

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 15 May 2019****The SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.**The SPEAKER:** Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS****The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today the 2019 prefect group from Rostrevor College, who are guests of mine.**An honourable member:** Was that your old school, sir?**The SPEAKER:** It was.**An honourable member:** Were you a prefect, sir?**The SPEAKER:** I was.*Bills***MOTOR VEHICLES (MOTOR BIKE LICENSING) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2019.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:31): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	23
Noes	20
Majority	3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E.
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.

NOES

Szakacs, J.K.

Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

MOTOR VEHICLES (OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2019.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:37): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	23
Noes	21
Majority	2

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES

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

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

The SPEAKER: I remind members per standing order 174 that every member present in the house or its galleries when the question is again put remains and votes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the member for Lee and the Deputy Premier continue, they will be doing this outside.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH (IMMUNISATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:43): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
Noes 21
Majority 2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:48): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
Noes 21
Majority 2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**LOCAL GOVERNMENT (RATEPAYER PROTECTION AND RELATED MEASURES)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 April 2019.)

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:53): In closing the debate, the contributions made by members opposite against the ratepayer protection bill clearly reveal that they have not properly understood the provisions in it. I will address each of the ill-informed criticisms, but first I would like to refute the assertion made that the ratepayer protection bill was not informed by consultation with the local government sector. Indeed, I can inform the house that last year I visited all but one of the Local Government Association's regional forums.

I attended local government forums for Eyre Peninsula, the cities of the Iron Triangle, the Legatus Group of councils in the Mid North and Barossa region, the Murraylands and Riverland region and the Limestone Coast councils of the South-East. At every forum, I discussed with councils their priorities for local government reform and, at every forum, I actually listened to what they had to say. I did not make a set piece address and then leave, as I have noticed some opposite do when they visit regional forums.

I also had several meetings with metropolitan councils and I listened to the challenges that councils are facing. They told me that South Australian councils are well aware that the rorts and excesses that have been exposed in the past couple of years are unacceptable to the community. South Australian councils know that these rorts, committed by a minority of councils, do not meet community standards.

They are interested in meaningful reform to ensure that councils meet community expectations and standards, but they do not believe that outsourcing or, if you like, privatising council financial management to an unelected bureaucracy with a poor record of restraining price increases for utility services will remove the worst excesses of council rorts. Councils have told me that, to improve council conduct and financial management, we have to mandate greater levels of council transparency, disclosure and accountability. These measures directly impact council conduct and performance.

The provisions in the ratepayer protection bill are designed to mandate greater levels of council transparency, disclosure and accountability. The bill was designed in consultation with the local government sector. Indeed, half a dozen meetings were held with senior executives of the LGA on the bill's provisions. If you compare the draft bill that was put out for comment with the final bill, you will notice a number of changes that reflect input from the local government sector.

I now turn to the ill-informed criticisms raised by those opposite. In relation to CEO remuneration reform, in his contribution the Minister for Local Government agreed that measures designed to limit chief executive remuneration were fair enough, but he went on to criticise the absence of a provision in the bill for housing support for chief executives in regional councils. My advice to the minister is that he should make sure that his advice is up to date.

Before the bill was passed in the upper house, an amendment was moved by the Labor Party to allow a place of residence to be included in the remuneration of chief executives of councils outside the metropolitan area who have an existing residential asset. This sensible amendment was designed to avoid disadvantaging councils that have already made a significant residential investment. The amendment was made in consultation with LGA executives and regional councils. In fact, a number of district councils raised it with me.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, out of an abundance of generosity, I would like to move that the member's time be extended by a minute.

The SPEAKER: Yes. I believe that you need to suspend standing orders in order to do that. Minister for Education, I am pretty sure that the member for Light is close to the end.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The provisions in this bill give councils a greater incentive to engage with their communities and a greater ability to form their budgets while also ensuring that councils are more accountable to their communities.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes21
Noes23
Majority2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Second reading thus negatived.

Motions

CHELTENHAM PLACE

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (11:04): I move:

That this house—

- notes that Centacare's Cheltenham Place HIV service delivers important services for sufferers of HIV in South Australia, including respite, advice, social support and community outreach for this very vulnerable population;
- condemns the cruel closure of the Cheltenham Place HIV service in the 2018 budget;
- recognises Cheltenham Place's continued importance to hundreds of clients suffering from HIV/AIDS and the impact upon these clients by the removal of these services;

- (d) notes that the removal of these services will see more costs on the health system through the increased use of emergency departments and acute hospitals; and
- (e) urges the government to reverse the senseless and ill-informed axing of this important service.

In the state budget of September last year, we saw, sadly, a number of cruel and heartless cuts, closures and privatisations. One of the cruellest cuts and closures was the government pulling all funding from this HIV service provided at Cheltenham Place. This was not a service that made the front page of the paper very often. This was not a service that most South Australians even knew the location of, but it was a service that was incredibly important for people who are sufferers of HIV in this state.

This government, in a completely callous and uncaring way, cut all funding to this service in their first state budget. They did it without a plan for what was going to happen to those services. They did it without a plan for what was going to happen to those people afterwards. They just decided to strike a line through all funding being provided to that HIV service. It was cruel, it was calculated and it was designed that way because they thought that maybe people did not care about sufferers of HIV in South Australia.

Well, we do care and I was appalled by this decision we saw in the budget, not just because we know that it is going to impact sufferers of that horrible condition, not only because we know of the great work that happened there until it was closed under this government but also because we know that it was actually providing an overall benefit to the state budget and a benefit to our social services. By providing the services, providing that primary community health care, it was ultimately saving money in the long run for acute care and other social services that are now going to have to step in and provide care for those individuals.

Last year, I visited the Cheltenham Place service that, until it was closed, was in the electorate of Unley, just off Duthy Street. It was in an old building that I understand had been used many decades ago for various Housing Trust services. It was a service that was used by sufferers of HIV to get support, advice and various social services. Sadly, a number of the people they dealt with, but not everybody, were homeless or had been homeless or had housing insecurity.

We saw that service continue to improve and evolve over previous years. In the last couple of years, they had signed up to a new model of care where they were undertaking more services outside the centre and doing more clinics in people's homes to help them. It was something that was signed up to by the previous government, based on what we knew was going to be the best way of supporting people in South Australia who have that condition.

Unfortunately, despite the fact that this new contract had been entered into, despite the fact that they worked on a model of care, despite the fact that Centacare, which were providing the services, were constantly being told by the health department bureaucrats themselves that they were providing a good service, that they were delivering what they needed to and that they were meeting their benchmarks they were provided under the contract, wham, in this budget the entire funding is cut.

If you talk to Centacare, I do not think they would have been happy, but they would have been satisfied if they had lost the service but somebody else was providing it. They would have been satisfied if it was not going to be a Centacare service for people suffering with HIV but it was going to be provided by somebody else, if the government was stepping in or if something else was happening to provide care for those people. But the government decided to cut all that funding and replace it with zero. They replaced it with absolutely nothing whatsoever.

There was no plan at all for those people, just an enormous cut that affected a group of people that this government probably thought was not going to make a difference in marginal seats or a difference to whether they win the next election, so who cares? I think the people of South Australia actually do care that we have a caring society that looks after people in very vulnerable situations.

It became quite clear after the budget that the government did not even know exactly what they had cut and did not know what this service actually was, because the Liberal government described it in their budget papers as the closure and cut of a service affecting only homeless people with HIV. To be honest, that sounds pretty bad by itself, but it was a broader service than that. They

did not even know that it was a broader service. They knew nothing about it. Some Treasury official or adviser in Rob Lucas's office, or Rob Lucas himself probably, just got out the highlighter and thought, 'We don't care about this,' and decided to cut it with no plan whatsoever.

When the outrage started about the cut to this service, and when it started to be reported in the media, the health minister defended it by saying, 'Our modelling shows that this is not going to be an issue.' On the one hand, Centacare had the stats to back up the fact that the very small investment in this program was producing a much greater benefit for the health system overall. A small investment in this primary community supporting care meant fewer visits to hospitals, less demand on housing services and less demand on other community support services, so it was actually a net positive for the budget. Removing this funding is going to cost the budget more.

Then we had Stephen Wade, who is becoming noted for his complete spin in this portfolio, going out and saying, 'We have our own modelling that shows something different. We have our own modelling that shows that that is not going to be the case.' It was only through various FOIs that we were able to prove that there was no modelling whatsoever. The government does not have any modelling that disputes what Centacare had in their modelling, which is that this would actually save the budget overall. Not only is it helping people and providing care in the community but it is saving the budget overall.

The government cut funding for this program in a cruel way. They did not know what the program was. They did not know what services it provided. They did not know that the health department had been going around saying that they had been delivering on their contract, delivering on their new model of care and doing a great job. At the same time, we had the health minister saying they had different modelling, but it was actually a lie and they had no modelling whatsoever.

This is an outrageous cut in this budget. It is something that this house should condemn. It is something that this government should reverse in their budget coming up in the next month to make sure that this service is replaced by something else because we are now the only state that does not provide any service like this. We are now the only state that says that sufferers of HIV should not have a dedicated centre to help them manage what is a very complex disease.

Obviously, we have had significant advances in terms of HIV care, but that is why a new model of care was put in place to help those people because it is still a complex disease to manage. It still requires a significant number of drugs to be taken. It still requires constant management. If that does not take place, the person, who might have a range of particular issues affecting them, whether they be mental health, social or socio-economic issues, if they are not getting the support to take the medication as they need, could be in a much worse situation overall. They could be an increased burden on the health system, particularly if they are not getting this medical support.

But the cuts did not stop there. We saw the cuts happening to SHINE SA clinics as well. We saw a callous cut to SHINE SA in the budget, which has forced SHINE SA to close two vitally needed clinics in the north and south of Adelaide. The Davoren Park clinic has closed and the Noarlunga clinic has closed and, because of that, there are no sexual health services in the north or south of Adelaide. People now have to come to the city or go to Woodville to get access to those services now due to Liberal budget cuts.

We have removed HIV support and we are removing those services that are trying to prevent people from contracting sexually transmitted infections in the first place, plus we saw a very large cut to any other contractor that the government had in place in relation to sexual health services. Why did the government single out sexual health and HIV services for these cruel cuts? Why did they do it? I think it is only because they thought they could get away with it. I think it is only because they thought that South Australians would not care about these people and would not care if they did not have these supports in place.

However, ultimately, I think people do care. Ultimately, I think people want to make sure that everybody in this state is looked after and that everybody in this state gets the care they need. The Liberal Party itself is going to face the fact that, if it keeps cutting programs like this that affect people, the pressure on emergency departments is only going to grow. The more people who go to emergency departments, the greater the cost is going to be for the government overall because that is the most expensive type of care.

As Centacare's own modelling shows, from what has happened at the Cheltenham Place centre over the life of their support there over the past 20 years, they have saved the government money overall. There was a range of support services provided at Cheltenham Place, including in-home and outreach support; psychosocial rehabilitation support for recovery; resilience and, ultimately, reintegration into the community; over-the-phone counselling, advice and practical support; and group activities on site at Cheltenham Place, allowing people with shared experiences to connect with one another, gaining practical skills for reintegrating into the community.

They helped connect their clients to other support services, both internal and external to the HIV sector, supporting their clients to stay engaged with those services. At times, they offered clients short-term respite over the course of three nights, but this was not part of their core business, particularly with the updated model of care that happened recently under the previous state government. They assisted with hospital avoidance and early discharge. They estimate that they supported 10 people to leave hospital early and assisted another 37 to avoid hospital in the 2017-18 financial year.

Based on the estimates of AIHW, they were saving twice as much as it cost to run. They were saving \$800,000, whereas they had just a \$418,000 annual cost. Compare that \$418,000 with the \$23 million that this government is spending this year on interstate corporate liquidators KordaMentha. Plus, of course, compare that \$418,000 with the \$800,000 that it is going to cost to look after these people in emergency departments and hospitals due to this cut.

Cruellest of all is that not only did the government cut this funding, not only did they do so without any proper analysis or any proper assessment of whether or not this was going to be a good thing, but neither the Premier, the Treasurer, the health minister nor the minister representing the Minister for Health could even be bothered to go and visit Cheltenham Place. They cut this funding and they closed this clinic without even taking a five-minute drive to get down to Duthy Street and see the work that had been provided there for the past 20 years for sufferers of HIV, a centre that is now not going to be there at all.

It would have taken them an hour to go and visit it. They might have changed their mind or they might not have, but at least they would have had an understanding of what they were cutting and what they were doing. Minister Wade could have left his leafy tower in Hindmarsh Square and visited this service instead of cutting it without even speaking to the sufferers and the people on the front line providing this service, and I think he should stand condemned for that.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:19): The government seeks to amend the member for Kaurna's motion. I move to amend paragraphs (a) and (c) and delete paragraphs (b), (d) and (e) so that the motion reads as follows:

That this house—

- (a) notes that Centacare Catholic Family Services made a historically significant contribution to the South Australian HIV/AIDS response; and
- (b) recognises that people living with HIV, and their supporting community, continue to be able to access a comprehensive range of HIV-specific and mainstream health services.

Mr Picton: Where? Where can they do that?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Picton: That's a lie.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna will not accuse members of lying. If he did, that would be highly unparliamentary.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Speaker, I ask that you ask the member for Kaurna to withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna, please withdraw and apologise.

Mr PICTON: I will withdraw.

The SPEAKER: And apologise, please.

Mr PICTON: If I have to, I apologise.

The SPEAKER: You do not have to do anything. I think the member has apologised; we get the point.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, let's get on with it.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I accept the member for Kaurna's apology.

Mr Picton: It's rubbish.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is warned for a second and final time. I am ratcheting it up, and if he continues he will be leaving the chamber this morning.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Thank you, Speaker. The member for Kaurna has told the house that his apology is rubbish; I accept it, nonetheless.

The SPEAKER: I do not think he said that, but let's get on with it, minister.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It is important that this house, and everybody who is focused on this matter outside this house, fully understands that the member for Kaurna's accusations about the Treasurer's just taking a highlighter and crossing things out of the budget without looking, thinking or caring are completely false and deliberately misleading. His suggestions that the health minister does not care and is not interested are again completely false and misleading. Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, the amendment makes it very clear how very highly the government values this service.

The government acknowledges the important contribution of Cheltenham Place in the South Australian response to the HIV epidemic, when palliative care and respite care for people diagnosed with HIV were required because HIV was a terminal diagnosis and inevitably led to AIDS. Cheltenham Place provided individualised psychosocial rehabilitation and respite.

In 2019, South Australians living with HIV can expect to live a long and productive life because of significant advances in treatment. The treatment advances are so effective that a person living with HIV who remains on daily treatment and maintains an undetectable viral load is unable to transmit the virus to another person. It is something to celebrate when we can say that HIV rates are trending downwards across Australia.

In 2017, under the previous Labor government, SA Health commissioned a Master of Public Health student to conduct a review of sexual health programs commissioned by the department in South Australia, including comparisons with interstate and overseas jurisdictions. This review, commenced by the former Labor state government, found that respite services for people with HIV, such as Cheltenham Place, are not needed to the extent that they were in the past.

SA Health has worked with service providers to support the transition of people affected by the closure of the Centacare Individualised Support Program for People with HIV to alternative services. SA Health has not received any reports that former clients of Cheltenham Place have not been able to have their care and support needs met since the closure of the program on 1 January this year.

These people will continue to be able to access a range of services—and many already do—that support people living with HIV in the community, including the HIV Enhanced Primary Care Coordination Program at the Royal District Nursing Service, the MOSAIC Counselling and Case Management program and the HIV Women's Health Program at Relationships Australia, and the SAMESH program at SHINE SA. SA Health remains committed to providing contemporary, evidence-based models of care, support and prevention to ensure that the diverse and evolving needs of people at risk of or living with sexually transmissible infections or blood-borne viruses in this state continue to be met.

SA Health will continue to provide over \$8 million in non-government grant funding for sexually transmissible infections and blood-borne virus programs this year. So, far from the completely unfounded accusations and personal attacks from the shadow minister, the government is following in the work of our predecessors, the former Labor government, and in fact making good use of that work. There are studies that they commenced that found the services are not needed anymore to nearly the same extent that they previously were.

Mr Speaker, you would think—we would all think—that instead of attacking the Treasurer, the health minister and the government, the member for Kurna would think that it was a good thing. You would think that he could find it in his heart to actually be pleased that this service is no longer needed to the same extent that it previously was. Instead of being pleased for all South Australians and Australians, in fact, all he wants to do is use this in a political way to try to cause grief and harm and further disappointment to people. You would think that he would find it in his heart to find the good news—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: People who suffer with these diseases need as much care and support as possible. They do not need the opposition talking down their situation. As has been made very clear, an enormous amount of money is being spent in this area, and the information provided by the previous Labor government makes it very clear that not as much money is required now as was previously the case.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:26): I rise to support the original motion very clearly put forward by the member for Kurna, the shadow minister for health and wellbeing, which, in a nutshell, condemns the government's cutting of the vital program at Cheltenham Place looking after the needs of people suffering HIV. I started my nursing career in the mid-eighties, and in that period of time we looked after some of the first people who suffered this dreadful thing called AIDS.

It was a terrible disease that we knew very little about, but we knew that when they caught this disease at that time it was fatal. There was very little we could do but watch people suffer the consequences of either a secondary illness like pneumonia or just terrible wasting away. They were isolated. People were frightened to go anywhere near people who suffered from HIV, known as AIDS, and we had to wear masks and gloves. Their family members were wrapped in plastic, basically, as they tried to show love and affection. It was just dreadful.

Over the years, yes, things have changed. Thank goodness for research, for caring scientists, caring legislators and caring people in our community. Life expectancy for people with this disease has changed, but to see the government come out with this hypocrisy, the absolute nonsense they are talking about—that it is all sunshine and lollipops and that we do not need Cheltenham Place—is just mind-blowing for me. I cannot believe that this motion, put forward by Anna Tree—hang on, sorry—

Mr Picton: That's what it says.

Ms COOK: I think Anna Tree is the person who works in the office, by the looks of it. A significant part of the motion has been cut out and changes have been made that make no sense at all. I am gobsmacked. I will support vehemently the reinstatement of funding and anything we can do to get Cheltenham Place back into the health sector and the wellbeing sector to the nth degree. The government needs to reverse the cuts. We knew, when this government came in, there would be cuts. The public were not aware of all the cuts that were going to happen, but they certainly have been coming thick and fast.

This cut is particularly cruel, with Cheltenham Place being a service that provides the only residential support and respite for people living with HIV. Almost 100 people a year access Cheltenham Place. I invite the member opposite who made the contribution, representing the minister in this place, to visit and talk to the people who will suffer as a result of these services not being available. I know you get this. They will tell you that they need the services that were provided there because they are not provided anywhere else. I understand that you have been given lines

about this and I understand that you are supporting it, but I know you know, so I invite you to go and talk to them and lobby in this place on their behalf.

What Cheltenham Place does very well is support people who are suffering the consequences of their illnesses and are discharged early from hospital. People save the government money by not being in hospital any longer and by also avoiding those quick bounce-backs to hospital that happen. Most importantly, it enables people living with HIV to be with family and friends in a place that is not clinical. We know that improves wellbeing and improves outcomes.

Many of the people who use Cheltenham Place also suffer the secondary effects of this isolation and the terrible feeling people have with diseases that are unable to be effectively cured. They often have significant mental health issues through this isolation and worry. Those people are a particular cohort that needs the support of Cheltenham Place. There are also others who have drug and alcohol dependency. Of course, for people who experience homelessness and who are out on the streets after being discharged from hospital after an exacerbation of an illness, it is almost a death sentence. We cannot afford that happening to the good people in South Australia who, through no fault of their own, have this terrible illness.

Centacare is a highly professional and experienced organisation that operates Cheltenham Place. They have been making such a difference and they need to be supported to continue, not have their funding cut. The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare produced research showing that Cheltenham Place, through the work that they do, saves more than \$800,000 in the health budget. These numbers do not go down: they go up. Soon, we will be talking about saving \$1 million if we allow them to continue.

There is \$800,000 being saved and a cut of \$411,000. I am no genius when it comes to operating a credit card, let me tell you, but I can see that there is a \$400,000 difference here. I really think this makes good economic sense. Hey, I am a mad, crazy leftie and I think it makes sense, so if I think it makes sense it must. It is cruel, it is reckless and, honestly, it is a pretty stupid cut. What makes it even more devastating is that we are only just starting to get the upper hand.

Credit for the lines coming out from the government. Yes, we are making some gains here. The prep treatment in place, the prep trials, are doing a great job. This almost speaks to the complete hypocrisy of the health minister, who is cutting such a poofteenth of a nonsense of nothing out of the budget, yet he was lobbying everywhere in the prep trial. He was everywhere, and now he is nowhere to be seen because he has cut the budget and run. However, during the prep arguments that we were having when we were in government and the health minister was then the opposition spokesperson, he was all over it.

We are just starting to make inroads from the good work that happened in a bipartisan way, and now we are seeing this cut. It is disappointing and it seems that there was no consultation. The sector believe it is brutal, and they had no idea it was coming. Had the government consulted, they may well have found out what we all know: this service is vital. This service has to stay. It must be reinstated in full. It makes a tangible difference to the quality of life of people living with HIV, and their families and friends.

This government does not seem to care about queer South Australians at all. I say that for a couple of reasons. Before the election, we heard about this cut to Safe Schools, which has been an incredibly successful program. The only crime for Safe Schools was being attacked by crazies on *Sky News After Dark*. That is its only crime. It is fearmongering. Ask the young people who have participated in this program, and they will tell you it has enlightened them, supported them and kept them safe. I know that there are people on that side of the chamber who do not agree with this cut and do not agree with this program being binned. It is a vital program.

Then we have SHINE. Where do young people in Noarlunga, Davoren Park and Elizabeth go when they need to talk? Who do they go to when they need to have a conversation about sexual health? I visited one of our local high schools last year and spoke to some of the teachers. One of the biggest indicators of lack of success is a compromised sexual health education system where young people end up getting pregnant and fall out of school because they can no longer attend. They leave school, have a baby and do not get back to education. The indicator is that these people are on a spiral pathway and it is not to success. SHINE helps these people.

This government has cut the guts out of SHINE, and we have seen it disappear from Noarlunga and Davoren Park, two of the most valuable services. The government has to reverse the cuts. They are cruel, heartless and mean and they do not make sense. You do not risk an \$800,000 impact on a health budget worth billions for the sake of a \$411,000 budget saving and you definitely do not cut essential HIV services that are keeping South Australians safe.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (11:36): I thank the member for Hurtle Vale for her speech and her eloquent explanation of why this funding and support were needed, and the excellent work that was being provided. I express my disappointment at the speech we have heard today from the Minister for Energy and the amendment that has been moved by him. According to the notes he has tabled before the parliament, this amendment was drafted for him by Stephen Wade's office and his adviser in his office. The amendment deletes from the motion that there is an issue and that there is a problem with the government callously cutting this funding.

I am particularly disturbed by the speech we heard today from the minister, who said that cutting this funding was a good thing, that the government should be applauded for cutting this funding and that no-one has complained, so this is all fine. I think that is ill thought through. I think that is an uncharacteristically poor effort by this minister because this was not an issue where the government undertook significant analysis, saw that there were too many support services available and ran a comprehensive program, investigation, consultancy, study or even spent five minutes looking at this issue before deciding to cut this funding.

No-one knew about this before it popped up in the budget. The government did not even know exactly what program they were cutting, and the minister was talking in the media about analysis that was later proved not to exist. There is nothing replacing this. The government have abolished a program, a service that was needed, that was re-signed in 2015 under a new model of care to help people, and they have replaced it with nothing. They have done that without one bit of evidence—zilch—and without one bit of analysis. So, for the minister to come in here today and say that this was a good thing, that this is no longer needed, shows how out of touch this government is.

I think it is a disgrace that the government has cut this. I think it is a disgrace that the government is continuing to defend it. I think it is a disgrace that the minister's adviser—who, I have to say, is an individual I once had respect for—is now the one drafting this garbage in this parliament, saying it is a good thing that this money has been cut, saying that sufferers of HIV are not picketing at the front doors of the parliament so this is all fine. These people are just trying to make their way as best they can and if they are not getting support, if they are not getting services in the way we have provided them in the past 20 years—and every other state provides a similar service—they are not necessarily the people who are able to mount a campaign against this.

We are going to see increased health demands on our services, we are going to see increased hospital presentations, we are going to see increased demands on our homelessness services and we are going to see increased demands on our social services. That is not going to happen through a picket line: it is going to happen by an increase in those services. The minister is pretty out of touch if he thinks that is going to be the way we will find out if there is going to be an issue. The issue is that there will be a resulting increase in demand.

We have a health minister who spent his entire time as the opposition health person saying that he supported more prevention, that he supported more primary health care, but what has he done when he has come into office? He has finally got the opportunity, after the 12 years in opposition, to be in charge of the portfolio, and he is cutting those services he once trumpeted as being important, that the minister's adviser used to trumpet as being important. Now we have them cutting those services.

I am incredibly disappointed about this. The minister says this is all about playing politics; unfortunately, I have to say I do not think this is going to be a deciding matter in the election. This is a moral issue about where you stand on the issue and, even if it is not going to win you any votes, as a state we should have a government that is willing to stand up and say that the most vulnerable in our community deserve to be supported. Even if the most vulnerable in our community are not going to be the ones in target seats, we should be making sure their services are protected. I support the original motion.

Time expired.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 23
 Noes 21
 Majority 2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Amendment thus carried.

The house divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes 23
 Noes 21
 Majority 2

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion as amended thus carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today members of the Mount Barker Agricultural Bureau, who are guests of the member for Kavel.

Motions

PUBLIC EDUCATION

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:51): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the importance of delivering a world-class public education system to South Australia's primary and secondary students;
- (b) calls on the state government to set a minimum ATAR score for university entry into a Bachelor of Education; and
- (c) congratulates all South Australian teachers on their commitment and professionalism to the students of South Australia.

As we all know, teachers have a profound influence during our childhood and teenage years, the formative years of our lives. They are responsible for inspiring, guiding and above all teaching us the skills that we need to survive and thrive in the real world.

As a student, you always remember the good teachers and you also remember the not so good teachers, but for different reasons. Students need teachers who are skilled, who inspire them and are driven themselves. A wise person once told me—and research has proven this—that the level of a student's academic ability will not surpass that of their teacher's in that given year. What that basically means is that if you have a poorly performing teacher, you are going to have a poorly performing student for that period of time.

As parents, we know this to be true. In some years, your child goes to school and is inspired, and you see them going ahead in leaps and bounds. They get out of bed and they look forward to going to school. They come home excited and everything seems to be on track. Then, of course, you have other years when the complete reverse is the case: your child seems uninterested in school and uninspired.

It does not take much digging before you start talking to other parents at the school and a certain teacher's name pops up and you hear the common phrase, 'Oh, you've got that teacher this year.' Quite frankly, that is not good enough. I am a big believer that we do need workplace protections in place for teachers; however, it cannot be at the expense of student learning. Being an educator myself, I know which teachers are performing poorly and which students in those classes are not receiving the best outcome that they should be.

Principals will often talk to me, and as I was working my way through the ranks of the education profession, it was apparent that it became less and less appealing to move into the role of the principal because of the HR issues and the burden that managing poor performance put on a principal at that time. Whilst I agree and strongly state that we do need protections for teachers—a lot of my very close friends are teachers—it cannot be at the expense of what is right and what is just for students, particularly students in those classes. I often wonder whether the rights of a teacher outweigh the rights of a student.

As a former educator, I would like to say that teachers who perform poorly are overwhelmingly in the minority. Most of our teachers, certainly the ones that I worked with, are very hardworking and very conscientious and deliver amazing environments for students to thrive and grow in through their formative years. I would like to congratulate all those teachers who put in the hours and commit themselves fully to their profession and their vocation and see the results in their students. When you have been a teacher and seen the impact that you can personally have on a young person's life, you know it is an extremely rewarding yet demanding role that requires commitment and integrity.

If we want to deliver a world-class public education system right here in South Australia, there is no doubt that we need to employ teachers who are of the highest standard and who indeed are world class. I have put forward a suggestion to place a formal benchmark on that standard. In their annual report last year, the Teachers Registration Board of South Australia recorded over 35,000 registered teachers in the state of South Australia. Of those, 54 per cent are employed at a Department for Education site, whilst 27 per cent are employed at a non-government site and 19 per cent are not allocated to a site at all—they might be relief teachers or those who are entering semiretirement.

Far and away, the state government is the largest employer of teachers in South Australia. As the employer, we can exert some influence on the standards we expect our teachers to have in our public education system. If the universities will not set an admissions standard for teaching, then perhaps the state government, as the employer, can.

A recent report by the Australian Institute for Teaching and School Leadership showed that 40 per cent of teaching undergraduates scored an ATAR of below 70. A high ATAR is not the be-all and end-all, and I am the first to acknowledge it. I have seen many fine teachers who may not have attained the highest ATAR. It takes more than high academic credentials to make a great teacher, but I would also argue that you need academic knowledge as a base, and a high ATAR is an indicator that you excel in that knowledge.

As a teacher, you need to have a deep understanding of what it means to be literate. You need to be able to spell, read and communicate at the highest level. Otherwise, how are you going to teach what you yourself do not know? I am backed in this opinion by many South Australian parents. In April this year, more than 60 per cent of parents who responded to a survey by the South Australian Association of State School Organisations backed lifting the minimum ATAR to 80. Obviously, the quality of teachers is also a concern to parents.

UniSA and Flinders University are two institutions supplying the largest number of teaching graduates. However, the guaranteed entry ATAR can vary across South Australian universities. I was interested to learn, from an article in *The Advertiser*, that last year less than a third of admissions to Flinders teaching degrees were based on ATAR scores alone.

Many students are admitted by other means, either by alternative pathways or getting in via other courses, only to swap to another six months later. There is also something known as 'applicable adjustment factors', which basically means you can get extra points added on to your ATAR if you complete approved courses. I have personally heard of students with ATARs in the low 50s who have gained admission to teaching courses at South Australian universities through this alternative pathway process.

If you want to go to university and study law, science or medicine, the minimum ATAR hovers around 90 to 95. This ensures only the highest level of students will achieve a place to study in those courses—the best of the best. Why should it be any different for our teachers? I support the state government's move requiring all teaching students from this year to pass literacy and numeracy tests before graduating. This means newly registered teachers will have to demonstrate that their skills are in the top 30 per cent of the population. But I question the timing of this test. Should this test not be conducted at the beginning of the university course, not the end? If they do not pass, students have conducted a three or four-year university degree for nothing—a complete waste of time.

If universities are graduating students who are not up to scratch on literacy and numeracy, I really question why they are allowing these students into courses in the first place. For the standard of teaching as a profession to improve in the eyes of the community, we need to ensure the standard of acceptance is not just high but extremely high.

The PISA test (Programme for International Student Assessment) is a comparison of education systems across the world. Every three years it tests 15 year olds from more than 80 countries in reading, maths and science. Australia has slowly but steadily declined in all three areas across the last 15 years. Interestingly, the coordinator of this program recently said the countries that are ranked the highest 'pay more attention to how they develop and retain the best teachers'.

I recently read a UNICEF survey that said that 17 per cent of Australian secondary students leave school without achieving basic educational skill levels. That is a pretty shocking fact in this day and age. Years 11 and 12 are preparation for life outside the school system, and without these basic skills future prospects are not overly bright. It is a fact that poor education can lead to unemployment, poor health outcomes, poverty and homelessness. This is not what we want for South Australia's next generation.

I have been interested to read about Finland, where teaching is a prestigious profession equivalent to that of a doctor or lawyer. High-quality teachers are the hallmark of their education system and opinion polls regularly show that primary school teaching is one of the most sought-after careers. Their teacher preparation programs are very selective and only one out of every 10 applicants are admitted. Following a lengthy screening process, applicants are observed in a teacher-student environment and only those with a clear aptitude for teaching, in addition to a strong academic performance, are admitted.

Students must also spend a full year teaching in a teacher training school associated with their university before graduation. The average retention rate for teachers in Finland is 90 per cent, a fact that speaks volumes. This is a country that really values its teachers and puts a lot of effort into selecting the best people for the job. I read an opinion piece by Caleb Bond in *The Advertiser* earlier this year on this issue and his words really resonated with me. He wrote:

Teaching is one of the most important professions—and teachers are some of the most important people in our society. Some children would see more of their teachers than they would their parents. They shape the future of our nation and its children.

It only follows that if you have dud teachers, you'll have dud students. That leaves you with a dud workforce and a dud country...

If you cannot pass a basic literacy and numeracy test, there is no way you should be let loose in a classroom.

These people have the country's future in their hands. The least we can ask is that they are up to scratch.

I could not agree more. The foundations for learning are laid early in life. Teachers have one of the highest responsibilities in any profession: the education and guidance of our children. For the next generation of South Australians to succeed, become leaders and take our state into the future, we need to give them the highest standard of education. That education should be delivered by the highest standard of teachers. I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (12:04): I am very pleased to be able to speak on the motion brought to the house by the member for Mount Gambier and thank him for his words. I indicate that I seek to move an amendment to the motion as follows:

Delete all the words in paragraph (b) and insert:

- (b) notes that universities are increasingly moving to alternate entry pathways to the ATAR, calls on universities to continue to engage with all relevant sectors to ensure that students seeking to enrol in bachelor degrees, across all disciplines, meet the necessary standards in order to be able to succeed in their vocation.

A copy of the amendment has been supplied to the Chair, moved and seconded. I will address the amendment in a moment and my reasons for moving it, but I want to start by talking about the broad implications of the motion. The first part of the motion states:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the importance of delivering a world-class public education system to South Australia's primary and secondary students;

Every member of this House of Assembly would give that first part of the motion their absolute wholehearted endorsement. We recognise that to support the potential and the capacity of each one of the young South Australians in our schools to be their best self and to live their best life, having a world-class public education system is critical. Having a world-class education system but particularly a world-class public education system, which is there to support particularly those who need the most support but indeed all South Australians, is one of the absolutely critical mechanisms to delivering that support.

Education is the enabler that ensures that a young person is able to identify their skills and pitch towards those skills, to be able to find that thing that they are meant to spend their life doing and give them the pathway to achieving those goals. That is the South Australian public education system's goal: world-class education that supports every student to fulfil their potential. It has the endorsement of this parliament. Reinforcing that goal is appreciated, and I thank the member for Mount Gambier for bringing it to us. I will go to the third part of the motion:

- (c) congratulates all South Australian teachers on their commitment and professionalism to the students of South Australia.

I know that all our members of parliament also wholeheartedly endorse that sentiment. The shadow minister for education, when she was the minister, I as the minister now, and indeed all of us as local members of parliament, whenever we get the opportunity do thank our teachers. In the education department we have days when we celebrate the achievements of our retiring teachers and educators and other support staff, and particularly recognise those who are marking 30, 40 or 50 years in the system. That is a lifetime of contribution towards supporting young South Australians. It is an absolute calling.

We as a state would not be able to achieve the marvellous things that we have achieved in South Australia over generations without the endeavours of those teachers, supporting our young people to be all that they can be. Many of us have benefitted from it. Some, like the member for Mount Gambier, who have actually worked in our schools as teachers, are to be commended and thanked.

In relation to the purpose of the amendment to paragraph (b), I understand the spirit in which (b) was moved. I think there is a desire for us all to do what we can to ensure that our teaching workforce is held in the highest regard and has the greatest level of respect. Of course, we want to ensure that all the people going into teaching degrees, and therefore by implication working as teachers in schools, are capable of doing the job and capable of being the inspiring educators who are going to give our students the capacity and the confidence to be all they can be going forward.

The reason I have suggested this form of words is not necessarily to take away from the intent of the member for Mount Gambier but to recognise the complexity of the higher education entry system. I have sought to encapsulate what the member for Mount Gambier is seeking to do and remove the complexity, to basically say we want our universities to ensure that all of our young people who are doing their degrees, in all our courses but including teaching, are capable of succeeding in their vocations.

It is important that we recognise that fewer than half of our young people going into universities, or indeed adult re-entry students going into universities, do so with an ATAR. To all those students who are entering those pathways without an ATAR, or without using their ATAR to enter that pathway, the universities have a message from us that we are cognisant that we want them to ensure those students are going to be capable of doing it.

I will give one example of why I think it is important that we support the amendment, and I thank all members I have spoken to so far about the amendment for their willingness to take it on board. It is potentially not just to do with teaching but, as the member for Mount Gambier identified, in some of the other disciplines which have high standards in particular there are a number of programs in universities where they are now looking at, for example, taking a student who has done well at the end of stage 1 of their SACE (their year 11).

That might be through a mechanism of looking at their overall grades from their school—or some universities are looking at using the research project as an identifier, if the student has done the research project in year 11—and then offering the student a place prior to their doing their stage 2 (their year 12) on the basis that the student will undertake certain subjects, such as specialist maths in many courses, which are seen as being hard subjects to get good marks in and impacting their ATAR.

The universities want the students to do the hard subjects, the specialist maths, the physics, the chemistry and, potentially, the languages. They want them to do that. They do not want the potential risk that the student might see their ATAR score to be a disincentive to the student doing those perceived hard subjects. So the universities in these trial programs—and there are a couple of

them out there at the moment—have given that student the surety of a place in university at the end of their stage 2, as long as they pass their SACE stage 2 doing these hard subjects, giving them that opportunity and that flexibility.

I think that those sorts of trial models that the universities are looking at are worthy and should be given the freedom to continue. It may well be that in teaching, for example, where we want to ensure high standards of language teachers, where we are critically desiring maths teachers and specialist maths teachers, having a disincentive put in place is not as desirable. So what I would prefer we do, as a parliament, is identify. It is critically important for our universities to offer places to students who are capable of meeting the required benchmarks without necessarily identifying forever more what that benchmark must be.

We will continue to work with universities, and I am sure we will continue to report back to the parliament on how that goes. Of course, there are other methods that people use to get that non-ATAR method into university. A common one is that they do a year of a TAFE degree and then transition into university. Indeed, they might get into one university course and then seek to transfer courses part way through. It may well be that a student has compassionate grounds because of illness or because of being a carer and that has meant they are given some exemption to the ATAR on the way through.

Having that flexibility is meritorious, but we want to continue to ensure that our universities have the high standards and the reputation for high standards, which goes to supporting all the reputations of the degrees they offer. We are very proud, as a government and as a parliament, of our teaching workforce in South Australia. We always want to enhance the status of the workforce. We always want to enhance the quality of the work we do—every one of us—and I know that that is an ambition that is spread across the government, across the education department and across our teachers.

As the member for Mount Gambier said, our focus, our priority, our reason for being and doing what we do is to give our students and those families the best possible support. Therefore, I commend the amendment and the motion to the house.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:14): I support the original motion and also indicate the support of the opposition for the amendment. As I understand, it has been supported by the original mover. I think we are all in furious agreement about the importance of teaching, the quality of teaching and the importance therefore of teachers being well trained, well prepared and having the right disposition to be good teachers.

The ATAR is one way of determining a perhaps narrow definition of intellectual capacity. It is a somewhat blunt instrument given it is heavily dependent on scaling marks and then ranking students in any given year; nonetheless, it is an attempt to determine intellectual capability. It is absolutely true that we need the teachers of our young people to be the most competent, intellectually curious and knowledgeable people possible, particularly as we need more and more of our young people to finish school, to get all the way through, which requires very strong foundations as well as the higher order skills.

I support the amendment on the basis that it is a recognition of the truth that about half the people who start university in any given year are not using the ATAR to get through. I support having multiple pathways. It is important that we not consign young people to their future at the age of maybe 17 or 18 on the basis of a single sum mark that not only is supposed to express the last 13 years of their education but defines what they are capable of in the future.

I think it is important that universities are able to recognise that students come through different experiences; nonetheless, as the amendment articulates, we are very clear that, whatever alternative pathway is used, it is rigorous so that we are not allowing in students who are not capable of finishing the course, which is a terrible waste of time for them and a terrible expense on the public purse, but also we get the best possible quality of teachers.

I recall that when former premier Jay Weatherill was the minister for education he was very interested in Finland in particular. It has such an outstanding education system in its performance. He recognised that one of the ways Finnish teachers are supported is that they are required to have a postgraduate degree before they teach. That is not a method that we have had traditionally in

Australia, where it has tended to be a degree or a double degree—which is nonetheless pretty rigorous—but Jay Weatherill at that time, about to become premier, was very keen to see that we start introducing a requirement for a masters in South Australia.

Unfortunately, that was checked by the then federal minister. I think we first had Christopher Pyne then Simon Birmingham, both of whom refused to lift the cap on masters placements in our universities. Therefore, we were unable to guarantee that we would continue to have the supply of teachers in South Australia with the appropriate qualification to bring that in. The other approach that we took in government was to introduce scholarships for masters students so that, for currently registered teachers who did their degree some time ago or fairly recently and wanted to gain the postgraduate qualification, the department offered scholarships.

I have heard that those scholarships have been cut. If that is true, then I am disturbed that it is a step away from supporting current teachers to be as well qualified as possible. You do your degree usually when you are a relatively young person. There are some superb teachers who have had another life first and then gone to university to qualify as a teacher, but it is usually a young person. You graduate and then you enter the profession. With luck and increasingly with support, you stay a teacher for a number of decades.

Life changes. The requirements of our education system change all the time because the requirements of our society and our economy are changing. If we do not support or have the capacity to enable our teachers to go back and retrain to develop greater skills and to have an opportunity to reach that postgraduate level, we are robbing ourselves of the opportunity to have increasingly highly qualified teachers.

I am disturbed that I have heard that that is now the case, but I support both the intent and the wording of the motion and the amendment. I think that we are all united in the sense of understanding the importance of teaching in South Australia and also not wanting to trap people only by the number of the ATAR, to make sure that we get people of high intellectual capability and also high levels of personal skills.

I would add the plea that we continue to enable teachers to increase their qualifications, increase their knowledge and increase their skills and capability in teaching what is rightfully a diversifying population of students. The number of students who complete high school is creeping up. It has risen from 25 per cent to 50 per cent in a 20-year period, which is a magnificent achievement for our education system.

When I finished high school, the kids who graduated—or matriculated back then—were the ones who intended to go to university. We have now managed to break that down and we have seen that big lift from 25 per cent to 50 per cent, with more people going to university. But also you ought to be able to finish high school and also undertake vocational training, or be uncertain about what you want to do in the future, but you know that having your SACE is an important step towards whatever you choose to do.

As we have seen that increasing percentage, naturally we have seen a more diverse group of people who stay on at school. That requires extra skills from teachers. It requires better differentiation in the ways in which teaching occurs in an individual class. We want to make sure that we are training up teachers to be not only very good at the purely academic work but also very good at recognising potential that might struggle to emerge, that they are capable of stretching students who need to be stretched and supporting students who need a bit more of a hand, a bit more scaffolding, before they are able to be independent learners. All this is absolutely crucial to the future of teaching.

I conclude simply by expressing the gratitude of this side of the house, and I suspect the entire chamber, for the quality of teaching we have in South Australia. It is an incredibly difficult job. As the member for Mount Gambier pointed out, being a principal is an incredibly difficult job. We want to see more people take it up who are suited to it, who are well trained for it and who are the kinds of people, guides, mentors and teachers, our young people deserve.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:21): As the shadow minister said, we are in furious agreement on this motion and the amended motion. I think that some of my teachers would be surprised that I am

standing here today to fully endorse this motion. As some members know, I had the distinction of being expelled from two high schools, one for being a ratbag and the other for being a rebel, so this issue about ATAR scores is an important one.

Because I was expelled, my dad's dream of me being the first person in our family to go to university was in tatters. I spent 10 years labouring and then I applied to go to university. I did not have an ATAR score, or the equivalent of an ATAR score at that time, and I sat a scholastic exam for Flinders University and got in to do a science degree.

Subsequent to that, some years later, I ended up at the University of South Australia as a tutor in, of all things, sociology and social policy. In that role, I noted that some students started doing Foundational Studies as a prerequisite to get into university. These people did not have an ATAR score and some of them would not have done all that well at school, others did and others left early. There was a significant number of mature age students who undertook that Foundational Studies course. A number of them did go on to university and a number of them have been outstanding professionals.

As the Minister for Education said, when it comes to entry into university, there is complexity. People can get into university in all sorts of ways, but at the end of the day standards are incredibly important. One would hope that, during whatever course somebody does—whether it is teaching or another course—those standards and that rigour will apply for the duration of the course. So it is important that we are open to those people who do not come through the traditional, if you like, high school ATAR score approach into university.

I want to talk about regional South Australia and especially some of the more remote locations in terms of our teachers. I sat in on a class just the other day up in the APY lands where two languages were being spoken. They were great kids, great teachers and there was great input from the parents who live on the APY lands. We know that those kids, as well as kids in other remote schools, are significantly disadvantaged when it comes to educational attainment. When we look at educational attainment generally in regional South Australia compared with the metropolitan area, there is a gap. That gap can be as much as two years and, certainly, in places like the APY lands, the gap is significantly greater.

I think all kids deserve a fair go. If our kids are to get a fair go, we need to be serious about our teachers and we need to be serious about the incentives in place when people go out to work in remote locations especially. One of the issues in regional South Australia is that there is an incentive for teachers that lasts for five years—and what you generally get in regional South Australia is teachers who have come straight out of university, whose first job might well be in the country—and often they get their experience and then, when their incentive comes to an end, they leave.

There is a very significant turnover of staff. In some remote and regional schools, the turnover in one year can often be up to 30 per cent. That has an incredibly detrimental effect on the students in those particular schools. So we need to look at incentive structures to diminish that degree of turnover and that loss of experience that has been developed out in country South Australia. I think we need to have an open mind about how we approach that.

Another issue is professional development for teachers. Once again, teachers in country South Australia are disadvantaged, especially in the more remote locations. I was at the Roxby Downs school a few weeks ago and we had a discussion about this. In order for a teacher to go to Adelaide to get what might be a day course of professional development, it can sometimes mean three days out of the classroom in that school, so that has an impact. That has an impact on the other teachers because there are not the fill-in teachers readily available, as you might get in the metropolitan area. So what happens is that teachers have to back each other up, which just diffuses that teaching effort across the school.

It even happens in the more remote locations when one of the teachers goes off sick. They feel as though they have to come in because if they do not come in it puts a burden on the other teachers. If we are serious about professional development, we need to look at country South Australia and apply a different perspective from the one applied in the metropolitan area. That might well mean a fundamentally different framework when it comes to doing the right thing by teachers in

regional South Australia. If we do the right thing by teachers in regional South Australia, that is going to have a beneficial impact on students in regional South Australia.

The disadvantage is not all about remoteness and access and those issues. There are issues that run through our education system. The level of educational attainment should not be dependent on a postcode or on the thickness of a person's wallet and the capacity to pay. When it comes to public education, I have always put my money where my mouth is. I have three children who all went through public education in regional South Australia. When speaking to some people who have sent their kids to some of the really elite private boarding schools in Adelaide, I realised that I got a far better result in a whole range of ways when it came to my kids.

Public schools have the capacity to deliver fantastic outcomes and they teach all who come. Private schools, especially the elite private schools, by default are selective, but public schools are not, so we should be doing far more to back our public schools. In this country, over the years, we have ended up with a mantra of choice. We have ended up with something of a Balkanised school system that has some inherent flaws in comparison with other systems overseas.

I did not hear all of the member for Mount Gambier's speech. I am sure he might have talked about some of the overseas jurisdictions that get incredibly good results when it comes to teachers and the professionalism of teachers. The one that is mentioned in the Western world often—and he might well have mentioned it—is Finland. There is a whole raft of things that go into the Finnish system, but one of the stand-outs is respect for teachers and the requirement that they have, as a minimum, a master's degree. Kids start school later and there is also a far greater emphasis on kids being active and outside. There is a whole range of things going on within their school system that I think we should have a look at.

There are always cultural elements in different countries and they cannot all be replicated here, but I think there are a lot of things in the Finnish system that are commendable. One of the really commendable things is that educational attainment is not tied to postcodes and wealth in the way that it has become in Australia. With those few words, I will take my seat.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:31): I would like to add just a few words, as I understand that there is an agreement that we are going to move to the next motion. I want to say thank you for moving this motion and discussing the importance of teachers and the valuable role they play. I am very supportive of the amendment that is being moved as I think it will provide some of our most capable students, who are not able to enter university through the ATAR system, access either through the STAT test or through foundation courses to university or even by entry to another course and then, by excelling at a very high level, being able to cross over to the course of their choice. I think that universities need to be able to provide these options. At some stage, although we do not have the time today, I would like to provide more information in relation to this.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:32): I want to thank all members who have made a contribution to this, in particular the member for Giles, who brought back a lot of memories because my first teaching appointment was in Port Augusta. I remember graduating and driving to Port Augusta. I got out of an air-conditioned car and it was 41°. The town of Mount Gambier shuts down when it is 35°.

We had 10-year guarantees, so if you stayed in Port Augusta for 10 years you got a year off fully paid. If you stayed for eight years, you got half a year off. If you stayed for six years, you got a term off fully paid. A lot of friends of mine used that and stayed in Port Augusta. Of course, I was too clever for that. I stayed five years and went back home. There were lots of incentives around to encourage people to get into regional areas.

I want to finish on the point that the standard of teachers is the most important determinant of the success of a young person. I know teachers who could teach under a tree and their students would thrive and excel, so whilst I appreciate and welcome state money going into infrastructure, as it is badly needed in our public system, I would love to see an equal amount going into the quality of teaching, teachers and continual upskilling. If we were spending \$100 million plus on existing teachers and upskilling them, as we are in infrastructure, we would see a far greater result in terms of quality of teaching. Thank you to all those who made a contribution and I commend the amended motion to the house.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I would like to welcome year 8 students from Adelaide Botanic High, who are in the gallery today and are guests of the member for Adelaide (Minister for Child Protection). Welcome to parliament.

Motions

MOTOR NEURONE DISEASE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:35): I thank everyone in the house today who agreed to move this motion forward, because it is a very important one. I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that motor neurone disease (MND) is a complex, high-needs disease that generally has rapid onset causing significant disability;
- (b) notes that the average life expectancy from diagnosis to death with MND is only 27 months;
- (c) recognises that MND SA is the only NGO in SA providing equipment and support to more than 200 South Australians living with MND, and their family carers;
- (d) acknowledges that NDIS and My Aged Care packages often do not adequately cover the needs of people living with MND due to the rapid onset of the disease;
- (e) recognises that people with MND often die while waiting for a support package or plan to be put in place or increased; and
- (f) recognises the work MND SA do to support the South Australian MND community on a tight budget, relying on fundraising, donations and bequests.

I would like to thank the following people who have raised my awareness and knowledge of this complex and aggressive disease. These people are courageous and compassionate, and I commend them. Firstly, my King resident Chris Grigg wrote to me about this disease and his situation. He wrote:

I am a Golden Grove resident and a sufferer of MND. I am emailing you to possibly seek help in gaining funding for MND SA.

MND SA and FightMND are two completely different organizations and I do support both organizations.

MND SA survive solely on donations and fundraising so you could imagine the amount of time wasted in raising funds rather than providing support and care to MND disease sufferers and families.

I have been advised to go through my local member for help with this.

Hopefully you can help me to start putting pressure on the health minister and the state government to help with assisting MND SA.

It was Chris' letter that led me to move this motion and try to raise awareness of the people in our electorates across this house who are suffering from MND and of the great work that Motor Neurone Disease SA does, and share their need in this state for more support.

I would also like to acknowledge Brian Whittenburg and Anna Penhall, who were here this morning, who suffer from motor neurone disease. They joined us here, but they had to go home before this was read. I would like to acknowledge Geoff Thomas, MND SA chairperson, who also lost his wife, Mary, to MND. I also acknowledge another good and courageous man, Greg Downton, a local community member living with motor neurone disease, who could not be here today.

I acknowledge Garry Tidswell, a passionate King resident, who is advocating on behalf of those impacted by motor neurone disease and who currently has two friends suffering from motor neurone disease. I acknowledge Karen Percival, the Chief Executive Officer of MND SA, and the Minister for Health, who has been swift in responding to my request for more information on the current state of support for those living with motor neurone disease in South Australia and who supported my request to raise this motion in the house.

In addition, I thank my Liberal colleagues who supported my request to move this motion in the house and explore how we can provide more future support. Likewise, I thank the members for Kavel, Badcoe, Kaurna and Mount Gambier for reordering their motions today so that we can speak on this important matter.

I have been told by many people that Motor Neurone Disease SA offers important support to care for motor neurone disease sufferers, especially after diagnosis of this often terminal disease. I have been told by sufferers that after a diagnosis their whole world is turned upside down and that, without Motor Neurone Disease SA's ongoing support and care, they do not know how they and their families would have functioned or been able to move forward.

I am told by the CEO, those suffering with this disease, advocates and friends that there is limited support in South Australia for sufferers. Additionally, I have been told that there is confusion and a lack of awareness in the wider community that Motor Neurone Disease SA has little to do with Fight Motor Neurone Disease. This contributes towards a key issue for Motor Neurone Disease SA in their lack of funding.

Motor Neurone Disease SA survives on fundraising, donations and grants. As we all know, trying to fundraise and get donations is time consuming and resource intensive. For MND SA, their fundraising efforts are made harder by the general public's lack of awareness of the differences between the bodies out there raising funds. Motor Neurone Disease SA has told me that the MND associations in New South Wales, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australia all get funding from their state government, which is why they are appealing to our state government for funding support, so that MND SA can spend less time on activities trying to raise funds and more time supporting those with MND and their families, most importantly.

I would like to summarise some facts about MND in SA to help raise awareness and knowledge of the state of play in SA today. Motor Neurone Disease SA is a not-for-profit, non-government funded organisation and fundraising is its prime source of income. Its aim is to see a world free of MND, but in the meantime MND SA will continue to provide the best possible care to clients and their loved ones.

During 2017, MND SA provided care, information and support to over 200 South Australians and their families living with MND. They provided support and information for over 62 people newly diagnosed with MND and their families, provided support for the families of the 47 people registered with MND SA who passed away, had 10,458 contact points with people with MND provided 151 clients with equipment from a pool of 303 items, provided 187 information packs and held education sessions, which 528 people attended.

On Sunday 5 May, the Walk to D-Feet MND fundraiser was held at Glenelg. It is an event designed to raise awareness of MND and vital funds for MND SA so it can continue to support South Australians living with MND. Congratulations and thanks to all staff and volunteers at MND SA for organising the walk. It was certainly a job well done. Thank you to the organisers and participants who successfully raised over their target—in the end, they raised \$113,000.

A very sad fact of this disease is that there is only a 27-month life expectancy from a diagnosis of MND. Approximately one Motor Neurone Disease SA client will pass away each month due to this disease. The staff work extensively with clients who are eligible for the National Disability Insurance Scheme; however, due to the nature of MND and short life expectancy, this is often unfulfilled. Of all MND SA clients, 68 per cent are not eligible for the NDIS. Most clients not eligible for NDIS start on a My Aged Care level 2 package, which is a subsidised scheme of approximately \$15,000. This means that clients must pay towards every service they receive. This is certainly a matter I will be advocating on with federal colleagues.

Motor Neurone Disease SA assists clients throughout early diagnosis, including early referral to NDIS access, My Aged Care referrals, palliative care and completion of Companion Card applications. Average hours of support given to MND clients during their journey is equal to 63.6 hours, approximately 2.4 hours per month per person. The MND clinic at Flinders hospital only runs once a week for three hours, and there is a waiting list between clinic visits. There are a number of equipment shortages among clients: powered wheelchairs, hospital beds, specialised respiratory equipment, mobile shower commodes, tilt-in-space shower commodes and hoists.

MND SA wrote to the federal Minister for Health, the Hon. Greg Hunt MP, on 18 April this year seeking \$400,000 for essential equipment and ongoing support of \$400,000 per year over a five-year period to enable it to support clients who are ineligible for NDIS services. Importantly, MND SA is different from other MND charities such as FightMND because it is focused on helping people who are suffering. On behalf of MND SA and my King constituents, I ask all families affected by motor neurone disease to share your stories so that awareness is raised about this disease and the support needed to both find a cure and support those people diagnosed with motor neurone disease and their families.

I have said in this house before that I am personally committed to being a voice for the most vulnerable people in our community, and I am proud of our party because we are fighting to give all South Australians the best health care that they deserve. It is recognised that there is a big issue in disability care and support for Australians with motor neurone disease aged 65 years and over, and I will continue to advocate to get more support. It is not fair that for some people, due to their age, they cannot access NDIS and have to rely on aged-care services, when I was told just last week at an aged-care forum in the north that there certainly are long waiting lists.

It is not acceptable that people with complex needs who are waiting for aged-care services packages may not receive these in time. What is being made clear to me is that, until there is a cure, there is a need for care for sufferers and their families. I thank my colleagues for the opportunity today to recognise this serious and most often terminal illness. In summary, motor neurone disease is a progressive terminal neurological disease. It can strike anyone. There is no known cure and no effective treatment for MND. Each day in Australia two people die from motor neurone disease. Each day in Australia two people are diagnosed with motor neurone disease.

People with motor neurone disease progressively lose use of their limbs and ability to speak, swallow and breathe, whilst their mind and senses remain intact. The average life expectancy is 2½ years. More than 2,000 people have MND in Australia, of whom 60 per cent are male and 40 per cent are female. For every person diagnosed with motor neurone disease it is estimated that a further 14 or more members of their family and friends will live with the effect of this forever.

I am grateful to the Premier for listening to me and supporting those living with the disease and advocating for funding, and I am grateful to Karen, Chris, Greg and Garry for their brave approach, especially when they are suffering, in advocating for support on behalf of others now and in the future. MND sufferers, their families and all South Australians deserve better health care, and I hope raising awareness of motor neurone disease today together across this chamber will help us to work together across the house to gain support and ultimately a cure.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (12:49): I move to amend the motion by adding new paragraph (g) as follows:

- (g) condemns the Marshall Liberal government for not providing any ongoing funding to support MND SA, making this the only state jurisdiction in Australia not to receive ongoing taxpayer funding for the respective peak MND association.

I would like to begin by first commending the member for King for bringing this motion to the house and doing what she can to support the fantastic staff of MND SA and the many people in South Australia who are living with MND.

As the member for King mentioned, she was introduced to this terrible disease through a constituent in Golden Grove who is here today, which is fantastic. I, too, was introduced to it by a resident in the seat of Wright, Mr Greg Downton. Along the journey, I have come to know Greg and his wife, Jean, quite well. I commend the passion that both Greg and Jean have shown for making sure that those battling this terrible disease get the help they so desperately need.

I am not quite sure how I personally would respond if I were given the diagnosis that Greg and Chris were given. I think you would be forgiven if you retreated from the world to deal with it privately, but Greg and Chris have chosen to use their diagnosis to fight for more support for other people suffering from the disease, and I think that is really commendable. Jean supported Greg every step of the way, as have the family, no doubt, who have gathered around Chris through his journey. Unfortunately, Greg and Jean could not be here with us today because they are off enjoying some very well-deserved sunshine in Queensland.

Can I also recognise some other people who are here today, in particular the CEO of MND SA, Karen Percival. When I first met Karen, and after meeting Greg and Jean, I wanted to learn a bit more about MND and the effects of the disease and what I could do as a member of parliament to help people in my electorate of Wright who are suffering from it and to help the association in providing more support to those people.

I caught up with Karen, and she explained to me that she had come from a very different sector and a very different background and certainly was not moved in any way by money or anything like that to work for MND SA. She just felt like she could use her very significant skills to work with this association to achieve some good. She is a force of nature and a fantastic advocate for people suffering from MND, and it is wonderful to see her in the chamber here today.

Only a fortnight ago, on Sunday 5 May, I joined hundreds of other South Australians at the association's fundraising event, Walk to D-Feet MND, at the Glenelg foreshore. The member for Morphett was in attendance, as was the Mayor of the City of Holdfast Bay, Amanda Wilson. The association aimed to raise \$100,000 on that day but actually eclipsed that target by raising \$115,000, which is an amazing achievement. I was fortunate enough to walk with Team Greg and all his fantastic family and supporters, of which there were very many.

Fundraising events such as this are so important to MND SA because it quite literally runs on the smell of an oily rag. As the member for King pointed out in her contribution, one of the issues the association faces—and I have encountered this when I have spoken to people and encouraged them to support MND SA—is that the very successful FightMND association, which has been spearheaded by Neale Daniher, is trying to raise money to find a cure, which is a noble cause and very important; however, many people out in the community get confused between the work that MND SA does on a daily basis in supporting people who are dealing and trying to cope with the disease and the work FightMND does to find a cure.

I can tell you, Acting Deputy Speaker, as Karen has told me, that it is by no means glamorous work; indeed, it is quite regularly heartbreaking. Putting aside the obviously very tragic effects of an MND diagnosis, as felt by not just the person who receives the diagnosis but also their immediate family and friends, it has a very powerful effect upon the staff at MND SA, who of course form very close bonds with the people they support, people who come to see them in what must be some of the darkest days of their lives.

As we do not yet have a cure—hopefully, one day we will—it is, of course, a death sentence. Upon meeting such brave people as Chris and Greg Downton, the staff know that they will be supporting these people from the start of their journey to what will inevitably be a very sad conclusion. To touch upon a matter that the member for King spoke about, last week I spoke to Karen on the phone and she did not sound her normal happy self. I asked her what was wrong and she said, 'Today has not been a good day because a client or a patient we have been supporting has passed away and we were only just given notification that we managed to secure them a level 4 My Aged Care package.'

Because of the issues around how long it takes to get those packages approved, that person had passed away before they were able to actually receive any benefit from the package. Karen was upset, as you can imagine. I join with the member for King in saying that I hope whoever is successful on Saturday at the federal election makes it a priority to do something about improving the time lines around having one of those packages approved and also the amount of money in those packages. A level 4 package is only something like \$50,000, which is certainly better than nothing, but it is not enough.

I move the amendment today because MND SA currently receives no ongoing money from the state government to assist with the work they do. That work includes the support they offer to people on a daily basis and also the purchasing of equipment, which, as we know in areas like this and the NDIS, is not cheap. More funding is needed for that as well. Currently, around 68 per cent of MND SA clients are not eligible for NDIS funding and rely on the My Aged Care scheme to support them. As I said before, a level 2 package is \$15,000 worth of support per year, and that is hard enough to get, let alone getting a level 4 package, which is only \$50,000.

With the lack of funding and difficulty for patients accessing that funding, a lot of the support falls to family and, of course, to MND SA, who are trying to provide that support without any ongoing funding from this state government. For that reason, although I certainly and quite genuinely commend the member for King for trying to do something here, it is a little perplexing to have this motion talking about how wonderful the association is—which it absolutely is—and how terrible the disease is, and we all know that it would be a horrendous disease to be diagnosed with, when it really only serves to highlight that we do not have any ongoing funding for the association.

I use the opportunity that this motion presents to me today to call on the state government to provide what is, in the scheme of things, a meagre amount of money so that they can do more of the really important work they do and to make sure that whilst that very noble search for a cure goes on with Fight MND we look after people like Chris and Greg, who are dealing with the disease every day, to live dignified lives.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:57): In closing the debate, I thank the member for Wright for his contribution and for agreeing that this is certainly a terrible disease to suffer from and that we need to do more at state and federal levels to support the people who are suffering and their families and to find a cure. Therefore, I maintain my original motion.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 18
 Noes 20
 Majority 2

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Boyer, B.I.
Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.

NOES

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

Amendment thus negatived; motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 13:03 to 14:00.

Petitions

SERVICE SA MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 101 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*.

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:01): I bring up the 19th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time***PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): My question is to the Premier. Why didn't the Premier tell South Australians before the last state election that he would consider the potential privatisation of the train and tram network?

Mr Duluk: Why didn't you tell us that you wanted to close the Repat?

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call. The member for Waite is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): The temerity of those opposite knows no bounds. Did those opposite tell the people of South Australia that they had plans to privatise the lands titles office, SA Lotteries and the forests in South Australia? Not a word.

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated. There is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not even 10 seconds in, and it's all debate.

The SPEAKER: I have a point of order. It's not often that I defend the Premier. The question could arguably be seen to be a little bit provocative; it could have contained some argument. We allowed the question. I have allowed the Premier some time to get that off his chest, and now I expect him to come back to the substance of the question. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have nothing further.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has finished his answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is again to the Premier. Why won't the Premier rule out the privatisation of our train and tram network?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04): I think we have covered this in plenty of detail over the last 24 hours, but I will go through it again for those opposite who don't—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —seem to understand what we are doing in South Australia. But the reality is that those of us on this side of the house have been dissatisfied with the operation of public transport in South Australia for an extended period of time.

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

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have seen declining patronage on our public transport service in South Australia. It is not operating anywhere near optimal. In fact, it is not operating at an acceptable level whatsoever. Those opposite want to bleat. They want to talk on and on about public

transport. I still remember when I came into this parliament, sitting on the other side of this chamber, hearing time and time again from those opposite what they were going to do to improve the outcomes for public transport in South Australia. They said that they were going to electrify the Outer Harbor line. Did they do that? No. They said that they were going to electrify the Grange line. Did they do that? No. I tell you what, they started to electrify the Gawler line—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: all debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: It is for debate. The way I caught the question, it was about why the Premier may not rule out privatisation of the train and tram network. I think so far the Premier has contrasted what a former government may have done and what this government has done so I consider that germane, but I will be listening very carefully. Before I call the Premier back to his feet, I call to order the members for Badcoe, Mawson, Elizabeth and Hurtle Vale.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying to the house, we have a greater ambition for public transport in South Australia. We reject those opposite who talk about public transport but do little to deliver for the people of South Australia. It was not that long ago that those opposite talked about the electrification of the Gawler line, and again and again they postponed that project. What did we do when we came to government? We made sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that the investment the taxpayers of South Australia have made in the Gawler line electrification will be finally realised with a train which goes to Gawler. That was surely the purpose in the first place. As I was saying, we would like to see greater patronage on our public transport in South Australia. The minister has already implemented fantastic reforms, announced before the election, to establish the South Australian Public Transport Authority, which I believe—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What do you mean, when? It's coming into effect on 1 July. That is my understanding. That is exactly what is going to be happening.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have been out there. This government has been working very hard—diligently in fact—identifying best practice because, let me tell you, you can look at any other jurisdiction in Australia and the public transport system works far better than the public transport system that we inherited from those opposite. We plan to look at best practice. We plan to come back and implement best practice because we want a better public transport system in South Australia and we want better value for money for the people of South Australia.

Those opposite talk about privatisation like it is something they have never been anywhere near. They grasp privatisation at every single opportunity. In fact, when they were in power last they signed a contract with private providers for the vast majority of the public transport system in South Australia and now they come into this place and start lecturing us. Well, I tell you what, we plan to improve public transport in South Australia. And I will tell you a second thing: we won't be seeking any advice from those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call to order the leader, the deputy leader and the member for Torrens. I call to order the Minister for Innovation and Skills, the member for Morphett and the member for Colton, and the member for Heysen can pay for the sins of the member for Waite.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: —is to the Premier. How long has the Premier been aware of the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure's plans to privatise the train and tram network?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: the way in which that statement was phrased was not in accordance with standing orders. There was argument, suggestion of fact, failure to seek leave in doing so, hypothetical—all of these things.

The SPEAKER: It is a gentle breach. Would the leader like to rephrase and then I will switch to those on my right.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Happy to.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How long has the Premier been aware of the Minister for Transport's consideration of privatisation of the train and tram network?

The SPEAKER: That question is in order. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): Well, as I have outlined previously, we are looking at all options to improve the public transport outcomes for the consumers in South Australia and the taxpayers in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I am going to switch to my right. I will come back to the leader. The member for Narungga.

ILLEGAL OFFSHORE GAMBLING

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:09): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney update the house on what measures the federal government has taken to curb illegal offshore gambling?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:10): Last month, I advised the house—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that I had written to the federal minister regarding the commonwealth's intention to address illegal offshore gambling activity. This was done in light of the endorsement—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —of the National Consumer Protection Framework by all states to address online gambling. I can advise that minister Fifield has responded to my letter and outlined three important initiatives, which I will advise the house of.

Firstly, the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) has commenced work with the Communications Alliance on the replacement and registration of the new Internet Gambling Industry Code under the Interactive Gambling Act 2001. Illegal offshore wagering websites will be blocked under this code, and it is anticipated that they will be in place by the middle of the year. It is aimed that online casino services will eventually be included.

Secondly, the Interactive Gambling Amendment Act has equipped ACMA with stronger enforcement powers to tackle illegal offshore wagering. I am pleased to report that, in the first year of operation, the enhanced powers have resulted in over 60 of the most popular illegal offshore wagering sites withdrawing their operation and services from South Australia.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I raise a point of debate. The Deputy Premier asked about what she was doing, not what another government is doing.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I will be listening carefully.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I was asked to give an update—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order on the point of order. I haven't upheld the point of order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Mr Speaker, I was asked to give an update on what measures the federal government has taken to curb illegal offshore gambling.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I will be listening carefully. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The third matter in response to my letter was the implementation of the National Consumer Protection Framework, which addresses the problem and proliferation of online gambling. I have informed the house of this important online wagering reform previously, but importantly it:

- prevents payday lenders from advertising with online gambling platforms;
- imposes stricter time frames on online wagering providers to verify their customers' identity to better prevent underage persons or those who have been excluded;
- prohibits inducements so that the gambling providers will be banned from giving rewards or other benefits to open an account or successfully refer someone; and
- establishes a national self-exclusion register.

Given particularly the member for Lee's interest in advancing what we are doing to supplement that, I indicate the following:

- funding to 28 gambling health services across all South Australian regions, and 12 of those are specific to Aboriginal and culturally and linguistically diverse audiences;
- funding a 24/7 gambling helpline;
- working with gambling venues to develop targeted harm minimisation materials; and
- finally, and amazingly this did not happen until this government came in, making the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner the sole regulator for the gambling sector in this state, which has resulted in same-day barring orders, unlike the 10 days it took under the previous Labor government via the Independent Gambling Authority.

I am proud of what we have done in South Australia. I am pleased at the federal level that there have been major initiatives, including the withdrawal of some 60 of the most popular offshore online gambling sites. There is always vigilant work to be done here, particularly given the Minister for Human Services' recently published survey that this is still a minority option for gambling, but it is a significant and growing one, and we will continue to be vigilant for the same.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I welcome to parliament today year 6 students from Saint Ignatius College, who are guests of the Premier, and also year 9 students from Navigator College, Port Lincoln, who are guests of the member for Flinders. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. Outside the train and tram network, is the Premier considering any other privatisations of state government services or assets?

The SPEAKER: The question is in order. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:14): We make all our decisions in the best interests of the people of South Australia, the taxpayers of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This has been the way that we have started our time on the treasury bench, and that's the way that we will continue.

Ms Stinson: Crazy Steve's warehouse bargains.

The SPEAKER: The member is Badcoe is warned for whatever that was. The member for West Torrens has the call.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:15): My question is for the minister for industry and trade. Does the minister still hold the same concerns about the privatisation of the rail network as he expressed in his media release, dated 4 February 2016, when he was shadow transport minister?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15): Let's be very clear. This question was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated for one moment. If this sort of behaviour continues, members will be leaving the—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Humiliating the Liberals?

The SPEAKER: Yes. Members will be leaving the chamber for interjecting if this continues—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I'm trying to stop humiliating you all.

The SPEAKER: —beginning with the member for West Torrens, perhaps. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The question from the member for West Torrens was directed to the minister for industry and trade. I don't know what sort of bygone era he was harking back to.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have a Minister for Innovation and Skills, and might I say—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —what a fine job he has been doing. It is really quite an outstanding job that he has been doing. We speak as one on this side of the house. The reality is that we will look at all options that achieve two outcomes for the people of our state; one, of course—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We're really going to miss him, sir. We are going to make all our decisions based on these two criteria: (1) improving outcomes for public transport users in South Australia, and (2)—a very important caveat and one which those opposite failed to observe for a long period of time—we want value for money for the taxpayers of South Australia. Let's not forget that

the taxpayers of South Australia very significantly subsidise the public transport system in South Australia, so we need to be able to assure them that we are spending their money as well as we possibly can to achieve optimal outcomes for the service.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles and the member for Light are called to order. The member for West Torrens and then the member for Newland.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:17): That's disappointing, sir. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the minister or his agency established any unit internally to contemplate or plan the privatisation of our train and tram services?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:17): Can I set the scene of how we got here in terms of the reform agenda that we have put on the table around public transport. We have a situation in South Australia where 70 per cent of our public transport network is already franchised. Back in 2011, a contract was let that is still in place today around our bus services. At that time, one has to ask the question—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can leave for half an hour for that interjection.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In 2011, there was an opportunity to change the way our bus services were operating, to bring it back in-house, but a decision was not taken at that time to do that. In fact, the contractor was put in place back in 2011. There was also an opportunity back in 2005 to change the way that 70 per cent of our—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, minister. One moment please. The point of order is?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It's debate. The question was specifically about the establishment of any unit to contemplate or plan the privatisation of train or tram services.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it was. The point of order is for debate. In fairness to the minister, he has given notice that he is going to provide some preamble; other ministers just get on with the preamble. I will allow him some scope to do that, and then I expect him to come to the substance of the question.

An honourable member: Four minutes of preamble?

The SPEAKER: No, not four minutes of preamble.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Can I say that there is a unit within the department that already administers the 70 per cent of our public transport network services that are franchised, and that unit has existed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The opposition are incensed by the word 'franchise'. If you keep using it, you will get some back.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Since 2000, there has been a group of people within the department who have been charged with administering a contract with the private sector. That has been in place for a long period of time; it's nothing new. In 2005 and 2011, you had the opportunity to change that, and it wasn't changed. But what we have here in South Australia is a public transport network in decline, and it has been in decline—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Patronage across our network is down 500,000 people on what it was three years ago.

Ms Stinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There are 500,000 people less per year catching public transport than a year ago.

An honourable member: Fewer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sorry.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order. It had better be a good one.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: How many more minutes of scene setting in breach of standing orders must we suffer?

The SPEAKER: That is definitely a bogus point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It's debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: I remind the member for Lee that he has been named once and, if he does not immediately depart the chamber for the remainder of question time in silence, he will be named a second time.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Mr Hughes: Are we still on the preamble, though?

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned. No, we are not on the preamble anymore.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We have a situation where we have declining patronage, we have the lowest levels of patronage in the country and we have the lowest levels of integration across our network. It's interesting in regard to integration. What we have, when we announced last Friday the model for our new public transport authority, is a desire to bring these disparate parts and divisions within the department into one unit so that they can have one focus, and that is to deliver on our election commitment, which was to deliver a customer-focused public transport network.

What is interesting when it comes to better integration of services is that this isn't just something that we have been talking about since coming into government. In fact, it was in the former government's 2015 integrated land-use plan. An idea that we are trying to implement today was actually something they were supposedly talking about as far back as 2015. So it's okay for them to talk about it but it's not okay for us to talk about it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Can I also give information to the house to say that we accept we don't have the best PT system in the country or the world, so we are prepared to look at what's happening around the country and around the globe. To that end, can I tell you that when it comes to trams we are the only jurisdiction in the country that actually operates our tram network internally. In terms of train networks, Melbourne, Sydney Metro, Auckland, Wellington, Singapore, Hong Kong, London, Stockholm, Germany and the Netherlands all have models where they have private sector involvement. This isn't something to fear.

Can I reiterate to South Australians that no decisions have been made. We have just been looking at ideas. We are not scared to look at ideas because we actually want to move better, rather than just accept the gentle decline of the status quo.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the state government engaged any consultants on working on the outsourcing, lease or sale of the train or tram system in South Australia?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:23): I think I have actually made public statements about the fact that we have been taking advice and looking into models all around the globe of how public transport systems operate. No decisions have been made, but we are looking at ideas—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —because we want to see a better future for our public transport network. We are also—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: We have the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —putting our money where our mouth is when it comes to augmenting the public transport network. So we are already delivering—and Mr Speaker will be very pleased to know—on our commitment to deliver a park-and-ride at the Paradise Interchange.

Mr PICTON: Point of order: this is clearly debate. The question was specific to: 'Have any consultants been engaged?'

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I am listening attentively. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Actually, it is part of some consultation that's being undertaken in relation to the north-east planning study, which does include having a park-and-ride at Paradise. That planning study has actually been out there, and I am due to get the final completion of it very soon. The great news for those commuters who have been looking for better car parking capacity at Paradise for eight years plus—I am trying to think back to when Labor first promised it but then didn't deliver it—

The SPEAKER: As long as I can remember.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is that we have been able to put a plan out at the moment, which is going to the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —State Commission Assessment Panel, which not only delivers on our election commitment to deliver 775 car parks at Paradise—Mr Speaker, you must wait because there is more—we are actually on track to deliver 850 car parks at the Paradise park-and-ride, an extra 75 beyond—

Mr PICTON: Point of order: debate.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. I uphold the point of order, as pleasing as that information is to me. Could you please get on with the substance of the question, minister, thank you.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Certainly, sir. We have also engaged consultants around other parts of our network that need to be augmented—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —especially the announcement we made a couple of weeks ago, having secured the funds to properly deliver the Flinders Link extension of the Tonsley line out to Flinders University. Again, it was much talked about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —but there was never enough money on the table. Now it's being delivered through a commitment, with fifty-fifty funding from the federal government. It's fantastic news for the people of the southern suburbs and for the future of Flinders University and the medical precinct that exists around there.

Mr PICTON: Point of order: the minister is continuing to defy your order in regard to his debate.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister—

Mr PICTON: The question was specifically in relation to—

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I don't need an impromptu speech. I think the minister has finished his answer.

Mr Malinauskas: He hasn't answered the question.

The SPEAKER: He has.

WASTE MANAGEMENT

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on what the Marshall Liberal government is doing to increase landfill diversion in the state and the positive environmental and economic benefits that will result from these improvements?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:26): I thank the member for Newland for his question. He asks a pertinent question about a very important sector of South Australia's economy, one that we have a very good history of doing excellent things in. We have seen leadership and success in the waste management industry in South Australia extending back to the 1970s, when container deposit legislation came in, and there have been various policy reforms along the way that have kept us at the real cutting edge internationally of effective waste management.

One thing that we are very much focused on is continuing to reduce waste to landfill. We know that reducing waste to landfill has a very significant benefit economically because it creates jobs. In fact, for every 10,000 tonnes of waste that goes into landfill, two jobs are created, but for every 10,000 tonnes of waste that are recycled, re-used or composted, over nine jobs are created, so not only is it an economic driver for our economy but it is also a very responsible thing to be focusing on from an environmental point of view. We know that we will have very significant reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that come from landfill if we don't send waste to landfill in the first place.

Many members would be aware that, following the China Sword crisis unfolding early in this government's formation in 2018, we had an assistance package for the waste sector worth just over \$12 million aimed at helping businesses innovate, create jobs and, particularly, invest in new technologies that would improve South Australia's approach to waste management so that we could sort our waste in a way that resulted in more quality waste being filtered through to the recycling process and ensure that economic streams around our waste were continued.

One important thing is to make sure that we get the education right and make sure that South Australians know which bin to use. It was great to be able to work with Green Industries SA, the business unit under my portfolio, to establish the Which Bin campaign, which was launched on the weekend. This includes a website (www.whichbin.sa.gov.au), where you can go to find out just about anything. If you have any questions as to what to put in which bin, you can go onto this website and put in the question, find the item and find out whether to put it in your yellow bin, which is obviously

for recycling, your green bin for green organics, or your red and/or blue bin in South Australia for general waste.

It is a really useful resource. It is going to be backed up by an education campaign which will go out to print media, social media and TV media as well. It stars Which Bin Vin—and some people may have seen Vinnie, our awkward dad character, who educates his family about what to put in which bin. So keep an eye out for Vin. Go online, visit YouTube, the Green Industries SA website or whichbin.sa.gov.au to find out about what you should be doing regarding your recycling.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has a probity officer been appointed to monitor any process regarding the potential outsourcing, lease or sale of the train and tram network in South Australia?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: I believe that is a hypothetical question.

The SPEAKER: No, I am going to allow the question. Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:30): It is a hypothetical state of affairs, I think, Mr Speaker, but can I say this: reform is hard. Reform is difficult because in order to make change you have to upset the status quo.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: And we certainly accept—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe can leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

An honourable member: Go on, you were telling us; you were giving us a lesson, a lecture about reform.

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We took a clear commitment to the South Australian election that we were going to improve public transport services, so—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —it follows that we would look at new ideas to deliver public transport services here in South Australia. But can I reiterate that no decisions have been made. No decisions have been made in this regard, but we are looking at ideas. We have been looking at ideas for a while and we have engaged people to help us look at ideas but there is no—

Mr PICTON: Point of order: debate.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order by the member for Kaurna. Minister, please be seated for one moment while we listen to this.

Mr PICTON: There has been a substantial preamble and the question was very specific with regard to whether a probity officer has been appointed.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate. I have the point of order. Be seated. There was a significant amount of noise coming from members on my left. One member has had to depart the chamber. I will listen carefully to the minister's answer however.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Obviously the bench isn't that deep, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Let's get on with it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What we want to do is to deliver a more customer-focused public transport system. What we want to do is to deliver increased patronage, and the best way—

Mr Picton: Have you appointed a probity officer?

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question. I know it was a late night last night, but it will all be over soon. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The best way for us to deliver that is to maintain control over our public transport network. The assurance that we can give to South Australians is that we, as a government, want to be the ones that drive better outcomes in our public transport system, which is why we need to maintain control of our public transport network. It is why the model that we delivered and announced last Friday, to start on 1 July, is to have a grouped-up South Australian public transport authority that still sits inside government because we want to maintain that control over the way services have been delivered. I can only reiterate again that no decisions have been made regarding this.

Mr Picton: Have you appointed a probity officer?

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned for not only a first time but a second and final time.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I think what is being postulated is a hypothetical state of affairs that doesn't exist because no decisions have been made, but we will not resile or walk away from the fact that we know that we need to change in order to get better, and we are willing to look at new ideas to do that, and we will continue to do that. It will be South Australian communities who will be the beneficiaries when we deliver the outcomes that we want to achieve as part of our South Australian Public Transport Authority.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is growing apprenticeships and traineeships across the state?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:34): Yes, I can.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am very pleased to receive this question from the member for MacKillop, a former apprentice himself and a man who knows the value of a vocational pathway—look where it has got him. The Marshall Liberal government is working to reverse the historical decline—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —in apprenticeship and traineeship commencements. Increasing the number of apprentices and trainees is a priority for this government and vital to meeting the skills required by industry, particularly in emerging sectors, and also ensuring young people's participation in the workforce.

It was terrific to open the Careers and Employment Expo on Friday. An interesting fact about that exhibition on Friday and Saturday is that school visits were up by 30 per cent. The message is finally getting out there after this government's engagement with schools, the private sector and businesses about the importance of apprenticeships. We are seeing more and more students interested in pursuing those options and exploring more about apprenticeships, but we need to do

more. We need to do more to make sure that students and their parents know the value of apprenticeships and traineeships.

That is why I launched the state government's \$1.6 million Skilled Careers—Your Passion campaign at that event. The advertising campaign aims to change community perceptions about apprenticeships and traineeships and highlight the exciting career opportunities that can be pursued. The campaign commenced on Sunday and will run to the end of the year. The campaign includes print media, social media and outdoor visual media, such as billboards and bus shelters.

The \$1.6 million Skilled Careers—Your Passion advertising campaign is funded through the \$203 million Skilling South Australia program. That is a key part of the national partnership with the federal government. The approach is backed by targeted market research. We went out there to establish just what those barriers were for kids looking at apprenticeships and traineeships and what those barriers were for parents encouraging kids to do that and the influences in their lives, like the teachers and others they spend their school years with.

A creative agency was appointed to deliver the campaign, a local agency and South Australian business, The Sideways Theory. The campaign creatively uses local actors to construct scenarios that represent the diversity and delivery of the message. It is another way we are supporting our creative industry sector right here in South Australia. We are getting absolute value for the taxpayer from this campaign and not only—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —selling a very strong message. The Training and Skills Commission released a report just 12 months ago that 82 per cent of the top 50 occupations in South Australia will require a vocational pathway to enter. What was the legacy that was left by those opposite? A 55 per cent drop in vocational education in the last five years and a \$12 million cut in the last Labor budget to vocational education. We have a long way to go, but we have started the process and we are kicking some goals.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the minister met with any organisations that have advocated or shown an interest in owning, leasing or operating our train and tram network?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:38): There certainly haven't been formal discussions about anything, but I have met with a whole range of public transport operators who operate in various markets. I have had the opportunity to go and have a look at the rollout of Canberra Light Rail. I have had the opportunity to go and have a look at the rollout of Paramatta Light Rail. I have had the opportunity to look at the way that on-demand services are being run in New South Wales. I have also had the opportunity to look at the way that trams, buses and trains operate in Manchester as well as in London. I have met with people from right across the country and the globe in relation to how their public transport systems operate.

What is interesting is that people bring things to government all the time—for instance, a proposal for a private tram to go down to the Airport, which I know is something that was put to the former government. Again, no decisions have been made. We are going through and looking around the world for the best ideas. There are a number of them that we are looking to implement. The first of those is the trial I announced a couple of weeks ago, putting up to \$1 million aside for a demand-responsive bus trial here in South Australia, an Uber for buses, to look at a new idea and bring it here to South Australia.

We have announced that we are going to upgrade the way our bus stops look and the services we provide and the information we provide to people living with a disability to be able to help them to engage better with the public transport network. We have also been through the Future Mobility Lab funding to look at a whole variety of ways that we can potentially look at new technology into our public transport system. We aren't scared of new ideas, we aren't scared of change and we aren't scared—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right and left! The Minister for Transport has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to talk to people who, quite frankly, operate better systems than we do around the country and they do around the world. We think that is what a responsible government should be doing, not closing ourselves off and accepting this gentle decline we have seen across our public transport network. This is a key driver for the new government because we know that it is going to deliver a whole host of broader outcomes in relation to traffic congestion, in relation to amenities and in the way we deliver a proper integrated land-use plan, in a way that helps to support the population growth agenda that this government has.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: Mr Speaker, you asked the member for West Torrens to excuse himself for half an hour and he is back after 23 minutes, against standing orders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Another five minutes. The minister has the call.

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

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Innovation and Skills is called to order and warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We will continue to meet with national and global experts. In fact, can I tell you that we took one of those national experts and we brought him to run our department. His name is Tony Braxton-Smith. We stole him from New South Wales, where he was running the public transport system over there—again, one would argue, a system that has some qualities that are far superior to what we have here in Adelaide—because we want to improve public transport.

We are also in the market at the moment for the advisory board that is going to sit there to provide ongoing expertise to this new government in relation to how the South Australian Public Transport Authority is going to continue to improve services across our state.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. When did the minister first contemplate outsourcing, leasing or selling the South Australian tram and train network?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:43): I must admit that I didn't—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —write it down in my diary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, the hypocrisy here does get to me a bit because for South Australians 70 per cent of our network has been franchised for two decades. South Australians are well aware of how that system operates.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: And the answer is: if any decision is to be made, it's not going to be my decision; it's going to be cabinet's decision.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I didn't realise that the concept of cabinet government was so much of a surprise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I don't know what else is supposed to happen on a Monday morning. We certainly don't get together for the coffee. We get together to make decisions in a cabinet government on ways we can improve our state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It's a very robust system that we have put in place and it is something the Premier is to be commended for. We don't meet just once a week; we meet twice a week because we want to get the benefit of a whole cabinet working together to deliver good outcomes for the people of South Australia. It is something that the Premier should be commended for.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: When we have made more decisions, and when the advisory board to the South Australian Public Transport Authority (SAPTA) is set up, there will be processes in place for us to be able to roll out the next stages. We are also in tender at the moment for our bus services contract. We are in tender at the moment for our bus supply contract. There is a whole series of moving parts here that all need to come together under the banner of one authority to deliver a better, more integrated service that increases patronage and drives growth across our public transport network.

This sort of root-and-branch reform takes time. It means that you spend a lot of time talking, chewing the fat and talking about ideas, some of them more benign and some of them potentially more outrageous. Nevertheless, there has to be a forum for governments to have a conversation to drive reform. We are not scared to do that. We are certainly not scared to have that conversation with the South Australian people—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to take them on a journey of reform. As much as those opposite really did enjoy the status quo that saw the gentle decline of PT—in fact, you saw the gentle decline of our state across a whole variety of areas—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But we on this side of the house will continue to talk about new ideas and new things, and we are proud to do it.

FRUIT FLY

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on the successful eradication of fruit fly from the Riverland?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:47): I certainly can, and I thank the member for Hammond for his very important question. It's good news. Some people like good news; those on the other side often don't. But what I can say is that the horticulture sector here in South Australia, particularly in the Riverland, is jumping for joy.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: We have seen that the quarantine restrictions have been lifted on the recent Queensland fruit fly outbreak. That outbreak was announced on 7 December and, sadly, we had a number of extensions of that incursion in the Loxton area. We have seen Biosecurity SA, working in collaboration with industry, government and the community, doing an outstanding job—and they have done an outstanding job. There were multiple detections, and what we have seen over that time is a collaboration. Industry and government came together with an extension officer, who came as a liaison between the industry and the public, making sure that things rolled along smoothly and that the transition from the outbreak to the eradication was seamlessly implemented. And I think it was.

Along the way, we saw a zero tolerance approach being implemented. That was done as an emergency response to the outbreak. We had seen, over a number of months prior to the last season, a build-up of flies in the area. The coordinated approach has seen more than 50 staff on the ground. They collected 37,000 kilograms of fruit, as well as keeping backyards hygienically clean and going onto orchards, making sure that we did everything that we could, including putting out organic baits—by and large, the SITplus facility at Port Augusta. I thank the member for Stuart for his cooperation and help.

What I would say is that this is a first—and I pay homage to this project. For the first time, the Riverland saw a release of the sterile flies. Of the 16 million sterile flies, I was able to release two million. We have seen a successful campaign and it's been an outstanding success.

The zero tolerance, as I said, was about enforcing the fines that a previous government didn't enforce. We have enforced them. We have turned trucks around at the border, making sure that they understand that we mean business when it comes to protecting a \$1.2 billion industry here in South Australia in horticulture, making sure that we have a clean, green reputation, making sure that our fruit fly status is upheld. It is critically important now going into those protocol markets.

What I can say—the breaking news—is that the USA have just announced that they will now re-recognise our pest-free status. That is a giant leap of faith in the horticulture sector, particularly in the Riverland. That now means that what we are seeing is that growers are having more money put back into their pocket and they are not having to cold sterilise. The protocol markets domestically are now recognising the area of freedom. They, too, recognise our area of freedom. That means that the protocol markets don't have to have the fruit cold sterilised.

These are the processes that have been put in place, enacted by a government that has been serious about the eradication of fruit fly. What I can say is that fruit will now go to the US not having to be treated. It will go into the protocol markets not being treated. What that means is fresher fruit and longer shelf life. A better piece of Riverland citrus will now be on the shelves because it is fruit fly free and #RegionsMatter.

HEAVY VEHICLE INSPECTION SCHEME

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can you please update the house on the progress of awarding and implementing the second stage of the heavy vehicle inspection scheme, which we were the first state to implement in 2017. With your leave and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: As you are aware, I have been asking this question since May 2018 and, whilst the minister has been advising an update of the issue, I think it is very beneficial to give a further update to the house at this particular time and also to the industry.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:51): I thank the member for Frome for his question and agree that he has been passionately seeking updates for his community about what this means for his community. He is right that, under the former government, HVIS stage 1 was put in place, and what we are dealing with now is the second stage of that: all vehicles over 4½ tonnes will be subject to heavy vehicle inspections because we know of the increased risk that heavy vehicles have on our road network.

I can update the member that we are currently in a tender process, that the selection is down to the final two tenderers and that essentially the final stages of that tender process are being undertaken. This has taken a long time but, as I have said in this house before and will say again, we want to take a cautious approach to this because, on the one hand, we have the desire to see safer trucks on our roads, but on the other hand, especially for regional communities, what we don't want to have is a bureaucratic red tape model that keeps trucks off our roads simply because they don't have access to the inspection points that they need to have.

We are taking a cautious approach because we want to make sure that when and as this is rolled out it will be rolled out as a staged process in terms of the types of vehicles that will be progressively entered into the system so that we can gear up for that, so that we can take again a cautious, staged approach. The other thing that I can update the member on is that in relation to HVIS stage 2 there is a mandatory period of three months of notification before the new system comes into place. I am thinking especially now about farmers, grape growers and the like. In my electorate, for instance, they grab the Bedford truck out once a year and use it to cart back and forth.

There will be a staged rollout. There will be very strong and long consultation and notification, and we will be taking a cautious approach to the rollout so that what we don't see in regional areas is those not able to get their produce to market, which this government desperately wants them to do in ever-increasing quantities, simply because they cannot get access to an inspection. We are going to make sure that we do this properly. Again, the concerns that the member for Frome has reflected to me are very much at the centre of our thinking, and as I have more information as the tender stages close I will definitely make it available.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:54): My question is to the Premier in his role as the minister representing the Treasurer in this house. How will any further deregulation of shop trading hours assist Choice survey winner, South Australia's own Foodland, maintain any sort of advantage against the supermarket duopoly giants? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: Foodland operators are large employers in this state and we congratulate them on being voted the best place to shop in Australia for satisfaction, product range and customer service. The survey also found that Woolworths and Coles, which already enjoy 62 per cent of the market share, have a high rating for opening hours and have been put on notice about offering fresh and good-quality local produce.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I thank the member for Florey for her question. I thought she might have been asking me about whether or not we could approach Hollywood about a feature-length film on Muriel Matters, a topic which is very dear to her heart, but today she asks about deregulation and choice. I think it is a very important question and one that this parliament should consider very carefully.

In the lead-up to the last election we took a very clear position to the people of South Australia, advocating for further deregulation of shop trading hours in South Australia, and we did this for a very good reason. The Productivity Commission report showed that there would be a substantial uplift in the South Australian economy and of course in employment, and one of the key things that we promised in our strong plan for real change in South Australia was more jobs. That is exactly what we have been working on ever since.

The point that I would like to raise to the parliament today is this issue of city versus country with regard to deregulation. Some people are violently opposed to further deregulation. Some people

in this parliament want to disregard what the people of South Australia want. Some people in this parliament are so under the thumb of the union movement, which they once led in South Australia, that they are not prepared to listen to the people who actually elected them into this parliament.

All published polls have actually shown that 70 per cent of people in this state would like to see further deregulation of shop trading hours, and that is why I go back to this issue of regional versus metropolitan Adelaide. In regional South Australia, sir, as you would be aware, there has been deregulation of shop trading hours for decades and decades and decades. Now those opposite, some of whom finished year 9 maths at school, are arguing that somehow deregulation is a bad thing and that it would lead to businesses going out of South Australia.

Some people advocate that Foodland would be on its knees if there was further deregulation of shop trading hours in South Australia. As I point out, there are deregulated shop trading hours in regional South Australia. Do we have any situation in which Foodland is operating in the country in South Australia? Yes, we do. They operate right across regional South Australia. They operate very successfully, and they have in a fully deregulated environment for a long period of time.

Only earlier today I was speaking to my good friend the member for Hammond, and he was telling me about a new Foodland that has opened up in a deregulated environment in Murray Bridge. In fact, he was telling me what a fine store it was in Murray Bridge, a fine city in regional South Australia. So it really does, I think, put to bed this argument that somehow deregulated shop trading hours would destroy private sector businesses like Foodland in South Australia.

I won't go into a lot of detail, but I would just say that we have had many requests from Foodlands in South Australia to have further relaxation of the arrangements that are now in place where we are administering the law as it is written in South Australia. The reality is that the people of South Australia want it: Labor in South Australia are blocking it.

SHOP TRADING HOURS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:59): I have a point of clarification, Mr Speaker. Have all the requests come from one Foodland operator numerous times or numerous operators once?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:59): We have had numerous Foodland operators coming to us after we made a decision to implement the laws as they stand and say, 'Well, we didn't realise this.' This is the whole problem. The complex shop trading arrangements in South Australia were never enforced even though they were the law. They were advocated by those opposite, they were administered by those opposite, but they were never enforced.

Now, when we are enforcing the laws that we are required to in South Australia, we have the Foodlands coming to us, saying, 'We didn't actually know that's what it was about. What we would like is further relaxation of the shop trading hours.' I say to all those businesses, 'So what you're saying is that you would like to have the choice to open when you would like to, when customers want to come and purchase your products, when your employees want to come and work.' They say, 'Yes, that's what we want.' I say, 'Well, that was what we put.' That's what we put to the people of South Australia in the lead-up to the election. We argued for further deregulation of shop trading hours—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and that's what the people of South Australia voted for. Those opposite say that, no, that's not what they voted for. They can take a look at multiple polls, run by independent pollsters in South Australia and nationally, looking at what the consumers in South Australia want. Some opposite say that this would be a disaster because young people need to spend time with their families; they need to stay in with their families on Sunday mornings.

Sir, I can tell you that I have a young family, people of working age who would love some working hours on a Sunday morning. I can guarantee you that they don't get up out of bed at 7 o'clock on a Sunday morning to spend time with their dad. They would get out of bed at 7 o'clock to go to work and earn money, but that isn't available to them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That isn't available because those opposite think that they know how people should operate in South Australia. Well, we don't. We want to give much greater flexibility, much greater choice, to the people of this state.

NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY ONLINE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Education. Does the minister accept responsibility for the distress caused to students yesterday during the NAPLAN Online disruption?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:01): I thank the member for the question, although I am disappointed in the way that she has phrased it because, of course, the government is progressing the NAPLAN Online rollout to the timetable set when the member for Port Adelaide was the minister for education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The rollout of NAPLAN Online, as set to start last year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would like to hear this answer.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —which we did with 140 schools, continued this year with 500 schools. The plan set by the member for Port Adelaide was that, in 2020—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader, please!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —all our schools will be on NAPLAN Online. A series of issues happened yesterday, which I am very happy to provide some information to the house about. In moving to NAPLAN Online, it is important to note that there are reasons we are doing so. This is a more responsive test. This is a test that, when it is fully rolled out, will enable the provision of answers and the provision of results to teachers and parents more quickly, which is incredibly beneficial to the outcomes for students.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, deputy leader and member for West Torrens!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: What happened yesterday at a number of schools were minor inconveniences. What happened at some schools were major inconveniences. Backup plans were put in place. We had significant technical support on hand to handle calls and to assist schools that had errors. Some of those were able to be resolved within a matter of minutes. Some of them, indeed three schools yesterday, had to go to the backup, which was the paper and pen tests as per the protocols put in place by the national body, as per the state's rollout.

There are significant benefits to NAPLAN Online as opposed to the paper and pen test. I am confident that the tens of thousands of students who undertook their writing test yesterday and were able to successfully complete their writing test yesterday had a better experience than those who were doing the paper and pen test. We know that it's very unfortunate for those who had a disruption, and we are asking very serious questions about how that took place. It is very disappointing.

The member for Port Adelaide casts this in a catastrophic light that I think is increasing the stress. But it is important to note that the whole idea that NAPLAN is a high-stakes test is something that needs to be dispelled. NAPLAN is there as a check on the individual—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy leader!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —performance and academic development of a student. It was worth noting. I have come to understand that the Facebook page called Mouths of Mums is an incredibly important resource for this. Statements on that page are from parents talking about how they have presented their NAPLAN tests to their children. An example is, 'My kid is fine; I haven't made a big deal out of it, so he's not fussed about it.' Another example is, 'We have never made a big deal about it so there's never been an issue yet with any of my kids.'

It is important that, as kids are undergoing their NAPLAN tests, we do not set this up as a high-stakes test but as a check on how they are going. In that context, it is important that we do not want to inconvenience our schools nor our students as they do that. But if there have been examples where students have had an interruption to the way they are doing their tests, the idea that it is the end of the world, that it is as catastrophic as the member for Port Adelaide is suggesting, is in fact doing the opposite of what she always argued as a minister. It is in fact suggesting that it's a higher stakes test than it is. It is not a high-stakes test: it is a diagnostic check on how students are going, and those students should not be stressed because it is not a high-stakes test.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: if the minister is quoting directly from a document, I would ask that he table it.

The SPEAKER: The document (a) it was not public and (b) I was looking astutely, member for West Torrens, because I anticipated this point of order, and it appeared that the Minister for Education was quoting off some notes, which I believe he has in his hand.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I can clarify, sir. These are notes that I wrote having had a look at the website in question. I am happy to table them for the assistance of the Member for West Torrens.

The SPEAKER: Please table them, thank you.

Grievance Debate

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:06): I rise to speak about the cruel, money-grabbing plans of those opposite to privatise public transport, to sell off our trains and trams—trains and trams that South Australians rely on day in, day out. That privatisation will absolutely lead to higher ticket costs, fewer reliable services and chaos for the people of South Australia.

Higher costs and poorer services are outcomes that utterly fly in the face of their oh so big pre-election promises of lower costs and better services—pre-election promises that, funnily enough, did not outline the particular new horror that this government is about to unleash on South Australians, a horror that also comes on the back of the ever so flippant and careless Minister for Transport and Infrastructure's \$46 million in cuts to public transport, cuts that hurt people, cuts that mean it is harder for people to get to work, to get to study, to visit friends and to get to appointments. They are cuts that hit those who most rely on public transport and cuts that devastate those without the luxury of other transport options.

These cuts and privatisation speak to what this government is about, which is not what the glib little election slogans promised but, rather, an agenda that is all about making a buck on the backs of people they should support. These cuts and privatisation also speak to what their Liberal mates in Canberra are about; what they are about, who they are focused on and who they care about certainly does not include the people of Boothby who rely on public transport.

Those good, hardworking South Australians who use the Seaford, Belair or Tonsley lines or the tram, who live in Boothby, who take millions of trips on these lines each year to go out about their business, to go to work—without penalty rates, if the Liberals have their way—have been burdened with the Liberal member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, who is a champion of privatisation.

In federal parliament, just last year Nicolle Flint said that when governments participate in markets, they crowd out private sector businesses. She said that individuals and companies, not government, are best placed to deliver goods and products. Wow! Well, thank you, Nicolle, for letting the people of Boothby know that you will put the interests of the big end of town—big businesses—ahead of the people of Boothby.

The interests of people, Nicolle, should always come before private profit making. But did we expect anything more from the woman who has voted multiple times against the interests of the people of Boothby, eight times against penalty rates and 20 times against the banking royal commission? No wonder we saw Nicolle sprint from the media yesterday. There are so many questions that she does not want to answer and so much damning evidence of her disregard for the people of Boothby and their interests.

When Nicolle Flint should have been thinking about what her vote against restoring penalty rates would mean for the many hospitality and retail workers in Boothby serving her coffee and helping her to shop, she was thinking about her mates and plotting to bring down her leader. We have seen Nicolle Flint sprint before yesterday's dash away from the media. Just a few short months ago, she ran to sign a petition to bring down her leader and install her ultraconservative mate Dutton in the top job. Nicolle fights for Dutton and Dutton absolutely loves cutting jobs in Home Affairs and whatever else he can get his hands on.

Nicolle Flint has some questions to answer before Saturday's election that she really should not run away from. Given her stance as a privatisation champion, I think we can suspect what the answers will be, but Nicolle really should let the people of Boothby know whether she supports this government's plans to sell off the trains and trams used by hardworking Boothby people. Given her passion for privatisation, she might like to answer some other questions before Saturday about what else in Boothby she wants privatised.

Do the people of Boothby need to bolt down the Flinders Medical Centre, Belair National Park, Warradale Barracks or Centrelink and Medicare facilities at Marion before Nicolle Flint slams up—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HILDYARD: —a For Sale sign or, as—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite, be quiet.

Ms HILDYARD: —she says in her own words—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HILDYARD: —acts to get those public assets into the hands of the companies that she says are so much better at service delivery. You can run, Nicolle, but your ultraconservative passion for cuts and privatisation will catch up with you.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION SERVICES

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:11): I rise today to acknowledge the ANZAC Day services I was humbled to attend to represent the people living in King. This year, when I attended the services I felt very emotional, and other community members have told me since that they experienced the same strong emotions, emotions we now can feel from our position of peace, comfort and privilege as a result of the sacrifices made by others from our families and communities.

Many people have told me that their family members were never the same on their return from service and that this impacted their own childhoods and lives. For me, ANZAC Day is about the supreme sacrifice that so many people have made and continue to make. Our own life is the most precious gift we have, and to risk that, for whatever reason, is a sacrifice that demands respect.

The local ANZAC services I attended were spread across the City of Playford, the City of Salisbury and the City of Tea Tree Gully and each was as moving as the next. One of the special things I have noticed in the past few years when attending these services locally is the increased number of people attending, the number of children actively involved in the services, as well as the growing number of wreaths being laid.

The first service I attended was at Golden Grove Primary School. HB23 presented a wonderful ANZAC Day ceremony on 5 April. The catafalque party's presence captured the students' attention. Mr Rick Baker proudly spoke about his great uncle, Thomas Baker, who served in World War II as a flying ace and was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross. Vietnam veteran Mr Michael Sherlock presented Sophie with a Perseverance on the Home Front medallion in recognition of her bravery while her dad has been on deployment for the past five months.

Harry stood proudly and recited the *Ode of Remembrance*. Defence students, Daniel, Liam, Jemima and Kaitlin, each laid a wreath, as did the member for Florey and myself. Musician Isaac White played the *Last Post* and *Rouse* on his bugle and our Primary and Senior Voices sang a beautiful rendition of *The Green and the Gold*.

At the City of Playford overnight vigil, I was impressed once again by the local service groups, including the Australian Navy Cadets, Ridley District Scouts, St John Cadets and Playford District Girl Guides, who took part in the Cross of Remembrance Memorial at Smithfield throughout the evening until the dawn service. I love seeing children being involved and having the opportunity to learn about their family members and connecting with the wider community. They also learn about other people's lives, not just about the military but their own family history, the impact of war, and how others have made and continue to make sacrifices for us to have the peace and harmony that we have today.

At the well-attended Tea Tree Gully RSL dawn service, I counted roughly 50 wreaths being laid, including the beautiful wreath of fresh flowers I laid on behalf of King constituents. I thank Hilltop Fresh Flowers for the very special wreath created for this important service and for the services at One Tree Hill and Salisbury. I also thank the Golden Grove Football Club junior members, the Golden Grove High School and the Greenwith Scouts for all laying a wreath.

At the Tea Tree Gully service, RSL president Bill Bates made a very moving speech and read a poem, which made me cry. An excerpt from Bill's poem is, as follows:

I've travelled down some lonely roads,
Both crooked tracks and straight.
An' I've learned life's noblest creed,
Summed up in one word ...'Mate'.

I'm thinking back across the years...
An' this word sticks between me ears...

Me mind goes back to '42,
To slavery and 'ate,
When man's one chance to stay alive
Depended on 'is Mate.

With bamboo for a billy-can
An' bamboo for a plate.
A bamboo paradise for bugs
Was bed for me and 'Mate'.

You'd slip and slither through the mud
And curse your rotten fate,
But then you'd 'ear a quiet word:
'Don't drop your bundle Mate.'

An' so to all that ask me why
We keep these special dates,
Like 'Anzac Day' ...
I answer: 'WHY??!—We're thinking of our MATES.'

An' when I've left the driver's seat,
An' handed in me plates,
I'll tell ol' Peter at the door,
'I've come to join me Mates.'

From Tea Tree Gully, I attended a lovely service at the Ferns Lifestyle Village at Salisbury East, followed by a delicious breakfast and fellowship in the hall. I commend the residents who decorated the hall, which included a lovely wall of knitted poppies.

The King electorate was also represented at the One Tree Hill dawn service, and I thank the One Tree Hill Progress Association for all their efforts to make this possible. I thank the City of Salisbury and the Salisbury RSL for putting on their annual service.

APAP, MR G.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:16): Many were saddened to hear on 3 May of the death of George Apap, the former secretary of the Storemen and Packers' Union, South Australia Branch. George was born on 10 June 1939 in Malta, the son of Louis Apap, a fodder store worker, and Josephine, nee Camillero. The website Labour Australia tells us that George was educated at Gharb Gozo public school before arriving in Australia in August 1953.

He began work on the Melbourne wharves for ANL aged 20. As a job delegate in the 1960s, he refused, for safety reasons, to allow a demonstration of the first 20-tonne crane introduced to the Melbourne docks. It seems George was a born activist, and in the late 1950s he organised weekly Melbourne strikes, prompted by the refusal of a company to pay a union levy. In 1967, after exhaust systems were upgraded, he led the campaign against ANL's attempt to get rid of the 'puffer man', where ships' holds were tested for car and truck fumes. George addressed workers on safety aspects, resulting in a strike which won the case.

He remained an active union organiser for the Victorian Storemen and Packers' Union until 1973, when he was sent to South Australia by the union's national executive. On his arrival, he started the May Day Committee with Ron Barclay, with the first march taking place in 1974. He was also instrumental in the establishment of the Semaphore Workers Club. George reviewed the SA branch's operations and resolved its financial problems. He then stood for the position of secretary and won with 84 per cent of the vote.

In 1974, George campaigned for a 35-hour week at the then Adelaide Oil Refinery, Port Stanvac. The ensuing strike lasted 3½ weeks. South Australia ran out of fuel and George required a 24-hour police guard. The dispute was eventually won, though, seeing Port Stanvac workers become the first group to get the 35-hour week. In 1976, he led a wool stores dispute that ran for six weeks with a 24-hour picket for the duration of the dispute.

George's time as secretary also included a titanic struggle against the Shop Assistants Union to gain membership coverage in the retail warehouses of Coles and Woolworths. The Storemen and Packers' Union involvement led to a situation where the wages of workers in warehouses were higher than those of the workers in the retail shops at the time.

George was a great champion for his union members, and he increased branch membership from 1,200 to 3,000 in 18 months and eliminated a starting debt of \$12,000 while at the same time increasing assets to about \$1 million at the time of his departure some 20 years later.

Internationally, George also worked to stop injustice. In August 1975, he was a member of a five-person ACTU delegation to Athens to assist in rebuilding Greek trade unions after their

disbandment. During his stay in Athens, he marched with 500,000 workers against Franco's political killings in Spain and, no doubt because of this experience and others, he joined the Peace Committee in the early 1980s.

In 1985, he went to the Philippines for a visit to trade unions and donated money and organised Australian support for the Nestlé workers who had been on strike for 12 months through a ban on the unloading of containers. George helped to win the strike and was carried through the factory on the shoulders of Filipino workers.

George was a member of the United Trades and Labor Council of South Australia (UTLC), on executive from 1975 to 1983 and president from 1981 to 1982. His union work extended into broader community work and in 1980, he became a union representative at the Correctional Services Board on Community Orders.

George joined the ALP in 1960 and was president of Young Labor and the Broadmeadows sub-branch in 1965. He was an active election campaigner and fundraiser. In 1979, George successfully sought ALP selection for the state seat of Semaphore, a campaign that delivered a rare loss, as it saw Norm Peterson elected to the South Australian parliament as an Independent. George was elected to the ALP executive and held positions of junior vice-president in 1986 and senior vice-president in 1987. In a rare departure from tradition, he did not succeed to the presidency. In 1988, he was expelled from the ALP for challenging premier Bannon for not doing enough for workers and for criticising the Hawke leadership.

I am told that before expulsion George once faced charges of disloyalty to the ALP. He was charged with the details in writing and told to appear in person with his response to the charges in writing. George, in typical style, produced his response written in Maltese and refused to translate it, incurring the further wrath of the many who eventually saw him off.

In the late 1980s, a number of small state and federally-based unions amalgamated and saw the Storemen and Packers become part of the National Union of Workers. That union paid tribute to George in *The Advertiser* last week. George retired from the workforce in December 1992 and, unsurprisingly, remained active in the community. He stood for election again in 1995, this time for a federal seat for the Greens. Our former state parliamentary colleague Peter Duncan reminded me that his law firm, Duncan Basheer Hannon, had the privilege of being lawyers for George and the union for many years and that together they scored some notable victories for working people.

George has been described to me variously as colourful, loveable, irascible, incorrigible and unpredictable. He had his differences with people and was a formidable foe, but as a comrade and friend he was faithful to a fault, and in response his members showed him great loyalty. Vale George Apap, a good bloke and a great champion of the working class and the labour movement in South Australia. To his family and many friends, our sincere condolences are extended to you all in this time of sorrow and loss.

VOLUNTEERS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:21): Today, I would like to talk about a couple of the volunteer-based organisations in my electorate and those who serve my electorate, given that next week is National Volunteer Week. I only highlight these as an example; there is an endless number of organisations and individuals who volunteer in our community and enrich our community with their contribution.

Firstly, I would like to acknowledge BBBfm, which is a community radio station based in the Barossa which also transmits into my electorate of Light. I was very pleased to be able to attend the opening of their new studios in Nuriootpa with our Governor and Mrs Le. The station is actually run, as I said, by a group of volunteers. The current president, Margaret Williams, and her band of volunteers, their board and other people who undertake a number of projects and shows do a wonderful job in keeping the community of the Barossa and areas engaged.

I think the importance of community radio—I will also mention the local broadcasting association a bit later—is that it does something very important: it concentrates and reflects the values and the priorities, if you like, of local communities. With the concentration of media in this country and other places in the world, local voices are often not heard anymore, so community radio

plays a very important role in ensuring that those local voices, local stories and local culture are transmitted to the community at large.

I would like to congratulate BBBfm on moving into their new studios in the senior citizens' building in Nuriootpa. Previously, for some 23 years, they were at the old railway station at Tanunda, which had become somewhat dated in terms of the equipment they required.

Another group I would like to mention is the Red Cross. The Red Cross is an international organisation, but the local Gawler branch does a wonderful job in raising funds for very valuable community projects in my electorate. One project is called the X-ray recycling program. I am very pleased to say that our office collaborates with the Red Cross in Gawler to collect X-rays. They actually recycle the metal in them, and that is an important fundraiser. They also recycle old film X-rays out of the community.

In addition to raising valuable funds for a whole range of different projects, they are also a very important social group doing a lot of activities to keep people in our community from being socially isolated and to make sure that people in the community are not left behind. I congratulate Pat Suridge, the chair and president of the Gawler sub-branch, and her committee on the wonderful work they do.

Another group I would like to mention is UCare, a social welfare group originally started by a range of churches in Gawler. UCare Gawler celebrated their 25th anniversary recently. They provide a lot of services to people in our community who are disadvantaged, people who are, for whatever reason, finding it tough in society, people who are homeless and people who are poor.

As was said on the night, the important role that UCare plays in our community is their ability to fill that gap where the government stops and the market fails. In other words, they provide a very important service to our community, and to human beings in our community, where the private sector is failing and the government does not fill the gap. I congratulate Reverend Richard Carter, who helped set up UCare 25 years ago, on his ongoing contribution to UCare and also the people involved in it.

It is also important to mention that today is Nakba Day. For people who are not aware, every year Nakba Day commemorates the displacement of Palestinian Arabs from their homes and homeland. The day marks the displacement, dispossession and dispersal of about 700,000 Palestinian Arabs, about half of the pre-war Palestinian Arab population who fled or were expelled from their homes and homeland during the 1948 Palestinian war. Sadly, this injustice continues today. They do not have a homeland, and American policy is not helping.

GREAT AUSTRALIAN BIGHT

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:27): I am fortunate to represent one of the most beautiful electorates anywhere in the world. This electorate is under threat by a proposal to drill for oil in the Great Australian Bight. Can anyone in here imagine the sandy beaches from Port Willunga down through Silver Sands to Myponga Beach, Second Valley, Rapid Bay, Cape Jervis or indeed the 550-kilometre coastline of Kangaroo Island covered in oil? If drilling is to go ahead in the Great Australian Bight, that is a very real risk for our area. Quite rightly, many of the 24,000 people I represent in this place are concerned about the proposal to drill in the bight.

We hear from Equinor, the company from Norway that wants to do the drilling, that they have world's best practices and that there will be very small risk. We say that any risk is too great for this wonderful part of the world. Eighty-five per cent of the marine life in the Great Australian Bight and around Kangaroo Island—85 per cent—does not feature in any waters anywhere else in the world. That is the sort of significant pristine environment that we are talking about.

In my area, people from all sides of politics are becoming more and more outraged at the thought that this area could be under threat. Primary school kids at McLaren Vale, secondary school kids at Tatchilla Lutheran College and people in their 80s and 90s doing beautiful handwritten cards are asking me to go in to bat and stand up for not just this pristine environment but also the 40,000 tourism jobs here in South Australia, many of them largely focused around our clean and green image and our pristine coastline, and also the thousands of jobs in the fishing industry.

In the past few weeks, I have been heartened to have had a lot of emails and Facebook messages from people in Streaky Bay, Ceduna, Port Lincoln and other parts of Eyre Peninsula, who are also very concerned about the prospect of drilling for oil in the bight. In a couple of hours from now, in Oslo, Norway, Equinor will be having its annual general meeting, where people will get to have their say. I know there are some institutional investors who will be calling for Equinor not to go ahead with drilling in the bight.

Last week, I met with the secretary of state for minerals and petroleum in the Norwegian government. I met with him in Oslo, and I also met with some other high-ranking officials from the government. I want to thank the Prime Minister of Norway, Ms Erna Solberg, for organising that meeting. I wrote to her in March to convey the concerns of people in our local area. She was good enough to arrange the meeting, and I thank her for that. I also thank the secretary of state and the others who were at the meeting for their time and their interest.

The CEO of Equinor had actually been on the radio the day before I arrived in Norway, telling everyone that no-one in Australia had any problems with drilling in the bight and that it was all going to be tickety-boo. Of course, we know that the story is very different from that. I hope that the Prime Minister of Norway will get that message across to this company, Equinor, which is 67 per cent owned by the Norwegian government.

Norway sells itself as a place that is very democratic and wonderful, but there is nothing democratic about the way Equinor went about its study into whether drilling in the bight should go ahead. We had 31,000 people—including myself and hundreds, if not thousands, of people from the electorate of Mawson—put in submissions, and Equinor ruled out almost all 31,000 submissions. There is absolutely nothing democratic about that. Today, I have again written to the Prime Minister of Norway to say that if she wants to leave a blue legacy for Norway she cannot do so if there is a black stain on the coastline of Australia.

I was really pleased last week that Bill Shorten said that, if he becomes the Prime Minister of Australia after Saturdays' election, he will call for a full inquiry into the consequences of a spill in the Great Australian Bight. For people who are going out to vote on Saturday, remember that if Bill Shorten becomes the Prime Minister of Australia he will put forward an inquiry into drilling in the Great Australian Bight. If you want that inquiry to go ahead, you need to get out and vote for Nadia Clancy if you live in Boothby or for Saskia Gerhardy if you live in Mayo, and you need to vote for the Australian Labor Party in the Senate as well. Good luck to all the Labor candidates on Saturday. Let's hope for a Shorten victory.

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION SERVICES

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:32): I would like to speak today about the ANZAC Day celebrations that I, as the member for Frome, attended at Redhill just recently. I would also like to talk today about Mick Hammill, who performed the flag-raising ceremony, and about his forebears who fought in both World War I and World War II. I also want to talk about Mick's grandfather, Edward James Hammill, and his father, Douglas Hammill, and the units in which they served.

Mick's grandfather, Edward James Hammill, served with the 9th Light Horse Brigade. Following the outbreak of World War I, the 9th Light Horse Regiment was formed in Adelaide and trained in Melbourne between October 1914 and February 1915. Approximately three-quarters of the regiment hailed from South Australia and the other quarter from Victoria. As part of the 3rd Light Horse Brigade, it sailed from Melbourne on 11 February and arrived in Egypt on 14 March 1915.

The Light Horse was considered unsuitable for the initial operations at Gallipoli but was subsequently deployed without its horses. The 3rd Light Horse Brigade landed in late May 1915 and was attached to the New Zealand and Australian Division. The 9th was fortunate to be the reserve regiment for the brigade's disastrous attack on the Nek on 7 August, but the commanding officer, Lieutenant Colonel Albert Miell, and several soldiers were killed in their reserve position.

The regiment was committed to the last phase of the August offensive battles. Attacking Hill 60 on 27 August, the 9th Light Horse subsequently suffered 50 per cent casualties, including its new commanding officer, Lieutenant Colonel Carew Reynell. Exhausted and under strength, the 9th then played a defensive role until it finally left the peninsula in December 1915.

Back in Egypt, the 3rd Light Horse Brigade became part of the ANZAC Mounted Division and, in March 1916, joined the forces defending the Suez Canal from a Turkish drive across the Sinai Desert. The Turks were turned at Romani. Although it did not take part in the actual battle, the 9th Light Horse was involved in the advance that followed the Turks' retreat back across the desert. By December 1916, this advance had reached the Palestine frontier, and the 9th was involved in the fighting to secure the Turkish outposts of Maghdaba on 23 December and Rafa on 9 January 1917, both of which were captured at bayonet point.

The next Turkish stronghold to be encountered was Gaza. The 3rd Light Horse Brigade, now part of the Imperial Mounted Division (later renamed the Australian Mounted Division) was involved in two abortive battles to capture Gaza directly on 27 March and 19 April 1917 and then the operation that ultimately led to this fall—the wide outflanking move via Beersheba that began on 31 October.

With the fall of Gaza on 7 November 1917, the Turkish position in southern Palestine collapsed. The 9th participated in the pursuit that followed, which led to the capture of Jerusalem in December. The focus of British operations then moved to the Jordan Valley. In early May 1918, the 9th was involved in the Es Salt raid. It was a tactical failure but it did help to convince the Turks that the next offensive would be launched across the Jordan.

Instead, the offensive was launched along the coast on 19 September 1918. The mounted forces penetrated deep into the Turkish rear areas severing roads, railways and communications. While awaiting to embark for home, the 9th Light Horse was called back to operational duty to quell the Egyptian revolt that erupted in March 1919. Order was restored in little over a month. The regiment sailed home on 10 July 1919.

Mick's father, Douglas Hammill, served in the 2nd/27th Division. The 7th Division was raised in 1940 at the instigation of the British War Cabinet, with the intention of forming an Australian Corps with the 6th and 9th divisions. The 2nd/27th was raised at Woodside in the Adelaide Hills in May 1914 and sailed for overseas in October. The battalion disembarked in Egypt before moving to duties in Palestine. After services on the Egyptian/Libyan front, the 2nd/27th participated in the invasion of Syria and Lebanon, which at the time was held by the Vichy French. The battalion fought in several major actions, remaining in Lebanon until January 1942.

Many people from regional areas participated in both the First World War and the Second World War. Mick's father and grandfather were amongst them. I pay tribute to not only those people from Redhill who suffered great tragedies but also their families. We are very fortunate today to live in a free society and that people like Mick's father, Douglas, his great uncle John, and his grandfather were there to provide great freedom for us.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Supply Grievances

Adjourned debate on the motion to note grievances.

(Continued from 14 May 2019.)

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:37): South Australians know that they do not want their essential services privatised. They know that buses being in private hands over the past 19 years has been an issue, and they do not want to see trains and trams being put into private hands.

Overnight, we have heard that the government is considering privatising our train and tram services in South Australia. That would be a disastrous move for our state. It goes completely against what Steven Marshall, the Premier of South Australia, said before the election when he promised, 'We do not have a privatisation agenda.'

The Premier promised that to the people of South Australia and the government have gone back on their word now. They are privatising prisons, privatising SA Pathology, privatising ambulance transfers in the north-eastern suburbs, and now we understand that they are considering privatising our train and tram services. That is only going to lead to worse services and higher costs, and it will make it harder for South Australians to get around.

We know that they have already booked in over \$30 million worth of cuts to our public transport in this state. It has led to significant cuts in buses across many areas, particularly my electorate. We do not want to see the same thing happen to our train services. The Seaford rail line in my electorate is a bedrock of our public transport in the South. We do not want to see that line sold off to the highest bidder.

We do not want to see prices rise, we do not want to see services cut, we do not want to see maintenance cut. This government has a privatisation agenda, and it has a clear agenda to cut as many costs as it can to cut as much from the budget, and it does not care what the consequences are for those hardworking South Australians in the outer suburbs who rely on these services and who want them to stay in public hands.

We will keep fighting for those services to stay in public hands. We are not going to relent. We want to make sure that our public transport trains and trams stay in public hands in South Australia.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:39): Mr Deputy Speaker, you will be thrilled to hear that I have been deputised by the Leader of the Opposition to be the lead speaker in this grievance debate on the Supply Bill.

Mr Pederick: Limited to 30 minutes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, and no-one is more pleased than the member for Hammond about the time limit imposed on me in this regard.

I rise to talk about a number of issues that relate to my electorate, the electorate of Lee. The first issue I would like to talk about is the Coast Park, which, as members would be aware, is an initiative over 20 years old in metropolitan Adelaide. The idea was to expand a 70-kilometre long shared walking and cycling path along the coast, from North Haven to Sellicks Beach, to give South Australians, members of the community, an opportunity to enjoy our wonderful beaches.

This vision has always received bipartisan support. Indeed, I understand that it was an initiative strongly pursued by former Liberal minister Diana Laidlaw. However, there are some missing sections of the Coast Park to ensure that it is completed as it was always intended, and we have heard from other members who represent southern suburbs electorates that there is some progress in fixing up the small parts that need to be delivered, but there is a very prominent part that has not yet been delivered—in fact, two parts: one between Semaphore Park and Tennyson and also between Tennyson and Grange.

Three years ago, the former Labor government provided funding for these sections to be completed—\$6 million shared fifty-fifty with the City of Charles Sturt. That funding has been provided not just by the government but also by the council. It is sitting with the council ready to spend. It is a hugely popular project in my electorate. Earlier this year, I sent out a survey to all households in my electorate, and I had more than 500 households responding, which is an extraordinary return when one considers the type of polling we are seeing for the current federal election and the relatively small samples they are getting in response to that polling.

Of the just over 500 responses (503 responses to be accurate), 497 were in favour of the project and only six were against. Fortunately, my interests align directly with the 497 people in my electorate who support this project. I also made it very clear in the run-up to the last state election that I will be pursuing the completion of this project. You might recall that the now member for Black, the Minister for the Environment, told this place that a key election issue between Labor and Liberal in the electorate of Lee would be about where the parties stood on the Coast Park. I welcomed that challenge because I know what I am supporting, and I am supporting the completion of the Coast Park.

However, the support in my electorate is not quite unanimous. There is a group of residents who continue to do everything they possibly can to frustrate the completion of this Coast Park. We have seen a legal challenge sponsored by two residents who live in houses along the very coastline—and they have also joined with the Coastal Ecology Protection Group (CEPG)—who have made it their mission to ensure that this project is not delivered.

Unfortunately for the Coast Park project, they had a win in the court to slow down the council and its progress in delivering this project. This, of course, was celebrated by these self-anointed conservationists. They are so concerned with conservation that some members of the CEPG, and indeed those two people who joined with them, have taken to conserving the dunes they are trying to protect by living in houses built on top of the dunes. That is how concerned they are with the conservation of those dunes.

However, happily, there are other people in my electorate who are willing to make their voice heard. Late last year, Grange resident Dr Pascale Quester, who participated in workshops and consultations on the path, was quoted in the Messenger about the threat of this Coast Park not being completed. He said:

It's appalling the project has been held up by residents...The concept of an unbroken coastal path...and even if we just don't build the 2km in the middle, then the whole project has been a huge waste of money...It's a trumped up campaign for a single purpose of stopping people from walking in front of their house on what is not their land.

It is Crown land: it is not private land there for the private enjoyment of those people who are fortunate enough to live along it. I would call on those people who have made it their mission to wake up and understand that we should have a responsibility to the broader community. That is what being neighbourly is about: making sure that we extend to those people who live around us the same benefits and privileges, where appropriate, that we are able to enjoy. Just because they are privileged enough to live along the coast does not mean that it becomes their exclusive domain.

I make it clear to this place that I will continue to lobby and push for the completion of this project. I hope that the Minister for Transport does not come good on his threat in the Messenger to withdraw the \$6 million of funding from the Coast Park project so that it cannot be completed. As we saw on election day in 2018, it is unfortunate that some of the most vocal people opposing this, who have appeared in media spots about this project, pulled on the blue T-shirt for the Liberal Party and handed out for my opponent, opposing me and my stance on the Coast Park. Let's hope that ends.

I would also like to talk about some planning issues. I have spoken before in this place about the impact that residents in my electorate are experiencing from unfettered infill development, particularly in the suburbs of Seaton, Semaphore Park, Grange and West Lakes, not exclusively in those areas but predominantly in those suburbs. We are seeing large blocks of over 600 square metres subdivided. We are seeing two-for-one, three-for-one and sometimes four-for-one development, where up to four townhouses are built on these blocks of land.

I am sure that all of us would agree that infill development has its place in ensuring that we combat the threat of urban sprawl from metropolitan Adelaide, but not in the manner in which it is proliferating in my suburbs. Just before the state election, I was interested to see an article in *The Advertiser* listing the suburbs with the highest number of property subdivisions in metropolitan Adelaide. No. 1 was Campbelltown, and very closely behind at No. 2 was Seaton, in the electorate of Lee.

I was even more interested to see that shortly after the election the Speaker, the member for Hartley, wrote to the new Minister for Planning, the member for Schubert, asking for a special arrangement for the City of Campbelltown so that the development plan could be amended to stop how badly these infill development projects were being conducted. He wanted to see a reduction of the impact on the local community from this unfettered development, just as I do in my electorate.

We see that these townhouses are being set very close to the roads, minimising the opportunity for off-street parking. As a result, overnight and on the weekend the huge influx of cars has to park on the streets throughout the community. Existing members of the community, some of whom have lived there for over 50 years, are finding it impossible to navigate their local streets, with cars parked over footpaths. They are unable to see out of their driveways to reverse out or even turn out of their own street into another street to get to where they are going because of the plethora of parked cars everywhere.

Unfortunately, I have had very limited success encouraging the City of Charles Sturt to think about the impact on the local roads and streets before they approve new dwellings on subdivided blocks. I hope that the Minister for Planning, the member for Schubert, can extend his special deal that he made with the City of Campbelltown to some of the other members—perhaps to the member

for Colton, who I am sure is suffering similar problems in suburbs like Henley Beach, let alone other areas such as Fulham or Flinders Park, where some of these large, desirable blocks are being subdivided, resulting in these sorts of issues.

I was also pleased that, in 2017, the former Labor government was able to commit funding for the intersection upgrade of West Lakes Boulevard, Cheltenham Parade and Port Road. This is a very large intersection with very high traffic volumes. The intersection also has a very poor history of road crashes resulting in casualties and fatalities. This intersection needs to be upgraded principally for residents leaving West Lakes Boulevard heading to Port Road, particularly to get into the city, and likewise for those travelling on Port Road back to West Lakes Boulevard. It is a major exit point for the thousands and thousands of residents living west of this intersection.

Money was provided at a critical time because of course the City of Charles Sturt had just finished that section of the Port Road median stormwater upgrade project to prevent flooding on Port Road. The council stopped its landscaping works around this intersection in the expectation that this project would start. The project was due to commence in the middle of 2018 and was due to be completed by the middle of this year but, unfortunately, it has not even started.

So the 43,000 vehicles using that section of Port Road, let alone the tens of thousands of vehicles navigating that section of West Lakes Boulevard, continue to be stuck in traffic. In the morning peak, it can take up to seven cycles of traffic lights for people seeking to leave West Lakes Boulevard to turn right onto Port Road. This is a project that needs to be attended to.

We also provided \$16.4 million to extend the Outer Harbor train line into the heart of Port Adelaide, to rebuild the old spur line, which had not been used for more than 30 years, and to build a new station, called the port dock railway station, adjacent to the National Railway Museum, just behind the Port Adelaide Police Station and Magistrates Court complex. This was a recognition that in the two diagonally opposite areas of the redevelopment of the Port, the Port Approach (South) and Dock 1 area needed a better, higher frequency, higher capacity public transport service.

That project, which entered into detailed planning in 2017 when that funding was provided, was due to start in the middle of 2018 and be delivered this calendar year. Unfortunately, once again, construction has not started. These are two major transport projects that will benefit thousands of people in the western suburbs, and they have completely fallen off the radar of the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and, presumably, his department.

That is a segue into talking about the broader performance and broader management of the portfolios of transport and infrastructure, particularly over the last 14 months. It is not just the area that I represent in the western suburbs or areas close to it, such as Port Adelaide, which are suffering from a lack of attention and due diligence from the Minister for Transport. It is easy for anyone to make themselves out to be a good, competent, high-performing minister when your activities are almost exclusively running around re-announcing projects that have already been funded, for which money has already been put aside and for which progress has already been commenced by the former government.

That is indeed how the member for Schubert, as the transport and infrastructure minister, started his tenure as minister. He was quick to crow about the progress that was being made on the Northern Connector and he was quick to spruik the improvements that would be brought about by the Torrens to Torrens project—two major projects, together valued at nearly \$2 billion and together employing over 1,000 South Australians, which were put in train. Funding was provided and secured by the former Labor government in partnership with the former, former, former Coalition government, with Tony Abbott and Jamie Briggs.

He has also been quick to spruik the benefits of the Flinders Link project. This is a project where funding was secured from savings delivered from the Goodwood Junction project, a project that was funded in 2013 and commenced that year, a project that he has had no responsibility securing funding for since he has been minister, although, of course, over his time, we have seen a blowout of \$40 million and a change in scope in the project.

With Oaklands crossing, once again he was quick to take the credit. Not only is he taking credit for that but we also see the federal member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, taking credit. In fact,

when I was transport minister, I was shouldered out of the way at the press conference when the relevant federal minister, Paul Fletcher, and I were seeking to announce in mid-2017 that the state and federal governments had reached a funding agreement. Once again, this was a project funded by savings from other state and federal government projects delivered by the former Labor government, in this case, savings from the three major north-south corridor projects: Torrens to Torrens, Northern Connector and Darlington.

We have seen the member for Schubert spruik the Glenelg driverless shuttle project and the Flinders University driverless bus project, two projects that were initiated and funded by the former Labor government. Not even two weeks into his term as transport minister, we saw him spruik public transport fare reductions—unfortunately, those that were already approved by the state government's cabinet under the former Labor government—and, of course, he has been thumping his chest about what a remarkable opportunity there is in sealing the Strzelecki Track. Welcome to the coat-tails of the 11 years of work that has preceded him.

However, the story is a little bit different when we come to focus on those parts of his portfolio, those initiatives, that have been exclusively his domain and his responsibility. We saw in the state budget the remarkable announcement that three Service SA centres would be closed. That announcement was made as part of the release of the budget in the first week of September. Two weeks later, his department sacked the director who was in charge of Service SA centres, Tanya Lancaster. She was summarily sacked by the government, presumably because she spoke out about the lunacy of this measure closing these Service SA centres.

Here we are, many months later, and we still have no further information, no further idea and no further instructions for the public about how they are meant to access the services that the government provides through those three Service SA centres in the electorate of Adelaide, the electorate of Waite and also up at Modbury, bordering the member for King's electorate and the member for Newland's electorate.

We have seen train carriage cuts. We have seen bus service cuts. We have seen cuts to managed taxi ranks—three crucially important areas of public transport all cut by the minister. We heard him say that there is no further support provided by the state government for the Footy Express service. Instead, he will unpick the good work of the former Labor government and expect the two footy clubs to cop it in the neck. We can imagine what the impact will be on footy fans. They will either have to pay higher membership fees or we will be flooding the city with an extra 10,000 to 20,000 vehicles in the couple of hours leading up to and in the hour after every AFL game at Adelaide Oval.

The minister was comprehensively duded by his federal counterparts when it came to South Road funding. We were told in May 2018 that there was an extra \$1.2 billion for South Road; less than 10 per cent of it eventuated over the next four years in the forward estimates. To make it even worse, the same duping happened in the most recent federal budget when we were promised an extra \$1.5 billion for the north-south corridor upgrades. Again, hardly any of that money was actually in the forward estimates and, as we know, according to Simon Birmingham, if it is not in the forward estimates, it is on the never-never. It does not count. The same comment was also made by the member for Schubert.

However, we were promised that we were getting a section, the Pym Street to Regency Road section, which the former Labor government had set aside money for in its state budget. However, we have not even seen work start on that. Now we have seen the Torrens to Torrens project finished, we have seen the Northern Connector project well past halfway and due to be finished this year, and we now see the Darlington project which should be well past halfway but, of course, the end date in the last state budget, the first budget of the Liberal government, changed the completion date of that and pushed it out. We are entering a valley of death for infrastructure construction projects here in South Australia.

We saw the minister's unbelievable stubbornness in refusing to admit for more than six months that his government would not be delivering on its election commitment for a right-hand turn for the tram. He received exactly the same advice that I received when I was transport minister, and that is that it is logistically near impossible, logistically not worth the effort, and not required for tram services to be run for the tram to turn right. But what did he do? He went through a charade for

six months of engaging external consultants, spending hundreds of thousands of dollars of taxpayer funds and then, more than six months after the election, he belatedly admitted that what Labor had been telling him for the best part of the year was in fact right and the tram right-hand turn would not be happening.

Of course, that happened after we were told time and time again that the tram extension down North Terrace would be completed 'very soon', 'within weeks', 'by May', or, what was set in stone, 'by 1 July'. All of that was missed, of course, presumably because as soon as the election was over, from Sunday 18 March 2018, workers downed tools and did not pick them up in any substantive fashion for more than a month. It is no wonder that tram extension blew out in its time line for so long. It was just because the minister took his eye off the ball about what the current crop of projects was that were funded, in process and needed to be delivered.

We saw him break a legal requirement for him as minister to consult with the Adelaide city council that has a legally binding lease agreement—between the council and the minister, regarding development at the Adelaide Oval—that he must consult with that council. He failed to do that before the Adelaide Oval hotel was announced.

We saw the humiliating backflip on the Springbank Road intersection upgrade, when he tried to persist for weeks that having two intersections would be better for motorists than one. Anyone who has obtained at least their L-plates and has driven a car knows that that is complete rubbish. Given that there are more than one million licensed motorists in South Australia it was only a matter of time before he had to conduct that humiliating backflip.

He was charged with the responsibility of delivering rate capping in South Australia. He came up with a weak, convoluted and unworkable bill that would not cap rates at all, that could indeed allow significant increases in rates. What do we see? Rate capping imposed? No, of course not. It is stuck languishing in the other place where, as we have heard in the last 24 hours, they do not like working past 5.30. We also saw one of his key departments, Renewal SA, have three chief executives in two weeks. It was formally leaderless for months. We saw rock throwing re-emerge on the Southern Expressway. He was caught napping in a response for that for weeks until, after many weeks of the opposition urging him to do something, he finally decided to install anti-throw screens on road overpasses.

We saw him cancel the park-and-ride project that Labor had funded at Tea Tree Plaza and cancel the park-and-ride project that Labor had funded at Klemzig—all in favour of an expanded park-and-ride that he wants to deliver in the Speaker's own electorate, the member for Hartley's electorate, at the Paradise Interchange. He has cut road maintenance. Presumably, that was the message he was delivering to residents of the South-East when he travelled down there to attend a Liberal Party fundraiser rather than front the damage that was occurring at the Darlington upgrade of South Road, with the concrete slumps that have occurred there along a 220-metre stretch.

We saw him sit on his hands month after month while dolphins died and while calves were killed in the Port River. It was a simple fix: all he had to do was tell his department to put some speed restrictions in those sections of the Port River and the other waterways around Torrens Island and Garden Island to stop the unfortunate hoon boating we have seen, particularly by jet skiers, in that area. He refused to do it until both the member for Port Adelaide and the *Portside Messenger* and its journalist, Ashleigh Pisani, humiliated him into backflipping and finally installing greater speed restrictions there.

We saw him led by the nose by his department straight after he became a minister. He tore up the cabinet decision to have Renewal SA moved down to Port Adelaide to fill the government office accommodation building that had been built specifically to house 500 public servants down there. Instead, he said, 'We have a far better idea: we are going to lease it out to the private sector.' You can understand where this predilection for privatisation comes from.

So, what happened? That building languished empty for month after month. All those small businesspeople who had invested hundreds of thousands of dollars of their own money in generating new small businesses in the Port were left there without an audience for months. That was the reason we were putting those public servants down there. Then what did we see? Rob Lucas had to intervene and send down the public servants so that finally this building was not charging the

government dead rent. All that could have been prevented if the April-May 2018 time line was adhered to by Renewal SA moving down to Port Adelaide.

Renewal SA would not be the only government department that does not want to be close to an area for which they are responsible. Deputy Speaker, you can ask why the EPA is not down at Port Adelaide. Perhaps they have not checked out the quality of the baristas down there. Perhaps all those members of the EPA who love living closer to the eastern suburbs are too addicted to the coffees that get made in Victoria Square.

We also saw the promise to increase regional speed limits on roads that had had speed limits reduced from 110 km/h to 100 km/h on the advice of road safety experts and on the advice of the transport department. He promised to immediately change that decision and increase those speed limits. Well, here we are, nearly 15 months later, and none of those changes have been made. The reason why is that it is unsafe for those motorists and it is unsafe for those road users.

Do members think that he has the capacity to answer honestly when he is asked questions by the member for Mount Gambier in question time about whether he is still going to do it? Of course he is not going to do it; he is too terrified about being responsible for a road death by encouraging motorists to drive at faster speeds on those particular roads. Rather than say, 'Do you know what, now that I have the advice, we have changed our mind; this is not an appropriate thing to do,' he continues to hold out the charade about increasing these speed limits.

He refused to assist the member for Reynell and take action in relation to Wicked Campers and the disgraceful, sexist slogans that we see paraded around our community by this particular company. There is a precedent for doing something in this state. It is the reason why we do not have particular four-letter words emblazoned on numberplates, and it is the reason why we do not have that sort of language and that sort of insinuation emblazoned on signage alongside our roads. It is because it is illegal and it is precluded by law. He is not happy to do that for signage on the side of vehicles. He is not interested.

Despite spruiking how good these new driverless shuttle buses were going to be at Glenelg and at Tonsley, he allowed the Australia and New Zealand Driverless Vehicle Initiative, the national office for pursuing autonomous vehicle technology, to be snared by New South Wales after the former Labor government had attracted it here. He also closed his mind to my entreaties and yours, Mr Deputy Speaker, about the importance of regional rail services on Eyre Peninsula. That has just been allowed to flutter away without any intervention to Viterra, Glencore or even Genessee & Wyoming. It is a disgrace.

I have already spoken about the Coast Park and the threats he made to my community to withdraw that funding. Of course, it is timely that we see the Minister for Environment here because between the two of them they have turned a leasing opportunity for Edmund Wright House into an outright sale, where they will no longer have any control about what happens to that building. Don Dunstan would be turning in his grave about the disgraceful legacy that these two have left.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (16:10): I, too, rise to make a contribution on the Supply Bill. Rather than repeat what so many others have said already, and given that we were here so late last night, I thought I might use this time to instead look at the disparity between what those opposite tell us our financial position is and what the actual data says it is through the lens of television. I will do it in a way that generation X and maybe generation Y will understand. Certainly, there is one generation X member of this place who will be very familiar with this analogy.

When I look at the state of the budget and some of the decisions that the government has made over the past 12 months, it reminds me of an episode of *The Simpsons* called *Duffless*, when Homer is convinced by Marge that he is in denial about his drinking and to give up beer for a month. In this episode, Marge challenges Homer's view of himself by asking a series of questions designed to highlight the disparity between what he sees and what others see.

In a memorable scene, Marge sits up in bed, reads from a book called *Is Your Spouse a Souse?* and asks Homer the following questions as he brushes his teeth: 'Do you ever drink alone?' Homer says: 'Does the Lord count as a person?' 'Do you ever hide beer around the house?' 'Do I ever,' says Homer as he opens the toilet cistern and pulls out a can of beer hidden inside. 'Do you

drink to escape reality?' Homer turns, faces the bathroom mirror and makes his imaginary muscles bounce up and down in time with a tune that he is whistling.

I use this analogy because this must be the tenor of the conversations taking place in the cabinet room at the moment, as the same kind of all-pervading delusion that gripped Homer has certainly gripped this Marshall Liberal government, a Marshall Liberal government that would have you believe that everything is fine or, to use their own vernacular, 'South Australia is the stand-out economy amongst all states and territories.'

Now, that is some Orwellian doublethink. I can hear it being introduced now, in Troy McClure's voice no less: 'From the people who brought you best-selling titles like *I'm Not a Climate Scientist But*, and *The Art of the Deal* by the Minister for Water and, *Government, Just a Right Turn Away* by the member for Unley.' I would not be at all surprised if the Minister for the Environment claimed the water found under the Darlington motorway as a victory for the River Murray.

The point of *The Simpsons* analogy is that when it comes to the state of the South Australian economy this Liberal government is just as deluded as Homer was. Of course, the rhetoric is grand and no doubt when they look in the mirror they like what they see, just like Homer did, but the numbers tell a very different story indeed. In fact, the numbers show that since the state election building approvals are down 17.8 per cent for total dwelling units approved, and the value of building approvals in all sectors is down by 20 per cent.

The numbers show that the youth unemployment rate in South Australia has spiked to 15 per cent, up from 11.5 per cent when they took office in March last year. This means that since the election of the Marshall Liberal government an additional 6,800 young South Australians aged between 15 and 24 are unemployed.

But what is probably most remarkable is that state debt will increase under this government. Think about that for a second. The party that enjoys nothing more than lecturing us on fiscal restraint and the need for a balanced budget has handed down a budget under which state debt will go up. What is the Treasurer's response when the media asks for an explanation on this spectacular backflip: 'This is not the debt that you're looking for.'

The numbers show that retail trade is sluggish in South Australia, too. In fact, it was growing at 2.9 per cent under the former Labor government; it is now growing at just 1.7 per cent. The numbers show that our share of national overseas goods exports has fallen from 4 per cent to 3.4 per cent, and the numbers show that international visitor numbers are down 3 per cent on the year to December 2018, with South Australia's tourism revenue plummeting by more than \$70 million.

Even if it were true that South Australia is the stand-out economy amongst all states and territories, what do we have to show for it? As a member of parliament in the north-eastern suburbs, I ask: where is the investment? If a tidal wave of optimism and confidence has washed over us, as those opposite would have us believe, there is very little to show for it.

Indeed, all we have in the north-east are cuts, closures and privatisations: the closure of Service SA at Modbury, despite the fact that the number of transactions performed there continues to go up, year on year; the closure of the Tea Tree Gully TAFE, despite the fact that youth unemployment has jumped to 15 per cent; the privatisation of patient transfers from Modbury Hospital, despite a solemn promise from those opposite that never, ever again would they privatise that hospital or any of its services; the seemingly inevitable, drawn-out privatisation of SA Pathology; and, of course, the indefinite postponement of the desperately needed expansion of the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride, despite the fact that the existing park-and-ride is full by 8.30am almost every weekday.

Health, training and transport are all under attack in the north-east. This can mean only one of two things: either the economy is doing well and those opposite do not give a stuff about people in the north-east, or the economy is not doing nearly as well as they would have us believe. Either way, it is a bad result for South Australians living in the north and north-eastern suburbs.

At the end of that particular episode of *The Simpsons*, Homer completes his month of sobriety and races to Moe's for a cold Duff. As Homer draws the pint glass to his lips, he is suddenly overcome with guilt and races home to spend time with Marge. Of course, there will be no such

fairytale ending to this story. The cuts, closures and privatisations that have been part of this Liberal government's first budget since 2001 certainly do not represent a bold new policy direction for the Liberal Party in South Australia. In fact, they are nothing more than a continuation of the same agenda that was cut short at the 2002 state election.

If we are looking for an episode of *The Simpsons* that more accurately portrays what is likely to happen next with this government, we should look no further than an episode called *The Springfield Files*. In this episode, Moe tries to sell Duff Beer at a premium by enticing patrons with Swedish Duff, which is just regular Duff on which he has drawn, with a texta, an umlaut over the U. This Premier is nothing more than the umlaut above the U in 'Lucas'—a smiling face on the same old agenda of cuts, closures and privatisations. There is nothing new, there is nothing different and there is nothing progressive about this government. It is just the same old Duff.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:17): It is very hard to follow on from that contribution. Well done! I want to speak in my grievance opportunity about the extraordinary community in Port Adelaide and the effort they have made over many years, particularly in recent weeks, to continue to protect the heritage of Port Adelaide.

When I was running in a campaign in order to become a member of parliament, it was very clear to me that there had been many missteps taken in the Port. Not least was the most recent misstep taken prior to my coming into parliament, which was to permit the razing of a number of sheds, including a boat yard, in order to facilitate a development that simply was not happening. There had previously been the difficulty that had been visited upon the Port by the containerisation of shipping, which meant that ships were able to become a lot larger.

As with all inner harbours around the world, the ships left and went to the larger berths nearer the open sea, and the Inner Harbor life was diminished. This was always going to be a difficult transition for Port Adelaide, but it was made more difficult by a combination of developments elsewhere, such as the West Lakes development. In fact, I understand, although I do not have personal evidence of this, that into the early eighties the shopping precinct in Port Adelaide was second only to Rundle Mall or city shopping in South Australia in terms of the number of shoppers and the range of shops.

Of course, that all went, at least in part due to the development of West Lakes and, in fact, due to the location of the big supermarkets and department stores further back from the wharf in Port Adelaide itself. There were attempts made, and I particularly laud the effort to have the National Railway Museum established—which is still not at all government run: it is run by dint of volunteers with the occasional grant—the Aviation Museum and, of course, the History Trust's Maritime Museum.

The establishment of an excellent museum precinct in Port Adelaide has been welcome and, particularly when I had small children, we would spend hours and hours roaming around those three museums. Nonetheless, the Port became pretty sad and tired. It seemed to me and also to the then member for Cheltenham, who had become the Premier shortly before my by-election, and then subsequently after the 2014 election, the member for Lee, that as adjoining members around the community of Port Adelaide, we needed to do something substantial and significant to support the area.

While previously there had been a deal of economic activity—and I pay tribute to the establishment of Techport, which then facilitated the more recent decision to build submarines and offshore patrol vessels, the decision to have opening bridges for the railway and the road to the north in order to continue to allow tall ships to come into the inner harbour—nonetheless, what was needed was a more human-focused and more heritage-focused program.

What we saw in that period when the former member for Cheltenham Jay Weatherill was premier, and once in particular we also had Stephen Mullighan in the seat of Lee and in the role of transport and infrastructure, was a focus on revitalising the life of Port Adelaide, upgrading the facades along St Vincent Street and completely redoing the traffic flow, including facilitating car parking, which meant that businesses were able to have customers. Still one of my biggest fans is the person who owned the Mayfair Bakery at that time, who started off not impressed with yet another politician but became convinced once he had some good car parking available for his business.

The development of the Hart's Mill precinct was very important. It is an incredibly beautiful building that had been allowed to languish. The refurbishment of the flour shed meant we were able to have community events, the offering of community events and the subsidy of community events. The use of Renew Adelaide for a while to facilitate businesses starting up in some of the empty shops, and the decision to build a new building to house 500 government workers and bring them out of the city and into the Port were tremendous steps forward.

Almost the first thing that Jay Weatherill, member for Cheltenham at that time, did was to suspend the contract that was clearly not going anywhere with the people who had commenced the Newport Quays development but had stopped doing any further development, and for whom the government earlier on under different leadership had razed those sheds to the ground.

The termination of that contract, the settlement of that contract, and then the process of doing a precinct plan lowered the density, lowered the height limits, and also identified important buildings that would be preserved and featured as part of developments. All of that was an incredibly important time. We had a community consultation group that was incredibly helpful in making sure that we were listening to the community and being in step with what their ambitions were for Port Adelaide.

Tragically, we have now seen a very disappointing turn of events with one of the last remaining sheds in the inner harbour, and the last one on the Glanville-Semaphore side of the Inner harbor. We had a developer who had maintained a picture of that shed—Shed 26—on its plans. It was in the precinct plan as a site that needed to be maintained in its aesthetic.

We had Robert Morris-Nunn, a brilliant heritage architect from Tasmania come over. We paid for him to come and work with the National Trust of Port of Adelaide, with Renewal SA and the council to look at ways in which that building and others could be adapted and re-used, and not necessarily exclusively for community use but for facilitating private use within the framework of maintaining the heritage character of the Port generally and of those buildings in particular. It was therefore very disappointing for the community to hear late last year that the developer no longer wanted to maintain Shed 26 as part of their picture for what was going to happen on that site.

It is particularly disappointing because the previous government had made an explicit decision that the option would be maintained to negotiate with that developer to have government money associated with doing up that building as we got to the point of seeing what the designs would be, what their ambitions would be and what contribution they were prepared to make in order to make their development special and lively, reflecting the place that they are in rather than being anonymous—any kind of development, any place, just dropped into the middle of one of our most precious heritage areas.

It is very disappointing given all of that background and, I think, all of that reasonable expectation. I, as the local member, the previous government and the community had that expectation that this would be a different development this time. It was very disappointing to discover that they had determined to knock over the shed.

The community had not sought to have heritage listing because we are aware that that constrains the kind of development that can occur, and what we wanted and expected was that there would be an open process of determining how to bring to life Shed 26 without having to put on that kind of legalistic burden. However, in the face of the prospect of demolition, heritage value, heritage protection, was sought, and the Heritage Council found that, not on one but on four of the criteria, the shed was deemed to be worthy.

I know that there is a process. There is a process that says that there might be other considerations prior to the inclusion of a place on the Heritage Register. I believe that the environment minister, who is responsible for the Heritage Act, genuinely was in some emotional or moral conflict over making that decision. He certainly expressed that very clearly in public, and it is not him that I turn to say that we should have done something different but to the minister for development, the Minister for Infrastructure, from whom the funding was always going to have to come if we were going to make this development work.

The decision not to do that was an explicit decision that was taken by that minister and by this government that the heritage of the port was not worth putting money into, even though the shed

itself had been determined to be worthy of heritage value, and my community is greatly saddened by that decision.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I call the member for West Torrens after he acknowledges the Chair when he comes into the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:27): I am sorry, sir—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): The member for West Torrens has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I apologise, sir, but often its the stature of the person in the chair—

An honourable member: Will you let that go?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I will let that go, but that's about it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I seek the apology of the house for not noticing—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Indeed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the member in the house.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Thank you, member for Wright.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is almost as if I saw right through him, like his leader does, every time there is a promotion up for grabs.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Thank you, member for Wright.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He sees right through him.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Member for West Torrens, you do not want to be kicked out again today, do you?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, interjections from the Chair show the smallness of the occupant of the chair. Again, Mr Acting Speaker, it shows probably why others have been talked about being promoted, but I digress from my grievance. I do have a great deal of affection for the member for Waite because I actually think he is a man of convictions, and when I find out what they are—no. I do think he is a man of conviction, and I enjoy my banter with him in this place. It is important that we have a bit of cross-party banter because it keeps the vibrancy and the robustness of our democracy well.

What does concern me, though, is the agenda of this government. The government was elected on the basis of, I think, three core principles; one is that they argued that it was time for a change. They argued that, if they were elected, they would provide better services and they would somehow be able to lower the cost of living. One of the first acts of this government was to increase debt by \$3 billion. After they increased that debt, a dramatic series of cuts was outlined in their first budget as a government. Yesterday and today we have learned that the government is contemplating privatising our rail network.

I asked a question today of the member for Unley. When he was shadow minister for transport and infrastructure, he issued a press release talking about an enterprise agreement that he claimed contemplated the privatisation of our train and tram services and how the government could not and should not privatise those train and tram services because they had not sought a mandate from the people. When I asked him that question today, the minister refused to stand up and answer, and it was left to the Premier to answer the question.

I have no concern about or criticism of the member putting out that press release. I think it is entirely appropriate for an opposition member to put out those types of press releases. What I think is important, though, is consistency—consistency of messaging. What does it say to the people of South Australia that the Premier was filmed in a debate with the former premier, the Hon. Jay

Weatherill, and the then opposition leader was asked, 'Will you privatise state-owned assets?' and the Premier responded, 'We don't have a privatisation agenda'?

He comes to office and outsources the Remand Centre. He comes to office and we find out through tender documents—no public government announcement—that the government is outsourcing field services in DPTI, which are things like monitoring traffic lights and the maintenance of traffic signalling, important pieces of public infrastructure. We also found out yesterday and today that the government is actively contemplating the privatisation of our rail and tram fleet and those services.

I say to government members, especially the backbenchers who will be forced to go out and sell this message: where was the consultation with the public? When did they get asked, or have the government misinterpreted their election result as a mandate to do as they please when they please for four years? This would be a mistake, but the government's arrogance—and I do not mean that personally, but I am talking about this generically from the way the government is conducting itself—is that they now believe that they can privatise our rail and tram services and it will have no consequence at the election. Well, actions have consequences.

There will be consequences from privatising our train and tram services. What are they? The public will notice a reduction in services. Why? I was questioning the merits of the transport minister's policy announcement of diverting bus routes away from a program of taking people to a destination but rather to a waypoint. Rather than catching a bus in Torrensville, Richmond or Golden Grove and coming into Adelaide, buses would become transit links between railway and other forms of mass transport rather than being a mass transit system in themselves. Instead of buses heading to a destination, they will move in the opposite direction between tram stops and train stops; they will move backwards and forwards. Why would you do that? The public do not like catching two forms of transport to go to one destination.

Then there is this other lie perpetuated by the government that patronage is down. Patronage is not down: patronage is up. People are catching more buses, trains and trams; it is up. It is a lie to say that it is not. Why would the government lie about patronage being down and then, rather than have buses head along traditional routes into the city—because Adelaide is a city-state and has mass transit heading from the suburbs into the city, to one destination—have buses move towards train stations and tram stops? We now understand why. They are fattening the lamb before sale.

Mr Malinauskas: Market day is coming.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Market day is coming. How did we discover this? It was not through some open government decision-making process. The minister got caught out in question time.

For any new backbencher who thinks that question time is irrelevant, look at yesterday and today. Three days before a federal election, the Minister for Transport has unleashed another issue into the seat of Boothby, and that is the potential privatisation of our tram and train services. That will now be a major focus of that campaign in the dying days of the campaign. The question will be: will the public get a better service or a worse service if they privatise our trains and trams? The Labor Party says it will be worse.

The Labor Party says that they have no mandate to do this. The Labor Party says that 75,000 people a day use and enjoy this service, and we want it to grow. You do not grow it by selling it. You do not grow it by increasing fares. Public transport is not meant to be a profit-making exercise. It is an essential service provided to the public by the government. Who benefits? Well, individuals who catch public transport are able to save money on car costs, insurance costs, car parking costs and petrol costs. It improves the environment. People pay off their mortgages faster. It lowers the cost of living. For the rest of us who drive cars on roads, it decongests our roads.

When our roads are decongested, we spend less money on maintenance, new infrastructure programs to decongest our roads, and grade separations—which are very expensive. So if more people catch trains, trams and buses we will all save. Yet this government, which cuts \$46 million from our bus transport system, is now planning to divert buses coming into the city.

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

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: By cutting bus services by \$46 million and diverting buses to tram and train stops with this hub-and-spoke approach, we are seeing the government prepare the people of South Australia for a sale of their tram and train network, and we will all suffer because of it. The people who will suffer the biggest consequences and who will be let down will not just be the commuters but the government backbench. They will be forced to go out to defend a policy they have had no say in formulating.

The member for Newland, the member for Colton, the member for Elder, the member for Morphett, the member for Black and the member for King are all members who have played no role in formulating this policy, but they will be the ones who will be expected to go out to street-corner meetings and bus stops in the morning to defend this dog of a policy. But that is how the Premier operates. Everyone on the government benches, especially the backbenches, is expendable because the Premier has met his objective. He has become Premier.

Mr Brown: That's all he wanted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is all he wanted. Now, without consultation with his backbench, they are privatising our trams and our trains. And how did the backbench find out? It was not through a caucus seminar or some debate in a caucus meeting; it was because I asked a question of the minister and he would not rule it out.

That is how the Liberal Party found out that their cabinet was privatising the public transport system. Welcome to the new reality. 'Run for parliament,' they said. 'Make a difference,' they said. All the backbench is really doing is keeping the Premier in the lifestyle to which he is accustomed. Until they start speaking up for themselves, all they will keep on doing is incurring the wrath of the people who are impacted by the Premier's decision while members on the backbench watch and applaud.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (16:40): The Premier and the tourism minister of South Australia owe the tourism industry and the 40,000 people who work in it an apology. Before last year's election, they were going around with all sorts of promises about what they were going to deliver for the visitor economy in South Australia. A few months later, in their first budget they delivered an \$11 million hit to the tourism budget here in South Australia.

That is pretty devastating for an industry that is made up largely of micro, small and medium-sized businesses, people who are based all around South Australia, because we know that 42 per cent of the tourism spend in South Australia is in regional South Australia. It is a massive hit for those people, and I am hearing nothing but complaints about how minister Ridgway is meant to be helping people in the visitor economy here in South Australia.

In the five years from 2013 through to the 2018 election, we grew the visitor economy, from \$4.9 billion a year to \$6.7 billion a year, so we increased it by almost \$2 billion in five years. What have we seen since the new government has come to power? We have seen it dropping for the first time in five years. That figure is down more than \$70 million in the last quarter alone, and everyone in the visitor economy is bracing themselves for further falls. They know that, if you withdraw \$11 million of marketing money to tell people around the world and around Australia, and indeed around South Australia, about the attributes of South Australia and the great events we have here, you are going to get fewer visitors coming to South Australia.

The best money that we can have in the economy here in South Australia is the money out of the wallets, pockets and purses of people from interstate and overseas. When it comes to South Australians making a choice on where they are going to spend their leisure dollars, we want to make sure that they spend them on Kangaroo Island, in Port Lincoln, up in the Riverland, down in the South-East, in the great Flinders Ranges or in the Outback, so we have to be out there selling South Australia to everyone. You cannot do that if you take \$11 million out of the budget.

What is concerning to people at the South Australian Tourism Commission right now is that they have been told that they have to cut their budgets even further. They are pulling their hair out,

wondering how they can possibly carry on doing the job they were once able to do when they were funded by our government. I want to thank the former treasurer, the member for West Torrens, for all the money that he gave to us to make sure that we could expand the visitor economy in South Australia.

We built the Adelaide Oval—\$535 million. That rebuild was a game changer. It has now been recognised as the best cricket ground in the world and the best sporting stadium in Australia. We were given money to start up a bid fund for conventions and then a separate bid fund for major events so that we could fill Adelaide Oval because we were drawing great events to it. We spent \$400 million building stages 2 and 3 of the Adelaide Convention Centre so that we could host more delegates because we know that convention delegates spend six times more than a normal visitor to South Australia. That was a really important investment, in terms of a capital investment, but it was the investment that we put into the bid fund that made all the difference.

All I am hearing from people in this sector are criticisms about David Ridgway and the way he is going about it. He does not have a clue about the visitor economy. He does not have a clue how to sit around the cabinet table and annoy his colleagues to get more and more funding. He must just sit there and be happy to have had \$11 million ripped off him last year and have more money ripped off him this year. He is out of touch. He has no idea how to fight for the sector he is meant to represent and he is meant to lead as the Minister for Tourism.

I want to congratulate our leader (member for Croydon) and the member for Ramsay for the wonderful initiative they launched just a few weeks ago, Tourism Equals Jobs. They have been out there listening to tourism operators and people who are employed in the visitor economy. They know that they are scared, that they are fearful for their jobs and for their businesses because of the huge cuts inflicted on their sector by the Premier of this state and the Minister for Tourism.

It is a great campaign and we can only hope that by putting pressure on the Premier and on the Minister for Tourism that some of these cuts can be reversed. They need to be reversed very quickly indeed because when we put that extra money in it took a while to get the momentum going. As I said, we saw that growth of almost \$2 billion over five years, but as soon as you take that money away the effect is immediate, and it takes a long time to get the momentum back once you have taken away the funding. Even if you start putting more money in, in a year's time or in two years' time, it will take 18 months to two years to repair the damage and get back to the stage we were at.

When we were in government, we secured Emirates airlines to come here, we secured China Southern Airlines to come here and we secured Qatar Airways to come to South Australia. Last week, I met with Akbar Al Baker, the CEO of Qatar Airways, to maintain the relationship we have had for the past three years. I want to thank Mr Al Baker for his friendship not just to me but to South Australia, and I hope that he can get back here again one day soon. He wants to come and visit us on Kangaroo Island. It really is important that we have these airlines bringing people in from all sorts of places around the world. Qatar Airways flies from 160 cities around the world and flies through Doha directly into Adelaide. None of this happens by accident. You have to work really hard and you have to have good relationships with people.

On my trip, I also caught up with David Lappartient, president of the UCI, the international cycling union. We had a good meeting in his home region of Brittany in France where he is a local mayor. He and I started working on a project in January last year when I drove him around the white roads of McLaren Vale, Willunga and Myponga beach. It was great to catch up with him in France a couple of weeks ago when he said, 'Why don't we have a race on the Sunday before the Tour Down Under that is for world tour points on these white roads?'

It is one of the new fast-growing sectors of cycling. When the cyclists come to Australia for three weeks, there are more points they can win in additional races. So we want to get another race up on the Sunday before the Tour Down Under proper starts on the following Tuesday, and then on the Wednesday after the Tour Down Under finishes let's have another race either on Kangaroo Island or down in Mount Gambier around the Blue Lake or on another circuit that goes out to Glencoe and a few places down there that are popular with cyclists. We need to get more events into South Australia.

While I was on the trip, I also caught up for four days with Christian Prudhomme, the head of the Tour de France and a good friend of mine and a good friend of South Australia. We did the Tour de Yorkshire together. We were in a car, not on bikes because neither of us was in great nick at the time, but Christian is happy to get behind this and really back it in as well. But what about David Ridgway, our tourism minister? None of these people know him. He turned up for 10 years, while he was the opposition spokesman on tourism. He turned up to the Tour Down Under every year, ate all the pies, drank all the wine and did not bother to go and say g'day to any of these people and form a relationship.

I gave him a warning in 2014 in the lead-up to the 2014 election. When Christian Prudhomme was here and Brian Cookson, who was then the head of the UCI was here, I asked them, 'Did the opposition have a meeting with you?' They were two months away from possibly being in charge of this place and they did not have a meeting with him. I gave him notice four years ago that you have to have these relationships. When Christian Prudhomme comes here, he stays at my house. When the head of the Tour de Yorkshire comes to Adelaide, he stays at my house. These are the sorts of relationships you have to have with people, where you can pick up the phone and get things done.

David Ridgway says, 'I think I met with someone from the UCI during the Tour Down Under.' He does not know who it was. There is no relationship there. The president of the UCI does not know David Ridgway and the former one does not know him. He has never met with any of them. Christian Prudhomme has been to Adelaide four times and David Ridgway has never taken the opportunity to catch up with him.

I have a plan for two new races that I have worked out for UCI WorldTour and ProTour points, and I will put that to the Premier of South Australia. I hope he gets behind them and backs them because if he does not they will sure as hell go to Victoria, New South Wales or Queensland. I fought hard for five years as the tourism minister of South Australia. I do not want to see those states taking victories over us. We need to get on board. This new government has let down the visitor economy. Get behind these two races.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (16:50): I take this opportunity to speak to the chamber about a matter that I started to canvass in my second reading speech on supply yesterday evening but was not able to complete due to a lack of time. It is something that has been rather topical in this state over the course of the last 36 hours: who runs, controls, owns and operates our state public transport system.

This is a fundamentally important question for our community. I think it is important just to put it in a bit of context because there have been a few myths allowed to perpetuate from the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure over recent weeks. The first thing is there are approximately 14.4 million trips that occur in our passenger network at the moment in South Australia. In the last financial year, in the figures that we have available to us—I believe from the annual report—14.4 million trips are taken during the course of a financial year.

To give a comparison, back in 2004-05, 11.1 million passenger trips occurred in South Australia. Over that period, what we have seen is very substantial growth in patronage of our public transport network. They are not the shadow minister's figures, they are not my figures and they are not the figures of the Premier. They are the figures, we understand, from the department in its own annual report. That is sustained, long-term, consistent growth in patronage of our public transport network.

If we take a most recent snapshot, when we look at the most recent financial year's figures for the year prior, there is a growth of around 100,000 trips over the course of a 12-month period. Again, that is crystal clear, ironclad, indisputable factual evidence of the fact that we have seen growth in patronage of our public transport network.

We on this side are going to constantly call to account the Premier and the Minister for Transport when they try to perpetuate a myth that somehow we are seeing patronage go backwards. It is simply not an accurate reflection of the facts and it needs to be called out because it seems to be the only argument this government is using as some sort of smokescreen, some sort of veil or some sort of fig leaf for their justification for pursuing a neoliberal agenda to pursue the privatisation of public transport in South Australia.

We know that the Premier himself is on the record, I believe from an AFR interview or article some months ago, identifying that Jeff Kennett is a source of advice for him in the way he conducts himself. That is starting to come through, because the only other example that we have in the commonwealth of privatisation of a metropolitan train network is in Melbourne. Who was it done under? None other than Jeff Kennett.

Sydney, Brisbane, Perth and Adelaide are the other key cities with major train systems in place, all owned and operated by the people of that state through their respective governments. It is only in Melbourne where we have seen the privatisation of the train network put into place by none other than Jeff Kennett. There is a reason why only one city has done it: it does not make sense. It is bad public policy. The overwhelming majority of South Australians and indeed Australians understand that key public services that a lot of people rely on day in and day out are best managed in the hands of the public.

Retaining control is something we have heard the minister refer to over the last couple of days. If you want to retain control, why would you hand over the asset or the operation of that asset to the private sector? You want to maintain control? Keep the control in your hands. That is why you are empowered to be a minister of the Crown: to take responsibility and use your decision-making prowess with the powers that are vested in you to exercise control. Handing it over to the private sector completely undermines that concept and that principle. Yet that is what we hear this government is seriously considering doing.

Not once before the state election, despite numerous opportunities, despite sustained questioning from the media and the Labor Party, did we ever hear the now Premier or the former shadow minister articulate a case that they were contemplating privatising the train or tram network—not once. Not once did the member for Newland go to his constituents telling them that he likes the idea of an active consideration of the train or tram network.

Not once did the member for King go to Golden Grove in her constituency or other areas within her electorate and say, 'Hey, just want to let you know that, if you vote Liberal, we are going to have a little look at privatising the train or tram network.' I know that the member for Colton did not do that. He did not run around Colton saying, 'I want to be open and transparent with the people of Henley Beach. I want to let you know that the train and tram network in metropolitan Adelaide could be privatised.'

If they did that, let them stand up and say it, but you will not hear them say it because they never said that to their constituents. That is why they will be held to account. They will be held to account because their constituents voted for them under the premise that this government did not have a privatisation agenda. It turns out they do. Trams and trains, SA Pathology, prisons, you name it, this is a government that is abandoning its promises to its own constituents. We will hold them to account on that fact.

Aside from the breaking promises component, aside from them undermining any credibility that they may have when it comes to keeping promises, there is a core public policy question here and that is: what do we do about public transport? Almost every other jurisdiction around the world that is serious about getting people from A to B, serious about reducing congestion, serious about doing something for climate change, is investing more in public transport—not less, not cutting.

Here we have an arbitrary \$46 million cut. Here we have the revelation during the course of question time—only a few days out from a federal election, mind you—as a result of questioning from the shadow minister for transport and infrastructure, that the active consideration of privatising the train and tram network is underway. It just does not make sense.

On this side of the house, there is unanimity of opinion that climate change is real. In Labor, we believe that climate change is real and we believe that it is human induced. We take the next step and believe that there is a moral obligation upon the policymakers and decision-makers to take action to mitigate the risks of climate change and to mitigate the onset of climate change. Public transport is a key part of that equation.

We know that transport emissions account for somewhere in the order of 30 per cent of all carbon emissions in Australia. That is a very big chunk. If you want to do something about reducing

that very significant component that contributes towards carbon emissions in this nation, public transport has to be key. If you reduce the number of people getting around in motor vehicles, which are far higher emitters of carbon compared with public transport, you are doing something that is making a positive impact on climate change.

The other variable is congestion. We have heard those opposite often talk about congestion on our roads and we have heard them talk about infrastructure, but now they are ripping away \$46 million and looking at privatising a network, putting the profit motive at the heart of decision-making on public transport, which could only result in less services. They already had made decisions that have resulted in less services, which will contribute to congestion.

We are going to have more congestion and we are going to have more carbon emissions going into the atmosphere. That is bad public policy. I know that there are some opposite who do not believe that climate change is real. That is a view they are entitled to have but is not one that I share. I can understand how they can rationalise the idea of privatising the trains and trams and cutting public transport, but on this side we simply do not agree.

The final point I make on this is the extraordinary political timing. Three is the number of train lines that go through the seat of Boothby, and there is one tramline. A lot of people use these services. I think that the constituents of Boothby, when they go on Saturday to cast their ballot, would do well to think about the fact that it is only the Liberal Party that have a now not-so-secret plan to privatise our train and tram network. I am confident that the majority of those constituents will not agree with that, and they should think about that when they cast their ballot on Saturday.

Time expired.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (17:00): I rise to speak in the grievance debate on the Supply Bill. Many constituents in my electorate rely on public transport. They use it every day to go to work and to school, to educate themselves through post secondary education, to visit friends and family, to attend medical appointments and to go shopping. The electorate of Ramsay incorporates the Salisbury city centre, including the Salisbury Interchange. It is a very well-used facility. It coordinates bus transport and the train, which is the northern line from Gawler through to the City of Adelaide.

Labor understood the importance of public transport. In fact, the previous Labor government invested in many improvements that benefited the broader community and my electorate. We saw the electrification of the Seaford line and the expansion of the tram network. We delivered the O-Bahn underpass and we lowered fares. We concentrated on the fact that we knew that people would buy a 28-day pass, and we made sure that it was the best price it could be.

In my community, we commenced the electrification of the Gawler train line. We replaced the station at Elizabeth. We improved safety at the Salisbury rail station and we extended car parks at Parafield, Smithfield and Chidda. But what has the Marshall Liberal government done? In their first year of government they started wielding the axe towards public transport. They have started their campaign of cuts, closures and privatisation.

At the last budget, we had an announcement about some efficiencies—\$46 million worth of cuts. We have only just seen the start of it, but now we know that those cuts are really going to come from a decision that has crept or slipped out, namely, the privatisation of trains and trams.

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

A quorum having being formed:

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: In their first budget, the Liberal government started their campaign of cuts, closures and privatisations, and I saw that they had decided to cut and reduce bus routes in my electorate. Let me read you an email that I received from a constituent that captures the type of grief these cuts have created. Aaliyah emailed me to say:

I'm [a] mom with children using the bus for going everywhere, going to TAFE, going to visit friends...and a lot of my friends in TAFE [are] using the bus [rather] than [using the] car.

This constituent takes the 224 bus route, but she has a friend with four children and another with two, and they both use the 411, 404, 405 and 401 buses. In her family, they have one car between

them. In this case, a true life example, all five bus routes mentioned have been affected by these cuts. These cuts make it more difficult for my constituents to get out and live their lives, to study, work and meet their loved ones. Without any warning, without any knowledge, this cut impacted greatly on their lives.

Every day, I see how this impacts older South Australians, students and people relying on public transport to commute to work. Often the rationale that is given is, 'Hardly anyone is on this train. Hardly anyone is on this bus,' but if you have to start work early in the morning, you have to catch the bus to get there. You might be starting at 6am but, if you do not have that bus, you might not be able to take up that role and take up that option. Public transport should be about people, not profit.

We should be talking about how we make public transport more accessible and more available. When the Minister for Transport talks about wanting to trial different things, at the heart of this should be how we can make public transport more available for more South Australians. Not every family has a car and not every family drives. Families who are not financially well off often depend on public transport to get around. It is a core role of the state government to make sure it runs efficiently. Not only is it a core role, it is something that should put at the forefront as being important in the future.

We talk about climate change, but I would like to focus on livable cities. We know that Adelaide ranks very highly as a livable city. We know it is an attractive place in which to live and we love living here but, as we go into the future with a focus on increasing our population, at the heart of it should be the ease of access to get around. We should have a diversity of transport options, whether it be the train, tram or bus. The messaging we are giving out at the moment—the \$46 million cut—is the complete opposite of what a livable city is about.

A livable city is an inclusive city. It means that you can come in and out, across, go north and south of that city. We know that it is important because when we enabled seniors to have free public transport after 9am and before 3pm, we knew that it would lower the barrier to them volunteering and getting out and about. Many times during my previous role, seniors would tell me how much it helps them that they do not have to pay for public transport during those daylight hours. So I feel that this is a retrograde step. I feel that we are failing the people of South Australia.

There was no conversation about this prior to the election. In fact, the conversation was about no privatisation, but that is simply not what is happening here. We should be finding ways of improving the system and not selling it off. My constituents value public transport. What we want to see is more investment and more of an understanding of how people can best use it, making it a valuable resource for all South Australians.

Motion carried.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (17:10): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 April 2019.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:11): I rise to speak on the Landscape South Australia Bill 2019 and thank the minister for introducing this bill and, in particular, for the work of his department and, I think, the considerable effort on his part to ensure that we have a proposed new structure to do a number of things. Of course, one is to promote the sustainable integrated management of our state's landscapes and further to make provision for the protection of the state's natural resources and, of course, the consequential repealing of the Natural Resources Management Act 2004.

Can I say in supporting this bill that much of the detail of the structure that has been outlined by the minister is the importance of two aspects: one is the protection of our water and the second is the protection of our soil resources. Much has been spoken about fauna and flora and fungi and all sorts of other things, but I want to concentrate briefly on water and soils.

I think it is fair to say that our whole Natural Resources Management Act scheme as currently exists was in some ways hijacked by the drought that we had at the commencement of this century. It was a 10-year difficult period for South Australia, and it coincided with the development of that legislation and its implementation. Unsurprisingly, therefore, it became a focus for those who had the management of that legislation and was given significant priority.

I think that there are two areas that were, sadly, not managed well or at all in relation to their protection and their advancement; one was pest management, and I think that fell into grossly inadequate provision during the operation of the previous government. It does need to be addressed, and it is an important part in the opportunity for our industries across our landscapes that rely on, for example, primary production that we have a healthy soil and adequate provision of water.

These are important for that reason, coupled with, of course, the management of feral pests. Unless we do that, then, coupled with these other aspects, there will be a failure to be able to advance the best opportunities we have in that regard. Secondly, as should be obvious, if the soil is poor, if it is infested with pests and weeds and fails to have adequate water resource and sensible and sustainable use of that, then of course the natural environment will also be under significant pressure.

I commend to the house the two papers I was provided with and discussed with Major General Michael Jeffery, a former governor-general of South Australia. Since 2017, he has been the appointed national soil advocate. One of them is his paper 'Restore the soil: prosper the nation', which was a report he gave to the prime minister in 2017. The second is a Soils for Life synopsis. Soils for Life is an Outcomes Australia project that was prepared to identify our problems in relation to land and water degradation and how they should be fixed.

In short, it is authored by the Major General and outlines a number of aspects and particularly strategies in relation to how we deal with the remediation of our soils for greater prosperity and the protection of the natural environment, as I have said. He approaches the problem through, firstly, defining the global imperative and the national opportunity this creates; secondly, fixing the paddock; and, thirdly, fixing the policy. He sets out a number of recommendations. I will not traverse them today, but I think that they are important indicators of how we progress that.

The Minister for Primary Industries also met with the Major General. Importantly, he discussed with him the opportunity of having case studies in South Australia where there is operational management that may be a contributing factor to best practice that can be presented as an example to advance these particular aspects and, where appropriate, be available for future research to ensure that we get that right.

Under a new model under the Landscape South Australia Bill, I look forward to issues in relation to soil, erosion, management and protection having some priority and resuming a very important role, as they had under the old soils board, in reaching the aspirations that are now replicated in this bill. Frankly, they were in the old management act that we are proposing to repeal, but it seemed that nobody gave any priority to them let alone actually took any programs to action their protection.

The second matter I want to raise is the aspect of protection via our national parks. Members may or may not be aware that in October this year there will be a marking of 100 years since the establishment of Flinders Chase and setting it aside for nature and heritage conservation purposes on Kangaroo Island. It was not actually declared a national park until 1958, but the development of its protection, its iconic position today as part of our natural landscape, should not be overestimated. Obviously, it is part of the place where I grew up on Kangaroo Island; therefore, I want to refer to a number of aspects.

Firstly, I look forward to marking the 100 years. Flinders Chase National Park is now seen by many as the jewel in the crown of both tourism and conservation in South Australia, drawing in visitors from around the globe. Over 160,000 people visit Kangaroo Island each year, which, incidentally, is more than go to the Galapagos Islands. They do so for a number of reasons, not the

least of which is the native environment. As I have already explained to the house, the great big snake that adorns some bikini-clad girl on *Sports Illustrated* is not native to Kangaroo Island, but apparently we are now featuring it on a calendar of Kangaroo Island that has been published just recently.

Nevertheless, members may not be aware that this particular park had a very long gestation period before it was born. It took more than 20 years of submissions from delegations of people who lived on Kangaroo Island to pass legislation that ultimately culminated in the Fauna and Flora Reserve Act 1919. Its purpose was to establish a reserve on Kangaroo Island for the protection, preservation and propagation of Australasian fauna and flora, to provide for the control of such reserve, and for other purposes.

The dedication of Flinders Chase as the reserve in 1919 signified the beginning of considerable development of active management for conservation. It is an important part of our state's history. Its establishment is an extraordinary example of a good purpose, and it provides continuing pleasure and educative value to generations of not only South Australians but people who visit from around the world.

A matter that I wish to bring to the attention of the parliament is not just how the early pioneers fought to have this reserve established but how it is part of a movement that ensures that we still do not have any foxes and rabbits on Kangaroo Island today. Within this national park, we are also able to maintain the only full river system in Australia that is untouched by any intervention. It has also been a crucible for educative research.

In fact, I sat on a board a number of years ago, chaired by the member for Heysen's father, to raise \$1 million for water research. I think we managed to raid a fair bit from the French water companies thanks to the member for Heysen's father, a former senator, to establish a fund for scholarship, research and the development of facilities at the Flinders Chase National Park, but I do not want to deviate.

What I want to point out is that, at the time of this Herculean effort to have this area declared and the legislation passed, in 1920 a publication was issued by Samuel Dixon in 1920 that recorded this, and he made a very good point about what it was for. It is important in light of the considerable number of people who visit the park today to enjoy the benefits and the newly introduced walking trail. There have been a number over the years, but more recently one was announced under the previous government in South Australia—to develop a walking trail through the park and to have an amenity that went with it to ensure that there was safe entry and evacuation in circumstances of a bushfire and the like.

These parks are not just sending through a tractor to knock down a few bushes. They are properly prepared, developed and designed so that they are safe, accessible and minimise interruption to the natural environment. That was a project of some \$5 million that had a little bit of a slow start. I for one and a number of others were not happy with the former government's decision to have the whole of the trail built by interstate operators, and we were able to secure some local people to be part of the program of this build. Anyway, it is there and operating and people enjoy it, and that is terrific.

More recently, there was some outcry from some of the residents on Kangaroo Island about the establishment of some accommodation for people to stay in as they are doing this trail. It is a trail you can do over five days, or you can just do a bit of it if you just want to have an afternoon walk, or you can do it over a sustained period. Obviously, for those who know Kangaroo Island, there is not a lot of accommodation down that end of the island, so it is reasonable that there be some facility for that.

It seems to me that there has been a bit of a backflip by the member for Mawson regarding his support for the provision of accommodation for people, where it is placed and the nature of it. Obviously, you can provide temporary accommodation, from tents to glamour tents or whatever you might want to have in that regard, or you can have permanent facilities. For those who are not familiar with the park, there are some permanent accommodation facilities available there, including houses adjacent to the lighthouse within the park, but, largely, people coming to the park would need to have accommodation.

Here is the incredible foresight of the people who worked on this for 20 years. Delegation after delegation was sent in little boats chugging across from Kangaroo Island to the governments of the day to try to convince them that there should be a declaration of this site. They described what they were seeking to achieve here, culminating in the act that I have referred to: Flinders Chase was to be a new holiday and health resort for South Australians and visitors. In fact, in the course of the history relating to this, it is recorded that the principal reason for writing the history was that future generations would understand the background of this and its importance, which Mr Dixon describes as 'at the same time securing a sanatorium and playground for tired workers suffering from brain fag or other forms of overwork'.

Interestingly, the provision of the legislation also canvasses the need to provide for accommodation for people visiting the park, so even as early as the legislation of 1919—the act to establish a reserve on Kangaroo Island—there was specific provision for the reserve to make provision for accommodation for those visiting the park. I am thankful for the foresight of those who worked hard for the development of this park and the final legislation to protect it. They have provided a magnificent legacy for South Australia and, in fact, the world.

But let's not forget that reserves and national parks are not places that we put a fence around, lock up and forget. They need care, support and attention to maintain them properly. Groups, such as the Friends of Parks, provide support to Kangaroo Island, together with officers who are employed by the Department for Environment and Water. They are an important part of that, but we cannot just lock it up. We need to properly maintain it and we need to ensure that it reaches its potential, in its 100th year, as a new holiday and health resort for South Australians and visitors from other parts. Let's not forget that they need somewhere to sleep, so they need to have some accommodation. Let's get on with it.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (17:28): I also rise to make a contribution on the Landscape South Australia Bill. I commend the Minister for Environment and Water, his office and his department for presenting the bill before the parliament as a substantial change to the way that South Australia will go about its natural resource and landscape management into the future, which is so vitally important.

There is nothing more important, sir, as you know, than looking after our natural environment and the preserving of our surrounds for us, the wildlife and of course the natural beauty that is South Australia, whether it is my electorate, the seat of Waite, where we have fantastic reserves and national parks, such as Belair National Park, or whether it is up on the APY lands, where I had the great fortune to be last week as part of my role with the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee.

I talked to many of the traditional owners on the APY about the importance of land management for them and their communities and how changes to this bit of legislation can assist them in their role and all communities across South Australia. Reforming NRM was a key part of our 2018 election commitment and we are glad that this legislation is now being debated before the house, and I think it will be well supported by members in this place.

We have listened to community, especially in the regions, and I think many people in the regions saw NRM as out of date, no longer serving its purpose, politicised and with grassroots members of the community not being involved in NRM decision-making, quite often being stacked with people who do not have natural resources management as their primary concern or primary focus. The NRM system was established by the previous government back in 2004 but, as I said, it became an over-regulated and centralised system and not focused enough on real outcomes and on practical environmental outcomes, in which I am a very strong believer.

As a result, we are proposing to reform NRM and start to refocus natural resources management on a back-to-basics approach to land, pest, plant and animal species and water management. Given the very dry conditions Australia is having at the moment, and particularly South Australia, nothing is more important than water management and the way that we look after that precious resource. The crux of the proposed legislation is to replace the NRM Act with the landscape South Australia act.

This will be a chance to have a biodiverse and sustainable community. It will also give our regional and rural communities a greater say in the management of our natural resources and provide

more security and confidence in the system. In my own community I talk to many of my friends groups, especially the Friends of Belair National Park and the like. There are many friends groups and natural resources management groups in the member for Heysen's electorate, and we share a common boundary. There is a desire for friends groups who are active managers of land and reserves to be involved in decision-making in the work that they do, so I know that this reform is well supported at the grassroots level.

There will also be an ability to deliver cost-of-living relief through the capping of the land and water levies to CPI. This is another way that we are committed to helping South Australians with the cost of living. We have seen that with the reduction in the emergency services levy (ESL) in the last state budget and with our cost-of-living measures, such as rate capping and council reform, which of course have been held up by those opposite. This is certainly another measure where we can assist South Australians with the cost of living.

As I said, the landscape South Australia act will replace the NRM Act. Boards will be decentralised, putting the decision-making authority in the hands of the community. Importantly, there will be the establishment of Green Adelaide. Green Adelaide will focus on seven key priorities working towards Adelaide becoming one of the most ecologically vibrant and climate-resilient cities in the world. In the 21st century, we live in an era of climate change and consciousness of this very important issue, especially on this side of the house. It is fantastic that the Morrison Liberal government is meeting its Paris climate commitment and doing its part as a player on the global stage.

You do not often hear about that in this parliament. Those opposite like to think that they are the only ones who care about the environment, but it is actually this side of the house that, in a practical way, helps communities and helps people and, more importantly, helps the environment. That is what we are on about and that is what we will be delivering through this bill. Green Adelaide will be focusing on creating another climate-resilient city in the world, which is so important. We are a dry city in a dry state in the driest continent in the world, so it is our responsibility to do all that we can. Most importantly, and something for which I commend the minister, is his desire to remove extensive bureaucratic business plan development and focus on outcomes for our natural environment. I think that is something that whole of government needs to do.

In my local area, which I am particularly proud of, under the proposed boundaries of the act we are looking at nine new boundaries, being Green Adelaide, Kangaroo Island, Limestone Coast, Hills and Fleurieu, Murraylands and Riverland, Northern and Yorke, Eyre Peninsula, South Australia Arid lands and Alinytjara Wilurara. Most of my community and my electorate of Waite will be residing in the Green Adelaide space and a little bit in the Hills and Fleurieu space.

In our area and in my community, we have Belair National Park. The wonderful Wittunga Botanic Garden in Blackwood also sits in my electorate and it is fantastic that a re-elected a Morrison government, as part of the City Deals, is investing \$750,000 into the Wittunga Botanic Garden. It is thanks to our support on this side of the house that we can invest in Wittunga. It was those opposite who at one time discussed selling Wittunga. I believe it was in a Treasury note to then treasurer Snelling to privatise our botanic garden in South Australia, which was an absolute disgrace. The residents in my community know that the Liberal Party, both state and federal, certainly support Wittunga as a fantastic asset.

At Brownhill Creek, it is fantastic to be working with organisations such as the Brownhill Creek Association in their land management. As part of the South Australian election commitment and in the last budget, we have provided \$100,000 of natural resource management funding to the Brownhill Creek Association for their fantastic work in rejuvenating that part of South Australia, which will of course feed into the greater Wirraparinga Loop Trail.

Once again, another fantastic announcement as part of the City Deals between the Morrison Liberal government and the state Marshall Liberal government was a \$3 million investment in Carrick Hill and what will become the Mitcham Hills walking trail. People will be able to start at Urrbrae House in my electorate, walk through Carrick Hill and the fantastic state asset we have there, through Wirraparinga, through Brownhill Creek, up into the Belair National Park area of my electorate, up to Wittunga and finish at the Colebrook Reconciliation Park on Shepherds Hill Road. That is all possible

through the fantastic work and the proposals that we have in this legislation, which is about making the way we look after the natural environment possible through grassroots participation. That is so important.

I know the regions are important to South Australia, and there will be key benefits in this reform for the primary production sector. One is reducing the costs to businesses and households through introducing a CPI cap on land and water levies, enshrining the principle that boards will work in partnership and collaboratively with primary producers and local communities to deliver real outcomes on the ground.

At times, we have seen that tension between primary producers and natural land management, and more recently we have seen that tension between primary producers and animal activists, when we saw animal activists in Victoria close down a perfectly legitimate farming operation. Ensuring there is great collaboration between those who care about the preservation of our natural resources and the land and primary producers who work the land and are some of the best carers of our land is so important. That collaboration would be enhanced under this legislation.

The landscape priorities fund will deliver landscape scale restoration projects and provide greater opportunities for natural resources management and focus programs and initiatives to benefit our primary producers. It is vitally important that we get that right. There is also going to be a grassroots fund and the grassroots fund will be administered by each board rather than by the centralised fund.

As I said, that is empowering local communities and volunteers who are so active on the ground. We could not maintain our natural parks and reserves across South Australia if it were not for volunteers who go out there regularly and undertake feral weed control and the like. I am always very grateful for what the volunteers do in my electorate as part of returning landscape to its natural environment.

The feedback has been fantastic, especially in the regions, about having autonomy and control in the way that funds are administered and disbursed. This is about putting control back into the regions rather than having issues resolved by a central bureaucracy. It is a great way for grassroot communities to connect with the local boards and, of course, the local volunteers. The minister will determine the size of the funding pool available for grants in each region. For most regions, grassroots grants will be funded from land and water levies collected within that region.

As I said, there is an important part on climate change and resilience. This is the first time that climate change will be embedded in a legislative framework for how we manage our natural resources. During their 16 years in government, there was a lot of talk by those opposite about climate change, a lot of talk about getting carbon out of the City of Adelaide.

An honourable member: It was a lot of hot air.

Mr DULUK: It was a lot of hot air, but I always thought it was ironic that they wanted to get carbon out of the City of Adelaide but they never once proposed to stop the V8s. I know that the member for Hammond would be very disappointed if we ever did, but I always thought it was a bit of an oxymoron that the former government loved the V8s so much, as do I, but also wanted a carbon-neutral Adelaide, which sometimes is a bit hard to achieve when you have a petrol race every year in the city. But I digress.

For the first time, we will be putting climate change actions at the forefront of government legislation and change. That is what we are doing. The significance of climate change to the management of our natural resources is given express recognition in the objects of this new legislation and, as I said, that need for climate change, resilient communities and landscapes. Greening Adelaide's streets and parks will be a priority for Green Adelaide, helping to build the resilience of the city to changes in climate, and this is very important.

Rates and council rates being set across the board is being debated in my community at the moment. Some members in the Mitcham council, including the mayor, are proposing a 4.25 per cent rate rise, and I somehow think that the council is going to settle at about 3.7 per cent to 3.8 per cent, which is still way above where inflation is running, and I think it is only one of two councils that is looking to increase council rates by more than the LGA CPI. One of the excuses that Mitcham council

is using to bring in an almost 4 per cent rate rise on residents in my community is the need to plant more trees.

Yes, we do need to plant more trees to help biodiversity in my community, but you can plant more trees without raising council rates by 4 per cent. At the moment, councils are going through their consultation process on rates in the community. I think that is something to bear in mind and to work with the state government on in terms of what we are doing for Green Adelaide and how we can achieve a greener Adelaide and a greener suburbia without affecting the hip pocket of mums and dads and many people in my community who are on fixed incomes. I ask the City of Mitcham and their hardworking councillors to bear that in mind as they impose an unnecessary rate rise on my community.

For urban communities, Green Adelaide will deliver initiatives to confront the challenges of a changing climate and urban density and pursue an agenda to transform our city into a world-leading, sustainable, green, climate-resilient city. This will underpin Adelaide's livability, environmental sustainability and economic prosperity for future generations. It will also provide broader benefits to other urban communities through Green Adelaide's role in sharing knowledge and expertise across the state. As I said, I would love the City of Mitcham to get on board with Green Adelaide to see how the two bodies can work in a collaborative manner.

Another issue I know that is very important to you, sir, is weed control, and it is a critical component in preserving biodiversity in the region. This bill looks to place an emphasis on declared weeds and feral pest control and the role of the regional landscape boards to carry out those measures.

In the APY lands last week, one of the issues raised with the committee was feral camels and donkeys that are trampling all over the natural landscape. There is the issue of culling them, getting them off the land and reducing the number of feral animals that roam in central Australia and the central parts of our state, which are so important. At the moment, they are obviously being attracted to water spots, as the inland is so dry and arid. We are working with the community in that regard.

Of course, stakeholders also require roadside weed management and always raise this with us, so we need to give that further attention, and that is important. I know that the clearing of roadside verges has been an issue for a long time and has been raised in this house many times, and it is important to give individuals the ability to clear roadside verges.

I think this is a very good reform bill and one I am very keen to support and get through this parliament so that we can implement it and work with our local volunteer communities on the ground, who do so much for the preservation of our natural environment.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

**NATIONAL ELECTRICITY (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (RETAILER RELIABILITY OBLIGATION)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:47 the house adjourned until Thursday 16 May 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***SCHOOL ZONING**

689 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2 April 2019). What is the total capital cost of moving year 7 into high school?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): While some of the funds announced for new capital are only necessary to enable capacity for the inclusion of year 7s, it is important to note that a significant proportion is also to meet the growing capacity needs that many of these schools were facing even without the year 7s. It is also noteworthy that a significant proportion of the announced capital investment will go towards specialist learning areas that will benefit other students at the school in addition to the year 7s.

Further details regarding investments to support year 7 moving to high school, along with other capital upgrades, are available online at <https://www.education.sa.gov.au/sites-and-facilities/upgrades-and-new-schools/major-school-upgrades>.

SCHOOL ZONING

690 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2 April 2019). How many in-zone enrolments are expected in year 7 in 2022 at:

- (a) Adelaide High School?
- (b) Adelaide Botanic High School?
- (c) Brighton Secondary School?
- (d) Marryatville High School?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

Information regarding expected enrolments at Adelaide High School and Adelaide Botanic High School can be found at: <https://www.education.sa.gov.au/sites/default/files/cbd-zone-change-data-method-presentation.pdf>.

Information regarding expected enrolments at Brighton Secondary School and Marryatville High School are:

School	Likely in zone enrolments in year 7 in 2022
Brighton Secondary School	158
Marryatville High School	94

This information is based on a count of children in public primary schools in year 3 in 2018 who live in the school zone, adjusted for the historic proportion of children attending their local school and number of in-zone non-government school children entering at year 8.

These figures do not account for children moving into the zone, children moving out of the zone, and changes in numbers of both government and non-government school children who live in the zone choosing the school.

TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

723 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). Will the Minister table an organisational chart of the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment? If not, why not?

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

On 6 March 2019, the Joyce review was released confirming the findings of a review of South Australia's international engagement.

The Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment will release a high level organisational chart in the coming weeks and is working with the on implementing an organisational structure that best responds to the recommendations of the Joyce review and supports the government's key economic priorities.

LOCAL HEALTH NETWORKS

733 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14 May 2019). On what dates between 18 March 2018 and 4 April 2019 were meetings held of the health advisory councils of the following local health networks:

- (a) Country Health SA Local Health Network?
- (b) Women's and Children's Health Network?
- (c) Central Adelaide Local Health Network?
- (d) Southern Adelaide Local Health Network?
- (e) Northern Adelaide Local Health Network?

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

(a) Country Health SA Local Health Network	Meeting Dates
	16 April 2018 22 June 2018 13 August 2018 8 October 2018 17 December 2018 18 February 2019

(b) Women's and Children's Health Network	Meeting Dates
	19 April 2018 18 June 2018 9 August 2018 18 December 2018 19 February 2019

(c) Central Adelaide Local Health Network	Meeting Dates
	13 April 2018 8 June 2018 10 August 2018

(d) Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	Meeting Dates
	20 April 2018 15 June 2018 24 August 2018 12 October 2018 6 December 2018 22 February 2019

(e) Northern Adelaide Local Health Network	Meeting Dates
	4 June 2018 10 September 2018 10 December 2018 25 March 2019

SCHOOL FUNDING

789 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14 May 2019). What criteria were used to calculate infrastructure funding packages for Brighton Secondary School and Seaview High School announced in February 2019?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

The following factors were considered in relation to allocating funding:

- the impact of the transition of year 7 to high school by 2022;
- analysis of current and historical enrolment figures;
- forecast school-age population growth;
- school capacity and condition; and
- historical maintenance.