thank the member for Frome. It is an important question. I drove up to Tarlee to meet with the member for Frome and David Long to look at a proposal that had been long asked for in the grain industry. It's about classification of grain. Over a number of years, grain growers have questioned how their grain has been classified. We all know that the classification equals the value of the grain.

For a number of years, particularly through some of the inclement weather events, we saw a lot of grain that had been downgraded. There is now an ability to look at a self-diagnosis of grain on-farm. With a lot of the technology now on harvesting equipment, they can measure the hardness of the grain and they can measure the protein. They can measure a number of the attributes of the grain before they actually put it in a truck and send it off.

Mr Long has given me a proposition to put to the grain industry, and I have done that. Submissions have been sent out to Grain Producers South Australia, the Grain Industry Trust (SAGIT) and also the Australian grain producers organisation for them to give their overview of a proposal as such. It is a good proposal. It is about value-adding a product that is going into silos and receivals that we currently see either being downgraded or being put at a very low grade.

If growers and farmers have the capacity to blend grain on-farm, it is a win-win. It is a win not only for our growers but for our local communities because, if they are returning more money for their grain, they are spending more money in their communities and they are employing more people. I commend the proposal that has been sent out to a number of organisations. It is being assessed at the moment and, as soon as I have any information, I will come back to the member for Frome.

ENERGY SYSTEM STRENGTH

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on the latest findings about energy system strength in South Australia and how it is being addressed?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:47): Thank you to the member for Finniss for this important question. System strength and inertia are very important in South Australia. The Australian Energy Market Commission recently—I think on 4 April this year—put out their annual market performance report. They highlighted very clearly that system strength in South Australia is a problem that we must address.

The reason we have this difficulty is that, while we are extremely good at generating electricity in South Australia from renewable sources, from sun and wind, and in isolation that is a very positive thing, you can't look at these things in isolation. The previous government failed to address system strength and inertia. As the penetration of renewable energy increases, which again I say is a very positive thing in isolation, it needs to be considered with regard to the market as a whole, considering matching supply and demand.

As we had less and less synchronous energy being delivered through our supply side of the market, system strength declined. What are we doing about it? In partnership with industry and primarily with ElectraNet, there will be four synchronous condensers brought into the South Australian market—two near Robertstown and two near Port Augusta—which will work to improve both system strength and inertia. We need both of those things.

While we want, of course, to continue to have more and more renewable energy playing a part in South Australia and throughout Australia, we can't do it at the expense of system strength and, as we know all too well in South Australia, we can't do it at the expense of high prices to consumers, either—another failing of the previous Labor government. So, in partnership with industry and key market bodies, we are working very hard on this issue.

ElectraNet will put these four synchronous condensers in place. They will contribute to system strength and inertia and make the supply of electricity much better. As well as addressing the quality of the supply of the electricity, they will also reduce the cost of electricity, something that the previous government certainly let get way out of control over the previous five to 10 years.

This move will not only improve the quality of supply but it will have a saving—a fairly small saving, I have to say, but any saving is a positive for electricity consumers in South Australia. This is paired with the Marshall Liberal government's energy policies—the Home Battery Scheme and the grid-scale storage scheme, which I hope to be able to make an announcement on in the middle of this calendar year. That is paired with our intention of getting partnership with industry to deliver an interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales.

It is also paired with our demand management and demand response trials—which, again, I hope to make an announcement on fairly shortly—and other aspects of the Marshall Liberal government's energy solution, which we have developed with a very clear focus in mind: to reduce the cost of electricity to all consumers, from the largest employers through to the smallest households; to improve the reliability of electricity in South Australia; and to continue to make it cleaner, greener and more environmentally responsible. All of these things paired together with ElectraNet's synchronous condensers will make electricity cheaper, more reliable and more environmentally responsible for all South Australian consumers.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. When the Murray-Darling Basin royal commissioner requested an extension of time, did the minister brief the Attorney-General on outstanding questions raised in evidence regarding the Condamine-Balonne water purchase?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:51): When the royal commissioner requested an extension in his time frame, I had many discussions with the Attorney-General and the cabinet about that. We discussed that in detail, but the royal commission was costing South Australia a huge amount of money—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and we know that is the case.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is on the board and called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: We made a very clear decision that the royal commission—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —had had enough time to provide a thorough analysis of the situation, as both the Premier and the Deputy Premier said. We expected that to include—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —looking into water theft and matters of concern around water theft interstate, which we would have greatly liked to have been analysed by the royal commission. That sadly wasn't the case and was a significant gap in the final report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier and deputy leader, please; I am trying to hear the minister.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: However, I did have a number of conversations with the Attorney-General and my other cabinet colleagues, as mentioned. Those covered a whole range of items, including evidence that had been tendered and including the various areas that were being followed up by the commission. It was at that point that we decided to conclude the commission.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): My question is again to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister raise any concerns with the Attorney-General that commonwealth officials would not appear before the royal commission to answer questions regarding water purchases, including the Condamine-Balonne water purchase, if an extension in time was not granted?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:53): I have answered a number of questions relating to the application—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: You've addressed them, not answered them.

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —by the royal commissioner to deal with the production of both documents and witnesses from commonwealth agencies. What happened, as I have explained in detail to the parliament, when the deputy leader introduced her ill-fated bill to try to remedy what she claimed was necessary, as the royal commissioner himself pointed out—clearly, if she has a look at the report (I am happy to find the page number) of the rather embarrassing finding by the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think the deputy leader and/or her colleagues were described by the royal commissioner as a 'bush lawyer', actually, in her attempt to—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —achieve what she perceived as the necessary remedy to the deficiency of the subpoena material. In effect, as is now known and was well known to the member, notwithstanding her ill-fated attempt to try to deal with the matter legislatively, in the royal commissioner's view—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —as the royal commissioner himself pointed out—

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, please do not provoke the opposition.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —it was not either necessary or appropriate, but as he did report, ultimately the commonwealth did provide support. That resulted in his decision to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —proceed with a withdrawal of the opposition to deal with a much bigger legal issue in the High Court, which I hope one day will be resolved, and that is the question of—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —what is the status on intergovernmental agreements; importantly for South Australia, we as a state are a party to many. What is the status for the purposes of enforcement and which of the parties, including South Australia, are able to enforce the terms of those agreements? They are major issues which ultimately will need to be resolved, probably by the High Court, but in the meantime—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —the royal commissioner made it very clear in his final report that the process in relation to trying to rewrite the Royal Commissions Act was ill-fated and ill-advised.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister brief the Attorney-General that evidence was presented to the royal commission that commonwealth-funded on-farm water storage programs were not being monitored?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:56): Sorry, the minister sneezed. Can the deputy leader please repeat the question?

Dr CLOSE: Did the minister brief the Attorney-General that evidence was presented to the royal commission that commonwealth-funded on-farm water storage programs were not being monitored?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: As I have said a number of times during this question time, I had many discussions with the Deputy Premier, with my cabinet colleagues—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —in relation to many aspects of the royal commission, the direction the royal commission was going, the evidence that was being tendered—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —at the various hearings across the state and, in fact, across the nation, and those matters were discussed in cabinet, and of course are a matter of cabinet confidentiality.

MINISTERIAL STATEMENT

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:57): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney explain why she tabled the document she tabled earlier today?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:57): I thank the member for Heysen for this question. Earlier, I tabled a report which has been the subject of a freedom of information application. The matter of Attorney-General SA v the Seven Network (Operations) Limited arises out of legal questions referred by the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal to the Full Court of the Supreme Court in a review by SACAT of a Freedom of Information Act 1991 decision of the Ombudsman.

The Ombudsman's decision was that the Seven Network should have access to a copy of legal advice prepared for the former government in 2006 by the Chief Justice when he was the solicitor-general for South Australia. The advice concerned a third petition for mercy made on behalf of Mr Henry Keogh. Judgement was delivered on Friday 12 April 2019.

The Full Court answered all of the questions in a manner which has the indirect result of upholding the determination of the Ombudsman that the advice should be provided to Channel 7 on the basis that legal professional privilege in that advice was waived by reason of public disclosures concerning the content of the advice made by then acting attorney-general Foley.

Following this judgement, the chief executive of my department, to whom I have delegated the power to make decisions about this matter, has determined to release the legal advice to Channel 7 through its representatives. As the indirect effect of the Full Court's decision is that legal professional privilege is no longer attached to that advice, I tabled the report in anticipation of other parties making applications under the FOI Act for access to it.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Does the minister continue to maintain that 62 gigalitres of environmental water, due by 30 June this year, is coming to South Australia?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:00): It's very interesting to have any reflections on the delivery of water from the South Australian Labor Party—

Mr Brown: Answer the question.

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford can leave for 20 minutes under 137A.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —because, of course, we know how much water was delivered to South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —from interstate when they were in government. Zero. One gigalitre was delivered from South Australia. So the games continue, and we have seen it all through this question time. Of course, managing the River Murray is incredibly complex. It requires a whole range of relationships to be established to deliver for South Australia, and that's what we did on 14 December 2018. We know that the Leader of the Opposition learnt a new word when the royal commission report was released: capitulation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The most capitulation that has occurred in recent history is the capitulation of Jay Weatherill—

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

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —when he agreed to reduce the amount of water under the—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there's a point of order. One moment. Please be seated. The member for West Torrens, who was interjecting during the minister's answer; I'm not 100 per cent about that, but I'm pretty sure.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, sir, I think you look at me in jest. The minister is now debating the question.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. There was some interjecting coming from my left. I ask members on my left to be in silence and, minister, I ask you to keep to the substance of the question. I believe the question was about 62 gigalitres. You are speaking about water, I appreciate that, but please come back to the substance of the question. Thank you.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: We do know what's coming because we know that water is coming, which was not the case—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Water is coming.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Water is coming. It's very relevant—I didn't even mean that. Water is coming and winter is as well. It is coming because of this government's ability to sit down and negotiate with other jurisdictions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The games continue from the other side. All they are interested in is a media release or a slogan or a logo around the River Murray. We are interested—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —in real water passing across the border, moving to the Lower Lakes and the Coorong.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the minister is now imputing improper motives on the deputy leader and I ask him to return to the substance—

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. I think the minister has finished his answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Does the minister support plans by a future possible federal Labor government for a judicial inquiry?

The SPEAKER: This question is highly hypothetical. Deputy leader, would you like another go?

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: And extremely unlikely.

The SPEAKER: Yes. The member for MacKillop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house on how the state government has been working with the Coalition government to grow the forestry industry in South Australia?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:03): I thank the member for MacKillop for his very important question because, unlike those on the other side, we are looking to grow the forestry sector. We are not looking to sell them out. We are not looking to sell out Mount Gambier and the Green Triangle. We are looking to

grow the sector, grow the trees, grow the value, making sure that the forestry industry is a thriving sector here in the South Australian economy, and those on the other side can bleat all they want.

We've got the opposition leader who goes down to the South-East and says, 'I'm really sorry we sold the forests. I wouldn't have sold them if it was me.' Well, why didn't you do something about it when you ran the unions?

An honourable member: Shame!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Exactly. What I can say is that here as a government—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Did that hurt?

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can leave for 20 minutes for clapping.

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

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What I can say about forestry is that the Marshall Liberal government is supporting the forestry sector. We are collaborating with the federal government and we are working together to set up the Green Triangle forestry hub. That is an initiative with both industry and all levels of government to grow the sector. It is about how we can actually grow the Green Triangle, plant more trees and make the forestry sector work much closer together.

Last year, the group of nine forestry industry companies in the Green Triangle, organised in anticipation of a federal government's pilot forestry hub, announced that there would be a continual program of growth and that there would be a serious amount of funding put to the forestry sector so that we can actually not only grow the number of trees but significantly grow the value of trees. The plan could also serve as a model for other forestry industry regions across Australia to help achieve the ambitious targets of the National Forest Industries Plan, including planting more than a billion trees nationally.

We have also seen in recent weeks the inaugural meeting of the Forest Industry Advisory Council, an 11-member committee, which was an election commitment to the forestry industry on how we were going to deal with growth, how we were going to deal with domestic supply of log and how we were actually going to give the Green Triangle certainty. Those businesses and external investment would come to the region and put money on the table to grow the sector. That is very, very important. The meeting was chaired by Mount Gambier local and forestry harvester haulage business owner, Wendy Fennell. It was a good productive meeting. It got a few of the cobwebs out of the closet because people had some uncertainty about the forward rotation sale that the previous government so gladly gave up at a rock-bottom price.

What we are seeing now is that forests are selling at record prices, where you can see that there is huge opportunity now not only to grow the value, to grow the number of products, but to value-add. It is about putting logs through a mill, not about putting logs onto ships; it is about value-adding on our shores and creating jobs in our local communities, which is very important. The Forest Industry Advisory Council is now considering all the recommendations at that inaugural meeting. We are looking at ways we can move forward and give that industry a level of confidence.

I could go on, but there is another initiative: the national institute for forest products innovation centre. That is a great initiative, a collaboration, once again, with the South Australian government and the federal government. The Coalition have committed \$2 million to fund a national institute for forest products, matched by the state government's \$2 million. The federal government's initiative will have a lasting legacy on forestry and the industry here in South Australia, keeping South Australia at the forefront of forestry, creating jobs, certainty and growing our economy.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:07): My supplementary is to the minister for forestry. Does the South-East forest processors association support the government's approach in opposing the inquiry into forestry in the South-East?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:07): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. Certainly, there are still a number of vagaries around the sustainability of the forest industry in the Green Triangle. The South Australian Timber Processors Association do have some concerns about the FIAC. They have had concerns about the sale of the forward rotations. They have had a number of concerns about where forestry is going. One of the big issues has been about the certainty of supply of domestic log. That is probably one of the biggest issues.

What I would say is that the FIAC is there listening, wanting to know how we are going to address the supply of log to domestic mills, how we are going to address the supply and the continual supply of timber to value-added industries that are looking to set up. There are many, many private investment companies that are looking to come to the Green Triangle, and they are looking for certainty and continuity of supply. That is why we set up the FIAC as an election commitment, that is why we are supporting the forestry industry and that is why we are looking to not only grow the value but grow the number of trees in the ground.

The SPEAKER: Today, during question time I ejected a member for applauding during question time. I am advised that Speaker Atkinson recently ruled on this matter in 2015, when he said that during debate members of the government applauded a comment the Premier made. The Speaker advised:

Members of the government's side will cease applauding. Applause is not permissible in the chamber. I would also add that I actually tried as attorney to outlaw this particular practice, and my proposal perished in the upper house.

Grievance Debate

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): Last week, all Australia found out that there are serious probity questions about the water buybacks that Barnaby Joyce signed off when he was federal water minister. This was news to Australia, but it did not need to be news.

We could have known about those questions. We could have had many of those questions settled had the Marshall government agreed to extend the deadline for the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission, as requested very respectfully by the royal commissioner. He knew that he could not get commonwealth officials to testify without an extension to allow the High Court to make a judgement about his powers and then have time to summon them. He made this clear to the Attorney-General. She not only declined his request but, in the process, she so offended him by misrepresenting his position that he asked for an apology. He is still waiting for that apology.

If we had a government that cared more about the Murray than about partisan politics, we could have had witnesses from the commonwealth answering the serious questions already raised in evidence about those buybacks because what the royal commission had heard, and the Marshall government would have known if it was paying attention, was that, in the case of at least one of the buybacks, the purchase of the water was never going to come off the property, let alone down to South Australia.

The water entitlement was legally tied to the land. It had no legal status or ownership off the land, so legally it could not move off the property. Even more so, physically it could not move off the property because there were levee banks in place and there was no legal requirement to remove the levee. On the face of it, this sounds like a disgraceful deal and it is one that commonwealth officials should have been asked about.

They should have been asked to explain in full in front of the royal commission, but this government decided that that was not a priority for them. They did not want to hear that evidence. Having had questions raised, they did not want it to go any further. Was it because they did not know that those questions had been raised? Were they not paying attention?

It is impossible to know from the answers we heard from the minister today because all he talked about was vaguely having lots and lots of conversations, which is somewhat reminiscent of the corrections minister having lots and lots of conversations, but not actually saying what was discussed, what was briefed to cabinet, what the Attorney-General was in possession of and what

knowledge she had before she declined to allow the royal commissioner to have commonwealth officials come in front of the royal commissioner and ask serious questions.

This Premier, this Attorney-General and this so-called water and environment minister chose to shut down a royal commission, rather than give an extension that had been respectfully asked for. This is entirely consistent with the approach that this minister already demonstrated last year in December at the ministerial council meeting, to give in to other interests, to make a decision that, in the words of the royal commissioner:

...should not merely be described as ill-advised. It is nothing short of a capitulation to the interests of the current Commonwealth Government, and those of Victoria and New South Wales.

Our state government capitulated to this current commonwealth government that said they would cooperate with the royal commission but ended up refusing to allow officials to be asked questions. It is a commonwealth government that had Barnaby Joyce, as a water minister and then a drought envoy, going around the country, undermining the plan by saying it was more important to give water to farmers than to keep the River Murray healthy in South Australia.

It is this commonwealth government that has not put out any public tenders for water efficiency projects to get environment water down to our state. It is this commonwealth government that first cancelled public tenders for voluntary buybacks and instead just bought from favoured sellers, which we should be asking many questions about, and then put a cap on more voluntary buybacks.

It is this government that bought water that legally and physically cannot leave the Queensland property it is on. That is the government that the Marshall Liberal government decided was worth doing a deal with in December, was worth offending a royal commissioner for and was worth fettering a royal commission's inquiry for. So we now know all about the quality of the character of this government.

They will stand by political mates and they will sell out our state. Shame on them. Shame on behalf of the Murray Mouth, on behalf of the Coorong, on behalf of the Lower Lakes and the communities that depend on them, and on behalf of irrigators now facing to 14 per cent allocation this year. Shame on this government. We will never forget.

KING ELECTORATE SPORTING CLUBS

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:14): I rise today to talk about and celebrate some of this year's fantastic local sporting achievements in the King electorate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LUETHEN: When I spend time in my local community watching, cheering on and celebrating sporting performances and teamwork, it is a great reminder of how lucky we are that we have a united, harmonious and peaceful community. The Golden Grove Cricket Club (the Brumbies) is a vitally important club to my local community and a club of which I am very proudly the patron.

Recently, the Golden Grove Cricket Club under 12 Maroon side were rewarded for their hard work by taking out the 2018-19 Twenty20 competition. For most of the children in the side, it was just their first season in the under 12 competition, and the way they have played as a strong team and represented our local club should be both commended and celebrated. The club, too, is extremely proud of their efforts. Congratulations to the following team members: Callum Petticrew, Thomas Glen, Harry Slater, Jake Polkinghorne, Ryan Kopec, James Gray, Kyan Smith, Bailey Dand, Caleb Zanker, Kade Vansoe and Casey Elding. A very big congratulations to all the players on their efforts.

A special mention must be made of the team's coaches, Adam Polkinghorne and Kym Gray. Without your support, encouragement and guidance I am sure the boys would not have been able to achieve this great result. Thank you. I will also take the opportunity to thank the Golden Grove Cricket Club seniors for inviting me to their seniors' night presentation. A special callout to Alex Higgins, A2 Player of the Year, who won so many awards for his stellar performances. Good luck on your future. I urge the community to watch your career carefully. Thank you to the Lynch family for dedicating so much time and passion to the club. Thank you for your family's important contribution

to the club. Go the Brumbies! Moving away from cricket and into netball, as patron of the SADNA I was recently given the opportunity—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

Mr BROWN: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms LUETHEN: Well done to all the teams that reached the grand finals at SADNA. A special mention to the Inter 1 premiership-winning Tango team: well done to all players and the leadership of Tango, led by Angela Loyde, President of the Tango Netball Club. Tango's Inter 1s became undefeated premiers in a convincing win against the Comets. The Tango Junior 3 team took on the Zodiacs. A comeback win saw them up by three at the end of the game. Big congratulations to Michael and his team on a wonderful effort and a spectacular season. I want to say a huge thankyou to all the players, coaches, umpires, committee members and parents who make our local netball competition possible.

In one year, nearly 400,000 people pass through the SADNA courts at Golden Grove. It is an incredibly special association in the north-eastern suburbs, and it brings together so many netball-loving families from right across the north and north-eastern suburbs. The association's president, John Adams, is incredibly dedicated and passionate about netball, and his SADNA committee is doing a fantastic job leading the association and pursuing a clear strategy to further increase participation in netball.

I am so pleased that the Marshall Liberal government has delivered on its promise to SADNA to provide \$320,000 to the City of Tea Tree Gully council to improve car parking and traffic flow at the site. Anyone who travels along Atlantis Drive on a Monday or Tuesday night is familiar with the frustrating traffic congestion due to the overflow from the SADNA car park.

This funding will be utilised to improve car parking traffic flow, increase the size of the parking facility, provide better lighting and provide additional exit points to provide a quicker and safer traffic solution. This work is due to commence in December 2019. This incredibly important improvement will benefit many members of the netball community living in not only the King electorate but right across the north-eastern suburbs. In addition, it will provide a welcome relief to residents living close by.

Finally, I was also given the opportunity to present end-of-season awards at the Golden Grove Little Athletics Association, an event so well attended by our local community. Thanks, Owen Gillingham, for inviting me and for organising the most well-attended AGM I have ever been to. Thanks to all the parents and volunteers who make this club so successful. These clubs, players, volunteers and officials all play such an important role in connecting our community in King, and I am so proud to support these clubs and advocate for them to achieve their future plans, which will increase participation even further. Sports participation is essential to our community wellbeing and connection.

FEDERAL LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:21): Today, I would like to spend some time shedding light on some of the abject failures of the Abbott/Turnbull/Morrison roundabout government over the past six years and how those cascading poor decisions in Canberra have directly affected the quality of life not just for South Australians in general but particularly for the South Australians who live with a disability.

The most obvious example of this mismanagement is, of course, the NDIS, a scheme designed to give choice and control back to those South Australians living with a disability, who for too long have been forgotten. Of course, it promised not to leave anybody worse off. Sadly, the potential of the NDIS has not come to pass through years of mismanagement, infighting and a revolving door of ministers that has included some absolute duds from the federal government benches, including the likes of Kevin Andrews, Scott Morrison himself—now the Prime Minister, rewarded for his failures—and Christian Porter. What had so much potential to deliver so much good to so many—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the status of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms COOK: What had so much potential to deliver so much good to so many has descended into dysfunction and bureaucracy. The lack of staff with expertise, the constant cost cutting from Canberra and the sheer volume of work have ballooned waiting periods for plan applications and plan reviews and left many NDIS participants short-changed and unhappy with their plan entitlements and inclusions.

Making matters worse is the fact that South Australia has the highest underutilisation rate across the country, meaning that South Australians with access to NDIA funding are not being adequately educated and supported as to how to access—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the status of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms COOK: What really has made matters worse is that South Australia has the highest underutilisation rate in Australia, meaning that South Australians with access to NDIA funding are not being adequately educated as to how to access and utilise their funding. The provider sector also is not getting the support it needs to increase and grow its capacity. What we see is a Liberal Party with its NDIS, in Treasurer Frydenberg's very first budget, showing a fictitious surplus for the next year—not this year, next year—which is propped up by a \$1.6 billion underspend of NDIS funding.

Imagine what that could do in the hands of people living with a disability. While the federal government is cheered on by the South Australian government, which according to the Minister for Human Services does not have a minister responsible for the NDIS, people living with a disability are left underserved. The government first pledged a full rollout of the NDIS by 1 July 2018, then 1 January 2019, then 1 April 2019, then 1 July 2019, and we are left wondering.

This is a government that by the end of this year will be stopping taxi vouchers for those people on the NDIS. They will be stripping them away from vulnerable South Australians living with a disability, leaving them stranded with no subsidised transport options to attend medical appointments, weekly shops or a social call with their family and friends. I am thrilled that federal Labor has pledged to drop the NDIA staff cap so that when they are elected this will allow the NDIA to get on with its job of assisting vulnerable South Australians as quickly as possible without artificial staff shortages grinding the process to a standstill.

Recently, I spent some time with the Royal Society for the Blind and Guide Dogs SA/NT clients. Firstly, I want to congratulate Guide Dogs SA/NT on a very successful International Guide Dog Day Paws Parade. It featured a huge turnout of both two-legged and four-legged friends with a walk from their office on Morphett Street to Government House followed by some incredible awards. It was a tremendous success, led by their patron, Governor Hieu Van Le.

However, I am concerned that vision-impaired South Australians are being robbed of the use of guide dogs, as the existing NDIS framework does not enable all costs to be covered. Indeed, there are only two being fully funded currently by NDIS-approved funding. That is two guide dogs only that I have been told about.

When questioned, and when this was brought to the attention of the media, the comments from the department were that 19 are funded. This is not true. About 17 guide dogs have ancillary, food, medicine and other costs funded, but only two receive the tens of thousands of dollars of training and support needed to put in place a guide dog to support someone with a vision impairment. I am advised there are at least 10 people who are desperately in need of a guide dog and they are awaiting approval right now. Some of them have been knocked back multiple times.

It is just further evidence that this interface simply is not working and that the Morrison government has mismanaged this social policy. Do not forget that there is \$1.6 billion sitting in a fake surplus account waiting for next year, next July, not now. There is no surplus now; it is next year, and \$1.6 billion of that is for a surplus that may appear in the ether. South Australians need to think very hard about whom they will support in a couple of weeks' time on 18 May, and it really cannot be the federal Liberal government.

Mr BROWN: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:29): I rise today as the first of the winter fronts passes over South Australia. Many people will be very pleased. I am going to talk about the dry conditions that have impacted this state and much of eastern Australia over the past months. On Eyre Peninsula, the focus has been very much on the Cleve, Cowell and Arno Bay areas. There is no doubt that producers have been severely affected by probably the most difficult seasonal conditions in the last 50 years.

It is important to remember that other parts of Eyre Peninsula, including parts of the West Coast, are also doing it tough. The Streaky Bay silos, for example, have not opened for grain receipts for two of the past four years. If we add to that the impact that Pacific oyster mortality syndrome (POMS) has had on the availability of oyster spat and the subsequent difficulties for our oyster growers, we have challenging times for our communities.

In regard to spat, I hear that the nurseries are about to put onto the market enough spat for oyster growers to meet their demands; however, it will not be at the four millimetres stage. It will be just at the two millimetres stage, which means that for most oyster growers, depending on where they are situated, it will be between 18 months and three years before they have any saleable oysters from that spat. Never mind—there is light at the end of the tunnel.

My congratulations go to the organisers of the Growing Together forums held just a couple of weeks ago in both Streaky Bay and Cowell. The events were the initiative of Steve Whillas, who has also done an extraordinary job coordinating the delivery of donated straw and hay to farmers in need across Eyre Peninsula as part of the work of the EPIC Charitable Trust. Steve also works as one of the three Family and Business (FaB) Scouts on Eyre Peninsula. Supporting Steve was Mentally Fit EP, an organisation for which former Streaky Bay girl Lain Montgomerie is a key coordinator along with Jo Clark from Port Lincoln. The District Council of Franklin Harbour wellbeing drought coordinator, Jasmin Piggott, is also to be congratulated on her work.

The events were held over a Friday night, Saturday and Sunday. On the Saturday, mostly local presenters gave their insights into ways to successfully navigate challenging times. All the guests spoke from their own valuable experiences and covered topics from mental and physical health to succession planning and everything in between. For those with businesses in difficulty, the message from the state government's Rural Business Support is not to self-assess. Confidential advice is available from experienced rural financial counsellors working under this banner.

The two guest speakers at the Saturday night dinners were David Head, a farmer from Tintinara and formerly from Wharminda on Eyre Peninsula, and the always eloquent and ever funny former AFL footballer Sam Kekovich. The weekends continued with packed family days on the town ovals on the Sunday. Thanks go to the many sponsors who made the events possible and the MCs for the two days, Brooke Neindorf at Cowell and Emma Pedler at Streaky Bay, both of whom are well known on Eyre Peninsula as ABC morning presenters.

The take-home message for me and many others that day was to take care of ourselves and to look out for each other. Rain is forecast, as I mentioned, and spots are beginning to fall. The forecast is good, certainly for the West Coast and the southern agricultural areas of the state. It will be enough rain for some to begin the season. It will not be enough for others, but it will certainly inject some confidence, I hope, into the rural community out there.

I would also like to mention the federal government's involvement in the drought effort. I congratulate the federal member for Grey, Rowan Ramsey, on achieving \$1 million of federal funding for local government areas. Those on Eyre Peninsula that were successful are the district councils of Franklin Harbour, Cleve, Kimba, Wudinna, Streaky Bay and Ceduna. All those district councils are situated in the north and the east of Eyre Peninsula.

It has certainly been an injection of funds that they can well make use of. We will be putting it towards projects that would otherwise not be done, community projects that will benefit the small towns and the smaller communities as a result of the drought funding. I am keeping my fingers

crossed that the rain does come and that we can recover, as we always have before from serious drought situations.

Mr Teague interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: I have just had an update: there have already been eight millimetres in Ceduna.

HELLENIC PRESIDENTIAL GUARD

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:35): I rise to talk about the third visit of the Hellenic Presidential Guard to our beautiful city and state. It is the third time the presidential guard has visited South Australia and it is an auspicious visit: it is their 150th anniversary. They are a proud military unit of the Hellenic Army. My grandfather served for seven years as an Evzone in the city of Smyrna in Asia Minor.

It is fair to say that many Greek-Australians who can trace their heritage and ancestry back to Greece are extremely proud of the role the Evzones or presidential guard play in the life of Hellenism. They are a symbol of Greece and of the Hellenic Republic, they are a symbol of our shared democratic values and they are a symbol of the very best of Hellenism.

The first two visits of these guards were shared visits, when they would visit Adelaide and other cities. The first time, they visited Adelaide and Sydney and conducted ceremonies for ANZAC Day in Sydney that I think were remarkable. Last year, they were shared between Sydney, Adelaide and Melbourne. This year, Adelaide was the sole beneficiary of their visit. While they were here, they honoured our Australian ANZACs by standing guard over the Catafalque Party as they embarked on standing at the War Memorial in the West Torrens Memorial Gardens at the Cross of Sacrifice.

Generally at these services, we get about 500 people attending. At this service, there were 2,500 to 3,000 people, the council officials tell me. It was a moving ceremony. I was given the privilege by the Hilton RSL to speak after the conclusion of the dawn service to the assembled gathering about the significance of the Evzones and their interaction with Australians, especially in World War II.

Not many Australians know that the island of Lemnos has been critical in Australia's staging in the Mediterranean. In both wars, Australians first landed on Greek soil in Lemnos. In World War I, they staged before their Gallipoli landings from the island of Lemnos, and it is to that island that they were evacuated, and it operated as a field hospital. Indeed, it is one of the first commonwealth cemeteries ever built anywhere in the world.

In the Second World War, after the Greek army repelled the first Axis invasion, prime minister Churchill sent over 62,000 commonwealth troops to Greece. Again, the Evzones engaged directly with the Wehrmacht, which was the only time the Australians engaged the Wehrmacht in Europe. It is fair to say that one of the proudest boasts of that engagement was that France fell in six weeks but that it took the same army that conquered France six months to conquer Greece—a small country, an impoverished country, yet they fought with distinction and gave the Allies hope, and indeed hope to Allies around the world, that the Axis powers could be defeated.

There have been a number of events across South Australia at which these young men have represented the Hellenic Republic: ANZAC Day, over Easter, and Good Friday, when they marched before the tomb and the Epitaphios at St George, the first time they have done so anywhere in the world in their ceremonial uniforms. It was a great honour for us in this city. They did so today at Athelstone for the first ever divine liturgy in that church for their feast day of St Nicholas, St Raphael and St Irene. It was a moving ceremony. Over Greek Easter, on Saturday night and Sunday morning, they were at three churches: the Nativity of Christ in Port Adelaide, Prophet Elias in Norwood and St George in Thebarton.

The Leader of the Opposition was kind enough to hold a public reception for these guards yesterday. It was open for all the public to attend and was very well attended, with over 500 people attending to see these young guards. People were crying at all these events that I saw. There was a lot of emotion about their being here.

I hate to end on this note, but these guards were supported by the state government in their first two visits. In their third visit, despite personal representations to the Premier and to the Treasurer by leaders of the Greek community, the government refused to fund them. I was contacted by leaders of the Greek community to embark on a fundraising effort. We were able to raise enough money very, very quickly to bring them out here. I think it was a shame that the government did not do what it should have done, which was to support this visit in the interests of multiculturalism, and I hope that it does not happen again.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION SERVICES

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:40): I rise today to talk about ANZAC Day and honouring the memory of the men and women who gave their life for this country. Last week, on 25 April, we commemorated ANZAC Day, and it is indeed a day of commemoration and not a day of celebration. On ANZAC Day, we remember the spirit of the ANZACs and how proud Australia is of its veterans.

I will speak about ANZAC Day more broadly in a minute, but prior to ANZAC Day, on 24 April, I was very proud to join the Premier, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the member for Elder and the federal member for Boothby at the Repat to announce that a federal re-elected Morrison government will invest \$5 million at the Repat for a new veterans' wellbeing centre, which will bring together key services for our veterans and their families.

This centre will be a shared place for a range of government and non-government organisations to deliver services and programs to veterans and their families. This is in addition to the state and federal governments' announcement of nearly \$80 million for joint funding to revitalise and reactivate the Repat as a genuine health precinct. It was fantastic to be there with Ruddy from the Plympton Veterans Centre as well as part of that announcement.

The Repat has a 70-year history in South Australia, and many South Australians were able to rehabilitate their bodies and minds at the Daw Park hospital. It is a critical part of the South Australian health system, and that is why I am so proud to be a part of a team that is reactivating the Repat. Those opposite still have not apologised for closing the Repat. I was actually a little bit surprised that on ANZAC Day, at the service at the Repat, the member for Kurna, the member for—

Mr BROWN: Point of order: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr DULUK: As I was saying, the member for Kurna, the Hon. Ian Hunter in the other place and the Labor candidate for Boothby were at that ceremony as well, which was fantastic, but I would like to see the member for Kurna, the Hon. Mr Ian Hunter in the other place and the candidate for Boothby come out and apologise for Labor's closure of the Repat and the role that they played in that and, if they do not, for them to refrain from hypocrisy as they go about their civic duties. More importantly, I call on the Labor Party to match the Morrison government's \$5 million investment in the Repat centre for veterans as a hub for them and the SPF centre there on that site.

More broadly, a lot of Australians attend ANZAC Day services across the nation, and I know that on both sides of the house it is something we do to honour the memory of those men and women who sacrificed their lives in service to this country. It is a shame that there are some parts of our community, stemming from academia at the moment, who criticise ANZAC Day and the role that Australians play in the commemoration of such an important day. I especially ask those from the left commentariat to reflect on their words as we celebrate this solemn day.

In my own community, I had the pleasure of attending the ANZAC Youth Vigil at the Blackwood Soldier's Memorial, an event put together by the Blackwood community and mainly led by the Scouts in my community, the Sturt CFS Group Cadets, St John Ambulance from the Blackwood Cadet Division and Belair Girl Guides. This year was especially significant. Not only did it mark 15 years of standing guard as a youth vigil but it also was held at the recently restored Blackwood Soldier's Memorial on the Blackwood roundabout.

This year, we also remembered Mr Brian Langsford, who passed away late last year. Brian was a long-term servant of the Scouting movement in South Australia and the driving force behind the youth vigil in Blackwood. In the morning, I attended services at the Blackwood memorial where

we had about 4,500 people and later on at the Coromandel Valley memorial. The Hon. David Ridgway in the other house represented me at the dawn service at Mitcham. It was an honour to attend the youth vigil on ANZAC Day as we remembered those who made the ultimate sacrifice on behalf of our nation.

These qualities of the original ANZACs, who landed at Gallipoli in 1915, can be seen in the service of those who came after them in the Second World War, in Korea and Malaya, Borneo, Vietnam, in the recent conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq and in all our peacekeeping operations. We remember those who have served our country during times of conflict and crisis and reflect upon their sacrifice and, in some cases, that ultimate sacrifice.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:46): I will continue my comments from before the break on the fortuitous fiscal circumstances that the government found itself in when framing last year's state budget: the \$991 million of GST revenue, let alone the \$128 million in additional dividends that had been extracted from SA Water, and the additional \$81 million in dividends from SAFA.

You might think that the economic conditions to which I referred earlier, including the slowing of employment growth, the slowing of the state's economy, the slowing of retail sales figures, the slowing of the housing industry and also the drop or decline in the share of national exports, would give some thought for the state government to contribute additional resources into supporting economic activity. Indeed, if I cast my mind back less than two years ago to comments made by the then shadow treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas from the other place, he advised:

If you look at the last 12 months from July 2016, there has been 2.5 per cent jobs growth nationally, but in South Australia it has been 1.8 per cent.

He referred, of course, to employment growth. He continued:

It is good to see that we have a 1.8 per cent jobs growth figure, which is a bit higher than in previous years, but we again sadly languish behind the national jobs growth figures.

There has to be a reason for that. The excuse from the government is always that it is somebody else's fault. It is the federal government's fault, it is the banks' fault, it is always somebody else's fault but, after 16 years, they are still unprepared to accept any degree of responsibility for the appalling economic and jobs growth figures that South Australia currently confronts.

It is interesting that you would have a treasurer who would describe a 1.8 per cent jobs growth figure as being appalling, let alone that figure lagging behind the national average. What must he think of the 0.8 per cent annual jobs growth figure that his government is currently delivering, languishing of course behind the trend employment growth rate of 2.4 per cent—three times higher than the state's growth rate?

There was a case for investing significantly. In some respects, you might think that that is what the government chose to do. They certainly provided some room for themselves to do that. They even changed the budget's fiscal targets in relation to debt. They removed the cap on general government sector net debt from 35 per cent to enable what appears to be a significant blowout in debt forecast for the general government sector over the next four years—very significant: over \$3 billion.

You might think that with all the money available and with all that room to move to ramp up government debt the government would have plenty of capacity to continue investing in those job creation and support programs that were in existence prior to March 2018. I will read out a number of those that have been cut: the economic investment fund; the unlocking capital for jobs fund; the northern connections; the southern connections; the fund my neighbourhood program—although that has not stopped various members of the new government running out and opening projects in the communities they represent funded by the fund my neighbourhood program—the small business

development fund; the food park tenant attraction grant program; and the SA early commercialisation fund.

They also include the renewable technology industry development program; the automotive supplier diversification program; the advanced food manufacturing program; the SA premium food and wine credentials program; the energy productivity grants program (although only from next financial year); the mining and petroleum centre of excellence grant program; the premier's research and industry fund; the strategic industry development fund (although those last two apparently are being developed elsewhere); the future jobs fund; the renewable technology fund; the career services program; and the regional capability community grant program.

The retrenched workers program, the jobs first employment projects fund and the personal support program were also cut and are particularly relevant in light of what I referred to earlier, that is, the number of businesses that have announced that they are closing, retrenching workers or scaling back their operations in South Australia. There is plenty of capacity to act, but there was the announcement that they were withdrawing support for the economy.

However, it did not stop there. There were, of course, some extraordinary cuts announced in the budget. I referred earlier to the \$46 million to be cut, according to the budget, from both bus and train services, although I note that the minister is at pains to try to change the description of that as it is mentioned in the budget papers to only bus services. The cuts include 880 workers in SA Health, a \$26 million cut to regional road funding, a funding cut to the *Overland* train service and the \$1 million not honoured to Crime Stoppers.

The laptop in schools program has been scrapped for year 10 students and the female facilities program has also been scrapped. The expansions of the Klemzig and Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride facilities were cut, the South Australian tourism budget was cut by \$11 million and there were also the closures of the three Service SA centres at Modbury, Prospect and Mitcham. Seven TAFE campuses are to be closed and two sexual health clinics are also to be closed.

I mentioned earlier the privatisation of Pathology SA and the Adelaide Remand Centre, but of course it goes further than that. We have the privatisation of Modbury Hospital patient transfers and the establishment in the Department of Treasury and Finance of a privatisation task force. Indeed, it emerged during estimates that the Treasurer is 'actively encouraging' his officers to identify opportunities for outsourcing and privatisation, the fruits of which are already being born out of the privatisation of the remaining road maintenance task falling to DPTI.

It was announced a couple of weeks ago that the regional road maintenance gangs, which for many years—decades—have been employed by the Department of Transport, are to be outsourced. This follows the first big crack at outsourcing road maintenance operations that occurred when Diana Laidlaw was transport minister and, of course, Rob Lucas was treasurer. This essentially completes the job.

One thing that those opposite fail to realise is that when essential services such as electricity, road maintenance, water utilities—should it come to that—or gas services are privatised, the introduction of a private sector profit margin needs to be achieved. Those opposite will always sing the praises of the market's capacity to deliver better outcomes at more affordable prices more efficiently for consumers, but it comes at a grievous cost. There has been no greater example of that, as the member for West Torrens has already foreshadowed to this chamber, than the privatisation of ETSA, which experiences its 20-year anniversary this year.

Members of the public might be surprised to know that a significant component of their electricity bills relates directly to the profit margin that is being made by that private company headquartered in Hong Kong. That amount is somewhere between 10 and 20 per cent each year—a return on those electricity operations that were privatised under the former government.

Given that the average power bill for a South Australian household is well in excess of \$2,000 per year, we are talking somewhere in the vicinity of \$200 to \$400 more every year that South Australians are paying in their electricity bills as a result of privatisation and as a result of the inclusion of that profit margin. It is extraordinary for those opposite to be railing against electricity prices and the record of the former Labor government. It is a remarkable statistic that this is what they have done to South Australians, many of whom can least afford that sort of cost increase over that period.

We also saw in last year's budget an increase in fees and charges. I am talking about the regular increase in fees and charges. There was an extraordinary number of new fees and charges, or fees and charges increases, well beyond the normal indexation, which last year, if my memory serves me correctly, was 2.2 per cent.

We have the government's war on the hotel industry fought on another front, that is, the massive ramp-up of liquor licensing fees, with an extra \$3.1 million to be levied from the 2019-20 financial year. While the hotel industry tells us and the community that they cannot afford it, the Deputy Premier has confirmed in parliament that she is intent on receiving all this money from the hotel industry. That, of course, escalates each year, so we are looking at nearly \$10 million in additional liquor licensing fees imposed by the Attorney-General. But the Attorney-General does not stop there.

In a government that talks about red-tape reduction, she is flying the flag for new additional red tape in South Australia. She is introducing a licensing regime with fees for the real estate property management sector. Perhaps I do not pay close enough attention to all the small businesses in my electorate, but I am not sure that real estate property managers are, above and beyond, the most important industry that needs a better regulation and licensing regime. I would have thought that maybe labour hire workers deserved some protections, rather than the operations of real estate property managers, but not, as we heard today in question time, according to the Deputy Premier. There is \$1.4 million in this financial year and \$700,000-odd growing each year thereon in fees, which will have to be coughed up by the real estate industry.

New opal mining fees are being imposed by the member for Stuart and a new mine royalty rate will see further funds extracted from the minerals and resources industry. The EPA has taken the opportunity to increase regulatory costs and a new On the Run tax has been introduced by the member for Bragg, taxing underground petroleum storage systems for the first time. Next year will see \$750,000 raised and \$1.5 million raised thereon.

There are higher firearm fees, there are, of course, higher cost recovery fees for SARDI (South Australian Research and Development Institute) and there is the absolutely outrageous and egregious attack on Housing Trust tenants, with more than \$45 million in additional Housing Trust rents levied over the next four years. There are higher court fees, which once again the Attorney-General, the Deputy Premier, is responsible for levying.

There was the one-off 5 per cent increase, an extra \$3 million raised by the Minister for Environment, in NRM levies. The election commitment was that they would cap NRM levies so that people did not suffer increases every year. What he did not tell people was that he was going to jack them up by 5 per cent before he imposed that cap. As the saying goes, a rising tide lifts all boats, and that will mean an increase in that level of NRM fee for evermore.

It is timely to talk about fees and charges because the grab for revenue did not stop at last year's budget. We have already had foreshadowed a grab for additional revenue in this coming budget. I already touched on the cries of being duded, from the Treasurer and the Premier, over GST revenues as a result of the latest Commonwealth Grants Commission review of GST relativities as well as the update to the national pool figures in the federal budget. There is the claim, of course, from the Treasurer and the Premier that South Australia will be \$500 million worse off.

If you paint it in the worst possible light, if you ignore the extraordinary deluge of GST that flooded into this state during the preparation of last year's state budget, that might be true. But if you ruled a line against the state's finances that the government received on forming government—that is, those in the 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Review—you will notice that for the 2018-19 financial year they were budgeted to receive \$6.615 billion; they are still budgeted to receive \$6.716 billion. That is \$100 million more net of those alleged reductions from the CGC update and the federal budget.

Against that same benchmark from the 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Review—the latest GST figures going into the last state election—the difference for the next financial year is indeed negative, but negative \$150 million, not the \$500 million plus dollars claimed by the Treasurer. So between two financial years, the net difference is \$50 million, an unfortunate but entirely manageable change in the timing of GST receipts. At least, it would be manageable if that deluge of GST money that came in last year were not spent in the budget to leave only very little room to move for the

government should there be any downturn in revenues. This was not the only revenue line that was anticipated to continue increasing by substantial amounts.

We saw conveyance duty revenues, or what we would know as stamp duty revenues, forecast to increase year on year by 8 per cent. That would be heroic in the face of the current real estate market, particularly given we are predominately talking about residential transactions here, given the former Labor government abolished conveyance duty on commercial property transactions. It also brings into sharp focus the context by which this current government rushed headlong into a deal, pushed by Scott Morrison and Josh Frydenberg, for a new allocation of GST.

Nothing could be more important when it comes to sustainable state finances than ensuring that we had a good deal for GST revenues here in South Australia. And we had a good deal for GST revenues here in South Australia. In fact, all the states and territories around the country had a good deal for the distribution of GST. It was one meted out nearly 20 years ago for the introduction of the GST, a new tax system introduced in legislation in the commonwealth parliament that ensured that there was a pure model of horizontal fiscal equalisation.

I warned the government at the time that any move away from a pure HFE model for the distribution of GST grants would significantly disadvantage South Australia. There is no way around it: South Australia, as a smaller state, as a net beneficiary of GST revenues, is one of the jurisdictions that stands to lose the most if the HFE model on the distribution of GST grants is in any way diluted. But we did not see that from the Treasurer and we did not see that from the Premier. They were more than happy to take what they were given by Scott Morrison and Josh Frydenberg.

They did that on the basis that when the model changed there would be additional top-up payments to South Australia leading up to the 2026-27 financial year. I am the first to admit that some time ago that felt like an eon away, but it is not—it is at the end of the next parliamentary term. I am positive that in 2026-27 not even the venerable Hon. Rob Lucas will still be around, gracing these corridors, at least in the guise of a member of parliament. Given recent developments in Liberal leadership, I am pretty confident that the Premier, the member for Dunstan, will not be leader let alone in parliament in 2026-27.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: You never know. It could happen.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There is a long queue between the Minister for Energy and that position, I am sure—and all of them know how to use cutlery, don't they?

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That's right, although I think we can exclude the Minister for Industry and Skills; I think that is a reasonable assumption. Beyond that, I am sure there will be people lining up for that particular position in the South Australian parliamentary Liberal Party.

However, it is pertinent because not too long from now these new financial arrangements for the distribution of the GST will come into effect here in South Australia. At that point in time, that additional assistance from the federal government, that \$257 million over the five or six years leading up to that date, will no longer be available. If you have the Treasurer complaining about a \$500 million write-down in GST revenues in one year, then it puts into context whether or not that extra \$257 million is significant.

In the scheme of things, in the scheme of receiving between \$7 billion and \$8 billion a year in GST, which we should be by that time, it is not significant; it is a rounding error. It is important but, given the quantum of GST grants, it does not measure up as a very significant contribution and certainly not the very significant contribution that has been spruiked by the federal Coalition government, the Premier and the Treasurer.

What happens beyond that has been a massive diminution, a massive watering down of the GST deal that South Australia will be able to get in future years. Remember how all this started. Western Australia, currently the fiscally strongest state in the federation, was complaining that the mining boom and the massive deluge of billions and billions of dollars of extra revenue from their mining industry that they were receiving each year meant that they were getting a reduction in their GST grants—not unreasonable under the tenets of a pure horizontal fiscal equalisation model.

It is not unreasonable at all, especially given that the way in which GST grants are rebalanced for those states experiencing significant uplifts in revenues, whether it is mining royalties or whether it might be their own source revenues. There is a lag for that. That means that from 2006 or 2007, when Western Australia was right in the thick of these additional mining royalties, they were also right in the thick of the GST revenues that had been calculated for them two or three years ago, so they were benefiting twice.

What they started complaining about was the mining royalties continuing on but the GST revenue starting to drop off, and then of course those calls became screams when the mining royalties also continued to drop off. Was there a flaw in the model for the distribution of GST grants? No, there was not. It was working as it was meant to. If any criticism could have been levelled at it, maybe it could have been to do with the timing lag in the re-evaluation of a GST grant by the Commonwealth Grants Commission. Maybe it needed to be shortened from three years. Maybe some other minor adjustments needed to be made to it or maybe we just should leave the model alone.

If the federal Coalition government felt they were going to lose seats at the next election in Western Australia, they could just pay more money to Western Australia rather than bugging up the GST distribution system for the whole country. But that is not what they chose to do. They chose, as I just expressed it, to bugger up the GST distribution system for the whole country.

Now states like Western Australia, and even Queensland, may find themselves unusually in the position of being the fiscally strongest state in the federation by virtue of the strength of their mining sectors. They will no longer have such a significant reduction in GST grants in recognition of the huge uplift in mining royalties. Instead, they will have a flaw in the level of GST grants that they will receive, a flaw which is almost entirely irrelevant to South Australia.

As I said, we are a net beneficiary of GST grants. We are not a jurisdiction that receives less than our population share, so the benefit experienced by Western Australia through these new arrangements going forward comes to the detriment of other states. When we have what has happened in the last few months—and that is GST revenues heading back towards levels of what they were in 2017-18—then we understand that the millions and millions of dollars of GST revenues that we have placed at risk beyond that date, beyond 2026, are really going to hurt the budget position of South Australia.

We called on the federal government to guarantee that no state would be worse off under the new GST deal, and they did not do that. They said that they did it, but they did not. They only did it up to that date of 2026-27. To have a guarantee for only eight years is ridiculous. This is the single largest source of revenue to our state. This year, it is nearly \$7 billion and growing, going forward. To have the size and distribution model of that only guaranteed for a further eight or so years is not good enough.

Imagine the federal government saying, 'We are only going to pay you health grants for another eight years and after that we will just have to chat to you about it and see if we still think it is a good idea,' or it could be regarding education funding, or for that matter an amount of water coming down the Murray. All those outcomes would be unacceptable if they were time-limited at only eight years, but for some reason this government thinks it is okay to dud our state out of a reasonable and fixed share of the GST or at least a fixed formula of the GST.

I thought to myself, knowing from a previous hat that I wore, that surely the South Australian Department of Treasury and Finance must be telling the government how important it is not to water down the GST model in South Australia. Surely, they would be telling them. So we placed a number of freedom of information requests to the department to see what advice they were providing. Those requests were put in towards the end of last year. You will not be surprised, in the context of the performance of this current government, to learn that it took over four months for the FOIs to be determined. I will read some excerpts from the Department of Treasury and Finance advice to the Treasurer on this very matter:

- The principle of horizontal fiscal equalisation is probably the most important underlying principle in Australia's system of federal financial relations.

- Full equalisation must always be the overriding objective, and moves away from this objective, like adoption of a 'reasonable' approach, are not supported.

You have to think about what was being countenanced at the time this advice was provided. Two different options were being mooted by the Productivity Commission: a full per capita distribution model, which would have seen South Australia lose \$2 billion a year in GST grants, or a 'reasonable' approach, which would have seen us lose hundreds of millions of dollars a year. The advice goes on:

- Equity is at the heart of HFE [horizontal fiscal equalisation] and each state and territory must be given the same capacity to deliver services and deliver outcomes to their citizens.
- In a Federation it is appropriate for Commonwealth funds to be distributed in a way that allows all Australians to have access to a consistent level of services, infrastructure and opportunities. This is best achieved with a system of full equalisation.
- The resource rich states and the more populous states that house the majority of Australia's head offices have inherent fiscal advantages over the smaller states.
- South Australia believes that the current system of HFE is appropriate and should be retained.

This is the advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance to the Treasurer. It continues:

- The proposed move to an equalisation benchmark based on the fiscal position of New South Wales or Victoria represents a shift away from the current system of full fiscal equalisation.
- If adopted, this would represent a significant change in Commonwealth-state relations. There will no longer be an objective to provide each state and territory with the capacity to deliver a standard level of services and infrastructure to their citizens.

There you have it: a warning from the Department of Treasury and Finance to the Treasurer that moving away from the original model to the model that has now been adopted by Scott Morrison and Josh Frydenberg will mean that smaller states like South Australia cannot provide the same standard of services or infrastructure to its citizens. The advice goes on:

- In the future, the fiscally strongest state (currently Western Australia) will have the capacity to deliver better services, lower state taxes and more infrastructure to their citizens than other states. There could now be incentives for individuals and businesses to migrate to Western Australia to take advantage of a lower tax environment or access a wider range of services. This could also put competitive pressures on other States to lower their taxes and reduce the quality of their services.

There is the warning from the Department of Treasury and Finance: 'Do not sign up to this model. You will make states like Western Australia stronger than the others, particularly smaller states, and the smaller states will not be able to provide the same services and will not be able to provide the same level of infrastructure to its citizens.' The advice goes on:

- The additional Commonwealth top-up funding does not provide certainty that all states and territories will not be worse-off. The relativity estimates used in the Commonwealth's modelling are just projections and highly uncertain. The projections rely on the gap between Western Australia's relativity and the next strongest state narrowing in the future.
- If Western Australia's relativity were to be much lower than projected (possible if iron ore prices grow) the benefit of a bigger GST pool may not be sufficient to offset the loss to smaller states and territories from the change in the revised equalisation objective.

So in an environment where there is higher global demand for Western Australian iron ore, their economic activity picks up, Western Australia receives higher royalties and the national pool of GST grows might not be enough to compensate South Australia for a decline in GST revenues as a result of the new model that has been adopted. The advice continues:

- In order to safeguard the interests of South Australia and all other states...a further mechanism is needed to ensure that if the Commonwealth's estimated trajectory of relativities does not eventuate, a further contribution from the Commonwealth would be provided.

That is exactly what the opposition called for: a guarantee that South Australia will be no worse off and, if it is found to be worse off, there must be top-ups from the federal government. It is shameful not only that Scott Morrison and Josh Frydenberg have not guaranteed that past 2026 but that our state Premier and our state Treasurer have signed up for this in order not to be a thorn in the tyre of the federal government's objectives in trying to get this issue dealt with. That is a dreadful outcome

for our state. While the Treasurer and the Premier will not be around to experience the impacts of that in South Australia, I hope that some of us are. However, I do not relish this parliament having to deal with budgets and budget bills that are unfortunately less fiscally effusive than they could be.

Beyond GST and beyond that claimed need by the state Treasurer to prop up the state's budget position in light of the forecast downturn in GST revenues from the period of the last state budget, it was a surprise to me to receive a phone call from a public servant a couple of weeks ago asking if I was aware of what the government was doing with regard to the annual indexation of fees and charges. I had to admit that while I was very familiar with the regular process of the government indexing the myriad fees and charges, the hundreds and hundreds it levies across many different portfolio areas, I was not aware of any plans beyond that.

I was advised by this public servant that agencies had been instructed not to investigate or to model a larger than normal increase in fees and charges but to go beyond that and prepare drafting instructions for parliamentary counsel to put those larger than normal increases in train; that is, a decision had effectively been made to get these higher fees and charges ready. That same day—not related to me, I can add—InDaily broke the news that higher than normal fees and charges were being looked at by the Hon. Rob Lucas.

He was forced to come out and admit that, yes, a directive had been issued to all government agencies, but he described it as merely investigating this, not beginning the process of implementing it. That was not what I was told by that public servant. Issuing drafting instructions to parliamentary counsel makes it clear that the government is much further down the path in some areas with this than others. This is significant because the government collects over \$2.5 billion each year in the sale of goods and services and the levying of fees and charges.

Usually, in recent times the increases have been around 2 or 2.5 per cent. This is calculated, and has been for decades, as a percentage increase as an amalgam between the Adelaide metro CPI and an index of wage increases across the public sector, which is used as some representation of the cost of delivering services to South Australians. That is why the fees and charges largely track but sometimes are a little bit higher than the inflation rate. Moving beyond that, a 1 per cent larger than normal increase would mean an extra \$25 million if it were applied across the board. You do not have to be too quick to do the maths: the 2 per cent is \$50 million and the 3 per cent is \$75 million.

The 3 per cent is interesting because 3 per cent annuls the \$71 million or \$72 million in emergency services levy relief that was provided last year by the government. You will remember, Mr Deputy Speaker, that they went to the election saying that they were going to reinstate \$90 million of relief to households, and what they actually reinstated was \$71 million or \$72 million of relief to South Australians, because, of course, they increased the emergency services levy (ESL) budget by the difference—by that \$18 million or \$19 million and they took the \$90 million from that; so, really, the relief to households was only just above \$70 million.

Now it looks like that ESL bill relief is about to be extinguished by this increase in fees and charges, so you cannot even trust the government to make good on their promises to lower costs for South Australians, and that is in addition to the claim of better services and more jobs I have already spoken about. It is extraordinary that we would have a government that is willing to give money back to South Australians only for it to be taken some nine months later with a hike in fees and charges. Of course, that would be most keenly felt if it were applied in the area of transport: driver's licence fees; motor registration charges, beyond the compulsory third-party insurance premiums which are levied each year; and, of course, Metroticket prices.

One of the last decisions that the cabinet made under the former Labor government was to provide discounts to Metroticket holders, particularly for 28-day and 14-day passes, which the current Minister for Transport spruiked as his own in April of last year. However, you can imagine how betrayed commuters would feel in being told that they were being stung high Metrocard or single-trip ticket prices for \$46 million less of bus and train services. Of course, it does not really wash with motorists, either, who would be faced with higher registration costs while having been promised upgrade after upgrade to South Road and who have continually been led down the garden path.

It is interesting because, as I mentioned before, the ceiling on general government sector net debt has been removed by this government. The ceiling was 35 per cent. It has been removed,

and that has enabled the government to increase that net debt to revenue ratio from that maximum of 35 per cent and it is now forecast to reach 42.1 per cent. Net debt by 2021-22 is forecast to reach \$8.9 billion, a 63 per cent increase in debt over the next four years—an extraordinary outcome given that this is meant to be the party of fiscal rectitude and that this is meant to be the party of financial management.

We see debt explode under the government, and you might think, 'Oh, well, maybe they're getting on with the job of building things in South Australia.' Well, there is some building work underway. There is, of course, the Northern Connector project, which was announced in 2015 by former prime minister Tony Abbott, Jay Weatherill, Jamie Briggs and me. Doesn't that cast the mind back! Unfortunately, it was on the day of the Abbott assassination, but luckily we got ours in just in time.

There are, of course, works continuing on the Darlington project and the work which was due to start at least nine months ago on the Flinders Link project, which we found out yesterday still has not started and which is going to be delivered late and nearly \$50 million over budget, so there is infrastructure spending built in to the forward estimates. We also factored in a state contribution for the Pym Street to Regency Road contribution, as well as for the duplication of the Joy Baluch Bridge at Port Augusta.

However, what we were also promised two federal budgets in a row was that there would be billions of dollars extra for the future stages of South Road. Last year, we were promised \$1.8 billion for infrastructure projects in South Australia. I remember it clearly on the front page of *The Advertiser*, '\$1.8 billion'. What did we get? \$395 million across the forward estimates—less than a quarter of what was promised; \$1.2 billion of that amount was promised for north-south corridor upgrades, upgrades to South Road, and we received less than \$200 million of that. The balance was allegedly beyond the forward estimates.

This year, we saw a carbon copy. We were promised \$1.5 billion for South Road. Was it all there? No. Less than 10 per cent of it was there. The rest of it, the bulk of it—the amount of money actually needed to get on with infrastructure projects over the next four years—is not available. It is beyond the forward estimates. We know that money that is factored in but not in the forward estimates, money that is counted beyond the forward estimates, is not real money.

Do not take my word for it. You can take the words of the federal campaign spokesman for the Liberal Party of Australia, Simon Birmingham, a senator for South Australia. He said that money beyond the forward estimates is 'never there' and on the 'never-never', and I think he makes it pretty clear: if it is not in the forward estimates, it is not there. We even had the same contribution from the member for Schubert: if it is not in a budget line, it is not in the budget.

This means that there is going to be a significant delay before we start work, an inexplicable delay. If we did indeed have this money in the forward estimates up-front, as we were told we were going to get, then we would have seen work start already on the section of Pym Street to Regency Road, and nothing is happening out there. The duplication of—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, nothing is happening out there. The member for Schubert can laugh. He might callously think—

Dr Close: He doesn't go there very often.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —he doesn't go there very often—that these sorts of road upgrades are voluntary or optional.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Excuse me?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, despite the member for Schubert asking to be excused for his tardy performance in securing money from the federal government, he cannot be excused. He cannot be excused because the role of a hardworking state transport minister is to go to Canberra to secure money. That is certainly the task that I had and it is certainly the task that I delivered: \$2.5 billion for those three projects—one of which is already finished, the next of which is almost finished and the one after that will be finished shortly after.

That is \$2.5 billion of projects. In fact, not only were they delivered under budget but they were also delivered ahead of time in the case of the Torrens to Torrens project. So far under budget were they that the savings from those three projects funded the state's contribution and the majority of the federal government's contribution to the Oaklands crossing upgrade.

I am sure you will hear a lot from the member for Boothby—one of the first to sign the petition to roll Malcolm Turnbull as prime minister and install Peter Dutton as Prime Minister of Australia—that she, in fact, was responsible. It turned into the Spartacus project: everyone was claiming to be Spartacus at that announcement. There was Paul Fletcher, the federal minister responsible, myself as state minister and then this flurry of Liberal state and federal MPs, even candidates—given how close it was to the election—claiming responsibility for having negotiated this deal. I can tell you why this deal came about, on the record in *Hansard*, so I am happy if somebody wants to get up and try to correct me.

When the last federal budget came down, and when we saw hundreds of millions of dollars delivered to a Western Australian urban rail project that did not even have a name let alone a business case, when we saw hundreds of millions of dollars delivered for other projects in Queensland that did not have a business case and I said, 'What about the money that Malcolm Turnbull said he was going to give to South Australia for the Pym Street to Regency Road upgrade if we provided you with the necessary paperwork in April 2017?' he looked at me a bit embarrassed.

I said, 'There is only one solution for this that I would like to see and that is us getting the Pym Street to Regency Road money. Failing that, the other thing we should get on and fund is the Oaklands crossing upgrade.' He agreed to do that and we agreed to use the savings from that project. I should also mention the other two rail upgrade projects that have been delivered in South Australia: the Goodwood junction project, just south of the city, to grade separate the freight and the passenger rail lines, and the Torrens junction rail upgrade to grade separate the freight and the passenger rail lines.

These were delivered under the former Labor government and delivered under budget so that the savings from those projects could fund the \$85 million Flinders Link project. That is what happens when you go to Canberra, secure the money, get on with delivering the projects, get out to tender quickly, have a good tender outcome and work collaboratively with your tenderer to make sure that you have the right design so you can save money and continue investing in broad projects.

Other than those existing South Road projects, it really seems that the only projects that are taking up infrastructure spending over the next four years are the \$650 million in school upgrades, which were conceived and funded by the member for Port Adelaide and the then treasurer, the member for West Torrens, and the \$270 million for The Queen Elizabeth Hospital—again, put in the forward estimates by the former state Labor government.

There are also some other projects in the forward estimates that do not seem to have much progress on them, unfortunately. There is the upgrade of Springbank and Daws roads, which had just under \$25 million committed to it by the former Labor government in the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure budget in the forward estimates, and a project dear to my heart, which was due to be nearly half completed by this very date, was the intersection upgrade of Cheltenham Parade, West Lakes Boulevard and Port Road.

This is one of the busiest intersections in the western suburbs and an intersection with an extraordinary crash history, given that Port Road is a major arterial road separated by a very significant median, which increases commensurately the number of turning movements for those people trying to navigate that type of intersection. As people would know, it is turning movements at intersections that cause the greatest number of motor vehicle accidents.

We have had delay after delay with these projects, and there is still no understanding from the council, which has been waiting to hear from the state government about their intentions with that intersection upgrade so that they can plan the next stages of their stormwater upgrades down the median of Port Road, given the work they have already done down Old Port Road. Tardiness is becoming a feature in the transport portfolio.

At the beginning of September last year, we learnt that there would be the closure of three Service SA centres and here we are, nearly eight months on, and we still do not know how those Service SA centres are going to be successfully closed and how those services are going to be provided to citizens in South Australia. It is extraordinary that you could tell South Australians that you would delay a budget for months so that all the background work, all the planning, all the preparation, all the program development and evaluation, even business cases, could be done so that as soon as the budget was announced you could press the button on all these projects, and on all these initiatives, and get on with them.

But here we are, and it looks as though a significant number of these savings measures will be unable to be delivered or delivered very late. That is important to note because we have already seen that, aside from some of these specific savings measures, such as the closure of Service SA offices, many agencies across government have unallocated and unidentified savings they need to achieve.

For example, this year \$135 million of savings need to be delivered. We have a couple of months to go until the end of the financial year and the Treasury is expecting all those agencies to save \$135 million. Or, I would say, all those agencies but not quite because we saw in the Mid-Year Budget Review that SA Health was being given some further breathing space on these savings tasks imposed by the new Liberal government.

Nonetheless, the savings tasks are extraordinary. As well as the privatisation of the Adelaide Remand Centre and the cutting of rehabilitation programs for offenders in our prisons, the Department for Correctional Services has another \$2½ million that it needs to save. The Department for Education, perhaps through the advocacy of the member for Morialta, seems to have escaped relatively easily with only \$2 million to save, but \$2 million is still no small beer, particularly in light of our understanding that the first rounds of TVSP calls have not quite gone as well as the government would have hoped.

We see the member for Stuart's Department for Energy and Mining with \$2.2 million of savings to achieve this financial year. SA Health, despite having some more breathing space in their savings task, seems to have got off a little lighter. Their head office has to save \$5.6 million this year. Public imaging and diagnostics is a \$1.1 million saving and the national benchmarking saving, which presumably is what the corporate liquidators have been called in from interstate to achieve, had \$73 million worth of savings to achieve in this financial year alone.

That is a lot of money—\$73 million is nothing to be sneezed at, even in the context of a health system the size of South Australia's—but that task for SA Health, as forecast in the state budget, increases: next year, it is \$126 million; the year after it is \$204 million; and the year after that it is \$295 million. That is \$698 million of savings to be identified through 'national benchmarking'. Maybe that is why they called in the interstate corporate liquidators. Maybe they have a national perspective on benchmarking.

We have \$21 million over four years in human services. We have \$15 million over four years in industry and skills. Maybe that will slow up the number of appointments to the Construction Industry Training Board for the Minister for Innovation and Skills. We also have further savings for the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure of \$44.7 million—those are not the bus cuts—\$38 million of savings for police, \$25 million of savings in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, \$10½ million on top of those SARDI fee increases I raised before for Regions SA and a further \$6½ million for primary industries.

There are \$26 million of further cuts in the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment and \$84.4 million in the Department of Treasury and Finance, which probably reminds people why the Treasurer is 'actively encouraging his officers to come up with new outsourcing and privatisation options here in South Australia'.

What has also been of interest to me is the delay in the number of reports that we were promised were urgent first priorities for this government. We have been told by the government, the Treasurer, the Premier and the Minister for Water that South Australians were paying far too much in their SA Water bills and that there had been some egregious cash grab by the former Labor government in the last pricing determination made by the former government and that it had been

done by an artificial inflation of the regulated asset base of South Australia. This was such an outrage to the government that they said they would immediately hold a full investigation into the water price-setting process, with the aim of substantially reducing water bills for South Australians going forward.

That was all the rhetoric we heard through 2015, 2016, 2017 and the early months of 2018, but when they came into government suddenly things went quiet. When somebody in the media said, 'By the way, where is that water pricing inquiry you promised you would establish?' the government then appointed the former chair of the Essential Services Commission, Mr Lew Owens, to undertake that inquiry. Here we are, more than a year on, and we still have not seen the fruits of that. I wonder why.

If the government truly believe that the regulated asset base is overvalued by billions of dollars, then surely they can be issuing a direction to the Essential Services Commission about a lower value for the regulated asset base, lower by billions of dollars, so that it can flow through to people's water bills. However, perhaps the government has realised why the former Labor government took that decision about the value of the regulated asset base: because it was based on advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance at the time. Maybe they will realise that over the forward estimates there is between \$300 million and \$600 million a year of additional infrastructure investment in SA Water's asset base.

Deputy Speaker, if your contention, like those opposite, is that higher asset values lead to higher water bills, why would you be investing nearly an extra \$2 billion over the next four years in expanding the asset base? Surely, that will only flow through to higher water bills. Surely, that will mean that the building block pricing structure, which has been used in South Australia for many years in establishing water prices, and the additional increase to the asset base of SA Water is only going to result in higher prices for South Australian consumers.

If you marry that up with what I advised earlier, that SA Water is being raided for additional dividends, it is substantial for SA Water. In the current financial year, it is an additional \$26.6 million. Next year, it is an additional \$62.4 million of dividends from SA Water. In terms of what that would mean to somebody's water bill, there are approximately 900,000 households, I think, give or take a few tens of thousands and, as we know, there are approximately 150,000 to 160,000 businesses in South Australia, not all of which will have a separate water account.

Let's say there are a million billable addresses here for SA Water. That \$60 million represents \$60 each if it is spread around them. That is what the government has done. It has not rushed to try to lower water prices, as it promised South Australians it would. Instead, it is ramping up the value of the assets in SA Water's books and extracting high dividends from SA Water. When it comes to how the government spend their money in more discretionary areas, we see they have not been quite so fiscally prudent.

I want to talk about a couple of particular matters of expenditure from the state government. While they were cutting funds to SA Pathology, they thought it would be worthwhile spending millions and millions of dollars over the next four years setting up health boards in South Australia. It is a surprise, really, because I always thought that, under the tenets of responsible government we had in South Australia, the health minister and, through him, the chief executive were responsible for the operations of SA Health.

Clearly, there is an appetite for the Minister for Health and the government to try to devolve that responsibility to a group of unelected, unaccountable board members who will run our local health networks. This was something that was thrust on us more than 12 years ago by the then Rudd government. It was always the position of the state Labor government that health boards are not ideal. Any board and any member of a board should always act in the best interests of the organisation it superintends. That is a basic fiduciary duty that all board members have under the Corporations Act. That stands to reason; I do not think anyone would question that.

However, in the context of SA Health and the statewide health services having a proliferation of health boards that are all only singularly focused on their own patch to the ignorance of what is happening beyond them it means that you come up with disjointed and suboptimal outcomes across the health system. I would argue that it is in the interests of a health board to argue very much in favour of—and potentially to the detriment of other health boards—their own organisation first and

foremost. That makes it extremely difficult for a chief executive and it makes it extremely difficult for a health minister to try to ensure that there is a system-wide approach to managing hospitals and health services. However, that is what the government is spending millions of dollars on.

Of course, way out almost in the never-never but not quite, \$20 million is being spent on GlobeLink. I have to raise it. I have to talk about GlobeLink so I can be the only member of parliament who is talking about it because apparently it has vanished. Apparently, it has just been forgotten. They got past the unpleasantness of a Liberal candidate in a Hills seat being challenged for their safe Liberal margin by a Nick Xenophon Team candidate.

Now that they have got past all of that and have finally been elected to their safe Liberal Hills seat, they can stop the pretence that they are going to remove freight rail services from metropolitan Adelaide, that they are going to stop using the \$300 million-plus investment for the Goodwood and Torrens Rail Junction upgrades, that they are going to turn their back on all those intermodal facilities that have only been opened in Adelaide's northern suburbs in recent years, including one that the Premier himself visited out at Regency Park, Northline.

Once we have put all that pretence aside, hopefully GlobeLink can die a slow death. Unfortunately, while I might be the only member of parliament talking about it in this parliament, there is another member of parliament, hopefully short-lived, the member for Boothby, the cheer squad for Peter Dutton, who is also claiming to be removing the freight rail services from metropolitan Adelaide and strongly pushing GlobeLink. There are a few flaws in the GlobeLink plan, of course.

Not only is there virtually no money across the forward estimates, aside from the \$20 million for a business case apparently in the last financial year of the forward estimates, but there is no other money of any substance being provided at the state level. There is no awareness of the project from the federal department of infrastructure. There is no awareness of this amongst Infrastructure Australia, although we have a new appointee to Infrastructure Australia, a former executive of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, Mr Rod Hook.

Hopefully, GlobeLink gets a look in just before SkyWay gets a ventilation. I am not sure whether SkyWay will get to the top of the tree, given the warnings from financial authorities in Europe about SkyWay basically being a pyramid scheme. However, if GlobeLink gets a guernsey before Skyway at Infrastructure Australia, maybe then the federal government will become aware of GlobeLink, but until then it seems to be an embarrassment that still sits around this government that still has not been dealt with. Maybe it will be dealt with. Maybe it will be killed off in this budget, because we know that the Minister for Transport likes to take his time killing off government election commitments which he knows are undeliverable.

We had the extraordinary seven-month wait to kill off the tram right-hand turn. It was remarkable, really, given that he was advised in his incoming government briefs that it was unachievable. We went through the farce and expense of getting additional reports, additional consultancies conducted to reaffirm the advice that had already been provided by both government engineers and external consultants that the tram right-hand turn could not be delivered.

After that delay, maybe we are just in for a delay on killing off GlobeLink, but we will wait and see. Given that it is \$20 million—and I presume they do not get out of bed for less than \$37 million—I wonder whether KordaMentha will tender for it. They did not have any experience in the health network, and I do not believe they have any experience in transport infrastructure, but maybe they will still win a tender. In fact, it was not a tender; it was a direct-to-market approach.

Funny that, because if I had been a health bureaucrat who was getting some pressure to try to find somebody who could perhaps provide some external expert financial advice, I might have thought, 'I wonder if there is anyone in South Australia who is good at this. Do we have anyone who is skilled in health administration? Do we have anyone who is skilled in financial administration? Do we have anyone in South Australia who has a combination of those two skills?' Apparently, the answer from health bureaucrats and the government is that, no, we do not have anyone in South Australia. It had to be KordaMentha. It had to be.

We do not know why it had to be KordaMentha, but I am hoping we will find out, because the Auditor-General told the Budget and Finance Committee in the other place yesterday that he will certainly be having a look at the KordaMentha procurement, which is really pleasing. It is not often

that somebody can win a select market approach for a consultancy of \$880,000 and write a report, one of the recommendations of which was that their contract be expanded for an \$18.7 million consultancy.

Once we get through that next piece of work, if it is all going glowingly—and, according to this morning's *Tiser*, KordaMentha will comment on whether they are doing well or not. It is not for SA Health or anybody else. KordaMentha will be the judge of whether they are doing a good job or not, and then they can have the full \$37 million that they believe they can extract in consultancy fees from SA Health. That is more than the first year of savings required from SA Pathology. It is just extraordinary.

It is not the only procurement that the opposition is interested in either. We also had the remarkable decision of the Marshall government to award a single-service contract for across-government travel services to QBT travel. It is remarkable, given that the tender process specifically sought a panel of providers, more than one, so that when people were looking at booking travel services they could choose whether it was the incumbent, if they were successful in making their way into the panel again, or from a range of new travel services providers. But the contract was not awarded to a panel of providers. Indeed, it went to QBT travel.

It is of interest because that company is run and owned by the federal Liberal Party treasurer, Andrew Burnes. You would have thought that that fact alone might raise enough eyebrows within government to ensure that if the government was going to go through a process where QBT travel was bidding for this work, then you would ensure that this process was wrapped in probity to the greatest extent possible.

You would ensure that there were probity advisers. You would make sure that ministers involved in the deal, who would perhaps be taking the recommendation to cabinet for cabinet to approve the awarding of the contract, had no contact with the company during the tender process. You might even ask whether the Premier or any other ministers had any shares in QBT travel while this process was underway.

We do not know the answer to that because when we put the questions in question time the Premier responded with, 'I cannot believe you are asking questions about this. It is not a big issue.' Well, it is a big issue. It is a \$56 million contract that has been awarded to somebody the Premier does know. It is a \$56 million contract that has been awarded to a company owned by one of the most senior members of the federal Liberal Party in this country.

The circumstances around it are remarkably similar to the way in which the federal government awarded their travel services contract to a company called Helloworld. QBT travel is a subsidiary company of Helloworld. You might recall that there was some furore in the federal parliament, if my memory serves me correctly, about how a \$420 million across-national-government travel services contract could be awarded to Helloworld.

In the federal government, the circumstances were a bit different from those we had here in South Australia. In South Australia, we had a single provider, everyone's favourite, Carlson Wagonlit. They were the provider of travel management services to the government of South Australia and also, I think, to the parliament. I believe it was the experience of that single contract that informed the recommendation to seek a panel of providers so that people felt they had a choice and did not necessarily have to go with one provider, let alone Carlson Wagonlit, if they were to be successful.

In the federal sphere, this was reversed. They had a panel of providers providing travel management services. You will remember that there was an election in September 2013 when there was a change of government. Within months of that change of government, immediately a new tender was issued by the federal government for a travel management services contract. It went from a panel of providers to a single provider. It went to Helloworld, from the same group of companies and the same ownership that we are talking about here with QBT travel.

It turned out that Mr Andrew Burnes, the federal Liberal Party treasurer, who owns Helloworld and QBT travel, had made a donation of \$500,000 to the federal Liberal Party and had also, I am led to believe, hosted fundraisers. It is remarkable that we could have a similar situation here in South Australia where, upon the election of a new Liberal government, we immediately see a tender

process that is changed so that, instead of ending up with a panel of providers, we have a single provider and, again, it is a company owned by Mr Andrew Burnes.

When these sorts of decisions are being taken, there is a great emphasis on the role of the Auditor-General to thoroughly examine these sorts of procurements. The government, as did the previous government, has structures in place, like the State Procurement Board, to provide a range of policies and to liaise with departments about how they should be conducting procurements.

It is often found by the Auditor-General or previous auditors-general that sometimes processes in terms of government spending decisions around procurements have not been conducted according to the letter of those policies set down by the State Procurement Board. I will be very interested to know to what extent the Auditor-General will be examining these two procurements: KordaMentha, for \$37 million if it is pursued to its full extensions, and QBT travel, a \$56 million procurement for across-government travel management services.

I should also make reference to the other discretionary spending that I must admit I was somewhat surprised to see, and that was, in March of this year, the very quiet announcement of a \$400,000 payroll tax advertising campaign by the government. Remember, this is a Treasurer and a Premier who had railed against government advertising, who had said that it was outrageous, that it was political and that it should only be used if absolutely necessary.

There is some government advertising that is necessary, absolutely—for example, the advertisements that go out advising of fire danger season and the advertising of the road safety campaigns superintended by the Motor Accident Commission. Of course, a number of different advertising campaigns are run throughout the year by SA Health, particularly at this time of year as we head into the winter period and those times that cause a higher level of demand on our hospital network. But does \$400,000 cut the mustard for a payroll tax advertising campaign? Of course it does not because this payroll tax cut commenced from 1 January 2019.

People do not need to apply for the payroll tax cuts; they just happen. It is an adjusted rate. People report their taxable payrolls to RevenueSA and a payroll tax liability is calculated. People do not need to say, 'I own a small business and I would like to access a lower rate if it may be available in legislation. Could I please have that?' It happens automatically. To advertise these payroll tax cuts three months after their implementation smacks of a government that clearly has some market research back that states that nobody knows what it is doing and nobody knows about individual initiatives like payroll tax.

They have chosen to spend \$400,000 on a government advertising campaign for payroll tax, which is blatantly hypocritical given what we were told by the former opposition about government advertising. Then, of course, we have the advertising that we are assured will continue, yet there are no signed agreements, for road safety campaigns with the Motor Accident Commission. Those opposite like to say that MAC was privatised; it was not.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is funny, actually. The member for Colton—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! The member for Lee will not respond to interjections. You have been doing such a wonderful job and I would wish for you to continue as you are going.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you for your timely interjection.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Wonderful audition, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He doesn't need to audition; surely he will walk straight in—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! Can we just continue with this supply debate? I am listening intently.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am not looking at you; it is just one of these three. Surely there will be room soon.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Member for Lee, no more protection.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The conjecture is that the core function of a motor accident commission was the writing of CTP insurance. Maybe it should have been called the CTP Insurance Commission. Maybe it should have been called the Making Claims Commission. Maybe it should have been the Recompense for Injuries Suffered on Roads Commission. It is not: it is called the Motor Accident Commission because its whole objective and aim is to reduce the number of motor vehicle accidents we have on our roads.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Where does the funding come from?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In fact, that's a good question that's raised, if I can respond to this untimely interjection.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! No, you cannot respond to interjections, you know that—and you shan't.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you for your magnanimity, Mr Acting Speaker. Where does the funding come from? It comes from appropriation. It comes from a government that is willing to provide funding for government advertising campaigns.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, indeed the arrangements that were put in place by the former government continued funding to the Motor Accident Commission so that it could continue spending—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: By appropriation.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Exactly—which is what I just told the chamber, thank you. It is nice to have a young Padawan over there finally learning something in this chamber. The problem is that once you wind up the Motor Accident Commission it raises the question of what happens to all the advertising campaigns it currently runs. What happens to that appropriation?

What we understand is that it is to be transferred off to the Minister for Police or, more particularly, to South Australia Police. Is this something that South Australia Police is happy with? Not quite yet because they are expected to take the money over; however, the government, via their minister, the Minister for Police, is insisting on having some control over how the police commissioner will expend those funds. More so, we have the Minister for Transport and his department also wanting to maintain some control over the advertising campaigns that are run, let alone the research activities that go to inform them.

It is important to mention those research activities because they are the ones likely first against the wall when it comes to the abolition of the Motor Accident Commission, which takes effect from 1 July this year. Those funding arrangements for those large broadscale MAC campaigns that we see—like the support, for example, that goes towards the Tour Down Under each year—are not locked in beyond the cessation of contracts, most of which end within the next 12 to 18 months.

I understand that that may be no news to some members in here. That 12 to 18 months must seem like all the time in the world, which is a little disheartening, really, when the vast majority of the South Road funding that was promised is not to be received in the next 12 to 18 months, or even 36 to 48 months. It occurs at some point allegedly, according to Simon Birmingham, in the never-never in the next 10 years.

However, those of us who are actually concerned about road safety, those of us who are actually concerned about bringing down our road toll and those of us who are very concerned about the trend we are seeing in this current year of a remarkable escalation in the road toll in South Australia do ruminate on whether this is the right move by this government, and of course it is not.

What other agency sits independent of other vested-interest agencies, like SA Police and the transport department, to come up with evidence-based policy advice to the government on how it should be investing its money, not just in advertising campaigns but in road safety measures as well? What we are going to see is either unfettered control for the police commissioner or some level of influence from the transport department. That in itself is not a good thing, but we will be losing that moderation.

That is only one of a number of agencies that are being abolished from last year's budget, and we still have to see the measures that will be rolled out in this coming budget. We do not know how much of the more than \$5 billion is going to be expended out of the provisions of this bill in meeting up those savings shortfalls that I mentioned—the \$1.263 billion of unbudgeted savings across those agencies.

We certainly do not know what further punitive measures the government is going to introduce beyond the fees and charges increases that are currently being prepared by the government, and we certainly do not know who else is going to be in the firing line. With those brief comments, I end my contribution.

Mr BROWN: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:13): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill, and I will spend my time talking about both the environment and education portfolios. On the matter of the environment portfolio, I think we have seen a very disappointing trail of poor decisions, inadequate funding and wrong-headed policy directions and legislative directions. It has been perhaps unsurprising but, nonetheless, disappointing to see. If we start with the big issue, which we have spoken about a lot today, which is—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: We saved her dolphins.

Dr CLOSE: Without any speed limit in one section in front of the speedboat club—with no speed limit whatsoever—let's see how we go with saving the dolphins, shall we? That was the Minister for Transport, in any case, and not the Minister for Environment and Water.

The River Murray, which we have canvassed extensively today and on previous occasions, merits the highest position in my speech and concern about the priorities of this government because this river system is arguably the most vulnerable environment that we are dealing with. It is certainly significantly under threat from overextraction interstate, from poor adherence to governance procedures interstate, from an unwillingness on behalf of the current commonwealth government to do anything to require additional water to come down the river, as is expected in the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, and, having had those years of inactivity, now it is also under threat from the drought.

We are approaching a time of very serious crisis for the River Murray in South Australia. We have seen this year, just recently, that the proposed initial allocation for our irrigators is 14 per cent. That is as low as it has been since the end of the Millennium Drought. That is a virtual crisis for our irrigators and a matter of enormous concern on this side of the chamber. What is this government doing, because it is hard when you are in South Australia? We have the most efficient irrigators. Our irrigators are already doing all that you could ask of them.

We are at the bottom of the river and, as was described in the royal commission, the canary in the coalmine. The state of the Murray Mouth and the Coorong is an indicator of the future state of the whole system. Given that situation, we need a South Australian government to show leadership and firmness of purpose, to adhere to the legal expectations and requirements of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and not be complicit in watering it down and not be complicit with states that do not want to send any environmental water over the border.

The drought envoy, former water minister Barnaby Joyce, belled the cat very clearly. He does not see why irrigators in New South Wales should provide any water to protect the environment in South Australia. That is what we have been dealing with—that commonwealth government and the attitude of both the New South Wales and Victorian governments—and this government thinks it is a good idea to sit down and hammer out something that they wanted all along.

Another large part of the responsibility of a minister for environment and water is the protection and the active conservation of our protected systems, our parks. Yet what I keep hearing from people within the environment department, particularly in the parks service, what I hear from people who are activists in the environment movement, who care about nature and biodiversity and who recognise that our parks system is an absolutely integral part of the maintenance of the health of all our South Australian environment, is that this minister is not really interested in parks except for Glenthorne National Park.

What I hear is that their 'vanity project', as they describe it, of Glenthorne National Park is the only area that this minister is seriously interested in. People worry about the priority for the international bird sanctuary dropping down, they worry about other metropolitan parks dropping down and they worry about the very large parks around the state that are just not as important as this little project that the minister has his name attached to.

We have talked a lot about rangers on and off and the minister will say, 'Well, the previous government did not care about rangers because there are fewer people with the ranger title and therefore that means that we were getting rid of rangers.' My understanding is that, to a large extent, there was a diversification in the titles of people involved in maintaining our protected area system and that what once might have been called a ranger was a research officer or a conservation officer, someone working on biodiversity restoration or habitat restoration.

This government wanted to go in the other direction and have more rangers. I think a lot of people genuinely welcomed that commitment. Imagine the disappointment when they looked at the budget papers and saw that there was no additional money coming into the department to pay for those rangers and that to pay for additional rangers the department was going to have to cut other activity. Imagine the concern when we start to see that rangers are being offered targeted voluntary separation packages. How could that be? How can there be a target for a ranger to leave the workplace? How can we be paying someone to stop being a ranger when we have a government that want to have more rangers?

How is it that we have people currently doing maintenance and construction work who are being told that they will not be doing that anymore but that they will get a new title, which is 'ranger'? Does that mean that they are actually a ranger, or are they still doing the maintenance and construction work? Who knows. Does the maintenance and construction work continue to happen, or does it simply not happen anymore because we now have a new title, which is 'ranger'? It is not a magic pudding.

Climate change was the area that got the biggest cut in the budget—some \$11 million coming out of climate change—at a time when we are absolutely desperate to deal not only with emissions reduction, which is not squarely the business of the environment and water department, but with adaptation. We are in a warming world. The summer that we have all just experienced—and I am not sure if it is raining yet—and this remarkable dry period that we are experiencing at present ought to alarm all of us, not just because people who live in cities and live in houses are going to have additional pressures on their electricity and their water charges, which is a very real adaptation concern, but that the environment on which we all ultimately depend is under terrible strain.

If the environment department is saying, 'Well, actually climate change doesn't matter to us; we are not interested in adaptation and mitigation strategies and we are not interested in working out how we need to manage our parks differently because they are going to be drier, because having a prescribed burn period is now getting harder and harder because the time when it is dangerous to have a fire is increasing, when the fuel load is increasing and we can't bring it down because we can't have a prescribed burn because it's too hot and too dry,' we need an area in the department that is dedicated to this work, yet this government has seen fit to slash that area.

Waste is also a very important area of concern for how we manage a more sustainable future. I support the minister in his contemplation of what we do about single-use plastic. I am looking forward to seeing what comes out of the consultation that has occurred, and I am very hopeful of being able to support his proposals. I can tell you who is not too happy at the moment about the minister's attitude to waste and that is local government, because local government has been hit with enormous charges associated with the sudden cessation of China taking our waste.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: I thought you were going to say a solid waste levy.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order, minister!

Dr CLOSE: They are now having to pay more in order to manage the waste that used to go overseas to be recycled and now cannot be. While I support the government's decision to put some money into developing the industry for additional recycling, I know that local government are feeling utterly abandoned by this government in the contemplation of the additional charges that they are

likely to have to pass on to residents to manage this issue. This government has shown absolutely no concern about it.

We have the question of reservoirs, one of the shiny policies that this government came up with. I will be asking a number of questions in estimates about how we are going with making sure that cryptosporidium is not making its way into our water supply and that we are making sure that giardia is not making its way into our water supply. I know that they have held off at the moment from allowing water-based activities.

I do not know whether they have seen the sense in not proceeding with that or if they are just still determining how they are going to sneak up on it without having the very serious water quality experts coming out and explaining just how dangerous that is without spending a huge amount of money on additional water treatment plants. We will be watching very carefully how they manage their shiny little policy. It will be very nice for people to engage in a bit of nature around reservoirs, but it will do absolutely nothing to deal with the profound difficulty and challenges we have with our biodiversity extinction crisis and climate change.

We have not heard much about marine parks for a while. It will be interesting to see whether the minister does indeed proceed to annoy every single part of the environment movement by taking on the important sanctuary zones in our marine park system. I am hopeful that he will be too wise to do that.

In relation to heritage, the last shed in the inner harbour in Port Adelaide is about to be knocked over. They have already put the chain around it and we understand from council workers that they will be moving in this week to knock it over. The minister said that it was the most difficult decision he has had to make as minister to not allow it to be maintained on the Heritage Register during the three-month window of opportunity he had to remove it after the Heritage Council said that they would regard it as being meritorious of being on the heritage list.

The reason was not that he does not believe that it is worthy of protection. He says he does and I believe him. It is because this government will not spend any money on Shed 26. This shed was always going to take some government money and some negotiation with the developers. This government is quite happy to sell heritage. They are quite happy to sell Edmund Wright House for \$6.3 million—that is excellent, pocket that money, but do not put any money into—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order!

Dr CLOSE: Exactly. You were corrected by your colleague, well done. Take the money, but do not put it into heritage in Port Adelaide. Well, I can tell you exactly what the people of Port Adelaide think about this government.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Did you fund Shed 26? Did you stump up the \$8½ million?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order!

Dr CLOSE: You need to be polite.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Deputy leader, please do not respond to interjections.

Dr CLOSE: Well, could you be a little fiercer?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Minister, please do not interrupt the deputy leader. You will have your right of reply very soon. Deputy leader.

Dr CLOSE: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. As I look around at all the issues that the people who are associated with environment and water care about, I have seen that, one by one, this government have gone counter to the responsibilities that they have to protect our environment and to prepare for the future.

Interest group by interest group has been let down by this government in the environment portfolio. One by one, it has been, 'No, we're not listening to you. No, you're wrong. No, we are cutting that. No, we know better. We know better than you do. We know better than a royal commission

about how to protect the River Murray. We are not even going to respond to the royal commission in a timely fashion, let alone acknowledge the seriousness of the criticism that was made.'

Turning to education, there is far less to talk about. Education has been awfully quiet, except for one thing and that has been the centrepiece—the move of year 7, which is the move of 12 year olds from one school to another school. Fair play—the government went to the election last time and this time saying that they would make this enormous change to move 12 year olds from one school to another school.

They won the election and have every right to do it, but, unfortunately, they did not provision to do it properly or well. So what they have to do is cobble it together, giving some additional money for the capital upgrades required in some of the schools, almost exclusively in Liberal electorates. They have changed zones overnight. They have imposed—

Mr Pederick: What about the high school in Whyalla—\$100 million.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Member for Hammond!

Dr CLOSE: They have imposed restrictions on siblings being able to attend the same school as the older child who is fortunate enough to get into a program at a school.

The Hon. R. Sanderson: You got rid of sibling rights altogether at Adelaide High in 2010.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order!

Dr CLOSE: Now it has gone for all of them, so congratulations on being part of that government. They took the money that was assigned to Building Better Schools, which was all about improving the infrastructure of our public schools to make them attractive to parents to send their kids to—what proportion we are still not told, but it is clearly a very high proportion, to reallocate to build classrooms for kids who had classrooms in schools down the road.

If you want to move 12 year olds from one school to another, fine, but pay for it. Do not take the money that was being used for Golden Grove High School for a performing arts studio and say, 'No, we are going to repurpose that, and you need to have that now for moving year 7s.' Do not take the money for the Para Hills school that is having its special programs shoved to one side to build classrooms for 12 year olds who already have classrooms down the road.

If you want to do it, do it properly because those schools deserve to look and be the best. Those schools deserve to have every dollar that was allocated to them—every dollar—spent on looking better and having more functional specialist teaching areas, not general classrooms for year 7s. There is an enormous number of transportables sitting in those schools that bothered me, that I wanted to see gone.

I was so pleased when we were given the money for Building Better Schools, the nearly \$700 million that would mean that a good portion of those transportables would finally be taken away from those schools. However, that is not going to happen anymore because those schools need those transportables in order to fit in their year 7s. This is a robbery of schools that needed and deserved upgrade money to fund an unfunded election commitment. I find that affronting.

As you go from school to school, where their capacity management plan has been put in place, where sibling rights have been taken away, where zones have suddenly been changed, where there is anxiety that zones will change in the future because no-one trusts this government on zones anymore, you will find over the next few years a growing resentment amongst the parents of South Australia about the attitude of this government to its one policy on education, which was to move where 12 year olds learn.

I want to be clear here: I am not being critical of the public servants in the department who are doing this; I know some of them. One of the leading people—I do not know, but I have heard—comes from the environment department and is an excellent public servant. I just think it is a pity that their intellect and their effort are being wasted on a project that has not been adequately thought out by the government, that has not been adequately funded by the government and that has no substantial educational value that anyone can point to.

If you want to do it, do it, fine. You took it to the election. It is hard when other states do something different. I know the cringe that we have, that we had better do what the other states are doing—fine. Do not look at the fact that in Western Australia the suspension rates for 12 year olds went up when they moved into high school. Do not look at the disengagement in our lower SES communities when you take a 12 year old from a primary school and put them in with high school kids.

Do not look at that. Just say that because other states are doing it we should do it. Okay, fine, because you won the election on it, but fund it properly and do not take the money away from schools that had expectations for what kinds of upgrades they were going to be able to have, taking it away from identified projects the school community was looking forward to.

Members interjecting:

Dr CLOSE: I do not have to convince you, and you can shout at me and you can try to undermine me, because I know what will happen: you will hear steadily how the parents in your communities feel about that, and I think you will pay the price.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (17:33): I was going to speak about something else, but—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I remind the minister we are on the Supply Bill, so he has to talk about supply.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Well, actually, that is everything. Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. In the last five years, we spent \$589 million on education infrastructure. Over the next five years, we are going to spend \$1.6 billion on education infrastructure. I think that South Australians are going to realise that this government is spending more on schools than we ever have at any time in our history. The biggest problem we will have with education infrastructure is making sure that we can deliver all the projects and help work with the commercial construction sector to gear up so that they can actually deliver the mammoth amount of money that this government has put into delivering education infrastructure.

Regardless, I rise to talk about the beautiful electorate of Schubert. We have just completed another Vintage Festival in the Barossa. Probably the most exciting time on the Barossa calendar, it comes every two years. I want to use this Supply Bill speech not only to reflect a little on the past few weeks but also to talk more broadly about the Vintage Festival as a statement of the beautiful community in the Barossa Valley.

My wife and I moved to the Barossa in 2011. It was part of a conscious decision about when and where we were going to raise our family and also about the kind of community that we wanted to live in. In trying to persuade my wife to move, we got involved in the local community and really tried to understand the beauty of the local community and the people there. As a couple who have lived in other parts of Adelaide, having moved a number of times before moving to the Barossa, what really stood out was how different this community was and how integrated and connected this community was compared to any other place in which we have lived.

There is a strong sense of community spirit that exists in the Barossa in a way that Amy and I have not experienced anywhere over our lifetime. This community spirit manifests itself in a number of different ways. It has a historical beginning in the way that the Barossa was founded by a group of Prussian settlers who were escaping persecution for their religious beliefs and who came to a land that was very different from where they had come from. Having to adapt their farming techniques to this new land meant having to work together even more fervently than they did in their previous homeland.

Mr BROWN: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Residents of the Barossa needed to work together, and they formed a very deep and abiding community connection with each other from its earliest days. Certainly from a farming perspective, people had to work together to understand how to grow crops in this new land. Their combined faith in the Lutheran church also brought them together. The church was the original

institution that drove change in the Barossa. The churches were the ones that built the schools, the churches were the ones that did the community outreach and the churches were the ones that provided those social services we now rely on the government to provide.

Because of its remoteness at that time from other parts of Adelaide, it became quite insulated but quite strong. The spirit that manifested itself at that time still pervades the region today. But today it is different. Today, we still have those formal institutions, whether they be churches or whether they be service clubs. The Barossa also shows its community spirit in a number of more informal ways, and they are the ones I would love to celebrate today.

For instance, we have just completed a vintage festival, which saw a whole series of events and individuals within the community deciding to put their hand up to help make sure that those events got off the ground. I am talking about the Vintage Festival Ball or the parade as well as the Young Ambassadors program. All these things were run by volunteers who put their heads together so that the community could have a wonderful week of activity.

We also saw, for instance, the Angaston Town Day last Sunday. Again, the Angaston Community and Business Alliance is a group of volunteers working together to put on a show to highlight the best that Angaston provides. I acknowledge people like Sarah Barrett and Steve Falland and everybody who was involved with that. They do this for the love of their community. In fact, watching everyone hanging around wanting to pitch in to pack up the rest of the day's proceedings again shows that people are not scared to roll up their sleeves and get involved, which is again a degree of community spirit that I have not experienced anywhere else.

Another example is the Barossa Swimming Club. A couple of gentlemen, Stephen Cook and Lee Docherty, came to me about three years ago now and said, 'Stephan, we want to start up a swimming club here in the Barossa for our kids. We need some help to be able to do that.' They went about a process of setting up a brand-new club from scratch that now boasts something like 40 or 50 kids swimming on a regular basis.

They compete at intrastate and regional carnivals, and really punch well above their weight. I was present this year at their presentation and saw how they not only help kids to swim but also help them grow as human beings and instil in them a sense of pride, discipline and self-worth. Again, that was off the backs of a couple of people who had an idea and worked together to set this up.

We see this with institutions like the Kind Hearted Kitchen, which again was just a bunch of people—Rachael Braunack, Ruby Stobart and a few others—who saw a need to provide pre-cooked meals to people in the community who were in need of them. They got a kitchen together, they put out the call for donations and they just got on with it. It survives today, and every so often it has a cook-up, and again they put that call out to the community to donate produce. It does not need a formal structure, and it does not need a whole heap of red tape and regulation, but what it does need are some volunteers willing to stick up their hand to help improve their local community.

It manifests itself in organisations such as the Barossa Area Fundraisers for Cancer, with Tash Goldsmith and the rest of the team over there. Again, this is just a bunch of individuals who, through tragic personal circumstance, decided that they wanted to do more to help provide transport for people to get to and from their chemotherapy sessions, as well as do some broader fundraising. They created this organisation run by volunteers who go out and raise a phenomenal amount of money for the local community.

We see it also with things like the House of Hope, which was built off the back of the church and Reverend Christine Manning. Again, it is trying to identify a need for the community to have a place for people to come and have a meal and for kids to come after school to be able to have a chat about some of the issues that are going on in their life. There is very little in the way of government involvement, except for a group of volunteers who are willing to help out.

I also want to acknowledge Kath Gribble and the work that her crew do feeding people who rock up on a weekly basis. This is again something that was just spurred out of the individual experience that Kath had with an individual man and seeing how there was a need in the community. Instead of relying on everybody else to get it done, Kath and a group of those volunteers got together and helped to provide that service on a weekly basis.

None of these things are institutions. They are groups of people who are willing to get involved. Again, one other example is that last week, on Thursday, we had our ANZAC Day services right across the community, and a lot of them were auspiced by the local RSL. In Angaston, we do not have an RSL and for about 30 years we have not had an ANZAC Day dawn service.

One local gentleman, a guy by the name of Peter Feist, decided that he wanted to see that return to the Angaston community, and without relying on anybody else he just got on and put together the service. We had the fourth year this year, which I was lucky enough to attend, and out of a town of about 2,000 people we saw close to 400 people rock up. Again, this was nothing official, nothing formal, but a guy who wanted to volunteer within his community. He was not scared to stick his own hand up, put his time in and create an event that the community has come to enjoy.

These examples speak to the kind of community spirit that exists within the Barossa, but it also manifests itself in other ways. It manifests itself when there is difficulty and tragedy. Like no other community I have been involved in, if somebody knows you are having a bit of a tough time, they will knock on your door to see if you are okay.

We have had a bit of that tragedy in the Barossa of late, with the tragic passing of a number of individuals, and we have heard stories of people checking in on others to make sure they are okay, to make sure if they have not felt like cooking dinner that one is provided for them and to be there to be able to have a chat, unannounced, and it is these people who are willing to put their hand up and say, 'I am part of this community and I am going to do what it takes to make sure we look after everybody else in it.'

What is also interesting about this is that what started off as quite a closed community of Prussian Lutheran settlers is not a community that now looks inwards. It does very much look outwards. The Barossa is a place that is growing. It is one of the few regional areas in South Australia that is growing and it is doing so off the back of its growing industries. I cannot overstate the importance of the food, wine and tourism industries to the Barossa. They provide the heartbeat that provides a very strong sense of identity.

Those food, wine and tourism businesses are entrenched in the community and volunteer culture that exists within the Barossa. We saw it on the vintage parade day when a whole host of businesses got involved in this community event. The winning float was Pindarie Wines and the amount of money that would have spent putting together their *Mad Max* float was phenomenal. I look forward to seeing that again in a couple of years' time. A business like Charlie Melton's provides the Nine Popes band every vintage festival, and he is willing to have a bit of a laugh at himself as he walks up and down the street playing his fake guitar. These are examples of how businesses in the Barossa are very much taking part in the community spirit that exists there.

As I said, the Barossa is growing. New people come to live in the Barossa all the time from all walks of life from all over the country and indeed from many parts of the world. I, myself, was one of those people who moved into the region in 2011. But instead of the new people coming into the Barossa diluting that culture and community spirit, the strength of that spirit means that when new people come into the Barossa community they are caught up in the ethos of what we are about and get involved in it. In fact, a lot of the people I have mentioned were not born in the Barossa; they are people who have bought into what it is we are about.

Our food, wine and tourism culture means that we have a very outward and internationalist outlook. We sell our wines all over the world and we have winemakers and wine marketers who spend an inordinate amount of time overseas away from their family, selling the best of what the Barossa has to offer and, again, telling that story. Because of that internationalist reach, we combine that history and strong sense of spirit with a sense of innovation and creativity that means we continue to go forward.

When new people come to the Barossa, they bring new ideas and help to continue to reinforce what it is we are about. The Barossa Vintage Festival and the Young Ambassador Program, which concluded on Saturday night, are massive examples of that. They are 11 young people who spent the last few months immersing themselves in the food, wine and tourism culture of the Barossa and its community spirit. Saturday night was their time to shine and to be thanked for all the hard work they have put in over the past number of months.

I want to thank the three winners—Melissa Helyar, Lauren Hutton, and the overall winner, Maddy Hopgood—for their efforts. They are three shining examples of what is so good about the Barossa. I have no doubt that they will be three individuals who will help to push the Barossa forward. We see former crops of young ambassadors still involved in the community—in fact, I see them dotted all over the place working for various businesses—going on to use the skills and life experience that they learnt during the Young Ambassador Program to help our region.

I say all these things by way of saying that I am extremely proud to be the member for Schubert and the person who gets to represent the Barossa Valley. It is a place that never ceases to amaze me with its ability to continue to move forward and do good things. In a world where we see rates of volunteering struggle, an increasing reliance on government to provide service and, in some quarters, a breakdown of the social fabric, it is wonderful to be part of a place where we have a recipe and a formula that encourages people to get involved, to volunteer, to put up their hand and to just get involved in their local community. While that continues to happen, I will continue to come into this place and spruik the very good work that the people of the Barossa undertake. I look forward to that continuing for many years to come.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

At 17:51 the house adjourned until Wednesday 1 May 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES**

658 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). How many targeted voluntary separation packages (TVSPs) have been offered across the public sector since 21 August 2018?

1. Which departments and agencies have they been offered in?
2. Which classification levels have these been offered?
3. What is the estimated dollar value of these offers since 21 August 2018?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Table 1 shows the number of employees for whom calculations were prepared by Shared Services SA for the purpose of agencies making an offer of a TVSP during the period 22 August 2018 to 6 March 2019, including the value of these TVSP offers.

Table 1

Agency	TVSPs offered	\$ value
Arts SA	15	\$1,510,361.45
Attorney-General's Department	72	\$6,746,384.55
Department for Child Protection	3	\$326,254.83
Department for Correctional Services	35	\$3,082,602.89
Department for Energy and Mining	16	\$1,693,259.19
Department for Environment and Water	117	\$11,591,658.92
Department for Industry and Skills	43	\$4,160,722.72
Department of Human Services	64	\$4,508,160.65
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	65	\$7,119,810.53
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	118	\$11,912,820.70
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	21	\$2,559,028.76
Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment	15	\$1,778,853.76
Department of Treasury and Finance	61	\$7,004,448.56
Environment Protection Authority	20	\$2,331,437.06
Green Industries SA	3	\$187,948.23
SA Health—Central Adelaide Local Health Network	3	\$279,167.66
SA Health—Department for Health and Wellbeing	3	\$682,740.50
SA Health—Northern Adelaide Local Health Network	1	\$147,127.62
SA Health—Women's and Children's Health Network	1	\$140,458.37
South Australian Housing Authority	65	\$6,632,106.09
TAFE SA	3	\$446,806.46
Department for Education	165	\$14,245,762.74
South Australia Police	14	\$968,754.34
Total	923	\$90,056,676.58

Note that due to a time lag from offer to separation, offers for this period will not correspond directly with acceptances for the same period. Not all TVSPs offers will be accepted by employees. Agencies will only advise Shared Services SA of offers that are accepted.

Shared Services SA have advised that the information it receives for TVSP purposes includes payroll identification and related information but not classification level. Therefore the classification level for each of these employees is not readily available.

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

659 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). How many targeted voluntary separation packages have been accepted across the public sector since the 21 August 2018?

1. What is the total estimate cost of targeted voluntary separation packages accepted since the 21 August 2018?
2. What is the department or agency, position title, and total employment cost of each position in which a targeted voluntary separation package offer was accepted?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Information on TVSPs is collected by Shared Services SA in the process of providing payroll services to agencies. Table 1 shows the number of employees who accepted the offer of a TVSP and separated for the period 22 August 2018 to 6 March 2019 and the cost of these TVSP payments.

Table 1

Agency	TVSPs accepted	\$ value
Arts SA	2	\$240,378.11
Attorney-General's Department	34	\$3,561,757.00
Department for Child Protection	2	\$288,526.83
Department for Energy and Mining	6	\$655,073.94
Department for Environment and Water	64	\$6,684,163.76
Department for Industry and Skills	26	\$2,413,338.10
Department of Human Services	15	\$1,258,987.07
Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure	46	\$5,017,291.53
Department of Primary Industries and Regions SA	37	\$3,958,413.43
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	3	\$353,087.57
Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment	1	\$205,441.11
Department of Treasury and Finance	44	\$4,749,265.60
Environment Protection Authority	2	\$108,984.09
SA Health—Central Adelaide Local Health Network	2	\$248,670.66
SA Health—Department for Health and Wellbeing	2	\$329,491.31
SA Health—Women's and Children's Health Network	1	\$136,990.37
South Australian Housing Authority	2	\$178,604.67
Department for Education	10	\$772,947.94
Total	299	\$31,161,413.09

Shared Services SA have advised that the information it receives for TVSP purposes includes payroll identification and related information but not position title nor total employment cost of each position and therefore this information is not readily available.

HOSPITAL STAFF

693 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). What were the nurse/patient ratios, both statewide and across each LHN and site, as at 31 July 2017, 31 July 2018 and 31 December 2018?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Ratios can vary between medical disciplines and between sites.

HEALTH BUDGET

697 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). What is the budget and FTE numbers for public health and clinical coordination area of the Department for Health for 2016-17, 2017-18 and 2018-19?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The net operating budget and FTE for the Public Health & Clinical Systems Directorate of the Department for Health and Wellbeing are \$47.4m (213.8 FTE) for 2016-17, \$47.3m (194.7 FTE) for 2017-18 and \$59.6m (206.5 FTE) for 2018-19 (as at February 2019)

LYMPHOEDEMA COMPRESSION GARMENT SUBSIDY

698 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). Has the Department for Health completed a draft of the business case for the Lymphoedema Compression Garment Subsidy? If so when was it completed? If not, what is the expected date of completion?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I have received a business case and it is being considered as part of the budget process.

HOSPITALS, PRIVATE PRACTICE

699 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). Will the savings targets for the Rights of Private Practice arrangements start from July this year as per the budget?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Negotiations with relevant representative bodies are ongoing. The government remains committed to achieving efficiencies outlined in the budget.

HOSPITALS, HOTEL SERVICES

700 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). With respect to the government's announcement of reform of hotel services at SA hospital sites:

- (a) How will hotel services across SA hospital sites be reformed?
- (b) Will this reform of hotel services result in any reduced services?
- (c) From what sites are the savings of \$4.5m per annum to be made?
- (d) Will any existing contracts need to be rescinded to deliver these reforms?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

(a) The new hotel services contracts apply to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Modbury Hospital, The Lyell McEwin Hospital, The Women's and Children's Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre. The new hotel services contracts for the five nominated metropolitan hospitals provide a performance based specification together with new technology that allows digital tracking of all non-clinical support tasks.

(b) No.

(c) The five nominated metropolitan sites.

(d) As a result of the open tender process there will be a shift in supplier market but all existing contracts will be honoured until their natural termination date.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

701 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). When will planning for the stage 3 redevelopment of The QEH be finalised?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Planning is expected to be complete in the second half of the year.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

702 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). What is the expected date for tender documents to be issued for the Stage 3 redevelopment of The QEH?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

It is expected that the tender process will commence in the second half of the year.

BAROSSA HOSPITAL

703 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). What is the expected date of completion of the Barossa hospital business case?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

I refer the member to the answer provided to question No. 704.

BAROSSA HOSPITAL

704 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). Who is conducting the Barossa hospital business case?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

A contract has not been awarded at this time.

MENTAL HEALTH PATIENTS

705 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). Noting that the emergency department dashboard only provides real-time and not collated/historical data, how many mental health patients waited more than 24 hours for a bed in a public hospital in each month between March 2018 and February 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The following numbers of patients waited for more than 24 hours in an emergency department in public hospitals between March 2018 and February 2019:

Month	Number of Patients
March 2018	100
April 2018	97
May 2018	89
June 2018	159

Month	Number of Patients
July 2018	125
August 2018	146
September 2018	150
October 2018	124
November 2018	167
December 2018	151
January 2019	166
February 2019	146

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

707 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). How does the promise for three older persons' mental health facilities tie in with plans for a Tier 7 facility at the Repat, and the two mental health facilities being considered under the response to the Final Report of the Oakden Report Response Plan Oversight Committee?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The services to be delivered at the Repat site forms one part of a broader plan to deliver a range of older person's mental health services across the State as outlined in The Oakden Report Response completed by the Oversight Committee.

HAMPSTEAD REHABILITATION CENTRE

711 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). Between what dates was the Ward 2A at Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre open over the past year?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Ward 2A at Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre opened on 23 July 2018 with the last patient discharged on 22 November 2018.

HOUSING TRUST

In reply to **the Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (13 February 2019).

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice—

1. As at 28 February 2019, there were 687 applications in either category 1 (17 per cent), category 2 (22 per cent) or category 3 (61 per cent) where customers had selected housing in either Port Pirie and/or Clare.

Number of applications	Time waited
155	Less than six months
125	Six to 12 months
114	12 to 24 months
293	24 months +

2. Of the 1383 total Housing Trust properties in Port Pirie, including Port Pirie South and Port Pirie West, 36 properties are currently vacant:

- one was under offer
- six were undergoing major maintenance
- ten were undergoing vacancy maintenance and
- 19 were vacant due to other reasons, including but not limited to: capital projects, sales and acquisitions, proposed sale or redevelopment, offer accepted, under assessment or undergoing an abandoned good process.