

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 4 June 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 11:01 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.

*Matter of Privilege*

### MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

**The SPEAKER (11:02):** I rise to make a statement in regard to a matter of privilege that was raised in the final minutes of the last sitting week. I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege raised by the member for West Torrens in the house on 16 May; however, before addressing that matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it relates to this house and its members.

Privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by the vote of the house on a substantive motion. As we have touched on in the past, McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*, in my view, makes the test for whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege by defining it as a matter that can 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties'.

Generally speaking, any act or omission which obstructs or impedes the house in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such house in the discharge of his or her duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such a result, may be treated as a contempt and therefore be considered a matter of privilege even though there is no precedent of the offence.

I refer to the matter raised by the member for West Torrens in relation to an answer given by the Premier to a question in the house on 16 May. More specifically, the Leader of the Opposition asked the following question to the Premier: 'Has the Premier stripped all funding from Brand SA?' The Premier, in responding to the question, made a few preliminary remarks and, after being directed back to the question, stated:

I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the answers that we have provided in the Legislative Council.

The member for West Torrens then referred to the following question asked in the other place on 16 May to the Hon. David Ridgway, Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, by the Hon. Kyam Maher:

...as part of the Joyce review, which the minister mentioned, will he rule out that Brand SA has been stripped of its funding?

The Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment provided the following answer:

As my colleague the honourable Treasurer said earlier, we are not going to play the rule in, rule out game. It's a game the opposition has played. We are not going to play the rule in, rule out game. We have a budget on 18 June, and that's when all will be revealed.

The member for West Torrens then went on to quote a letter the opposition was in receipt of, dated 16 May 2019, from the Premier to the chair of Brand SA, Mr Peter Joy. The member for West Torrens indicated that the letter was delivered to Mr Joy before question time on 16 May. Without quoting from the letter, its contents reveal that, following a review, the government had decided that funds previously provided to Brand SA to promote the state will be reallocated.

The member for West Torrens contrasts the content of the Premier's letter to Mr Joy, together with the date and time of receipt of the letter by Mr Joy, with that part of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment's answer in the other place that, 'We have a budget on 18 June, and that's when all will be revealed.'

The member for West Torrens refers to the answers provided by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment in the other place, attributed those answers to the Premier, and alleges that the Premier has misled the house as to when a government decision would be announced in relation to Brand SA funding.

The member for West Torrens has provided me with further information about a subsequent announcement made by the Premier on this matter at a media conference held on 20 May. The member for West Torrens states:

On Monday, 20 May 2019, the Premier made further statements at a media conference in relation to that matter stating that he had personally signed, before question time and therefore before he provided his answer to the House of Assembly of 16 May 2019, a letter to Mr Peter Joy of Brand SA announcing that the South Australian government had made a decision to not continue to fund Brand SA.

Further, the member West Torrens goes on to say:

The Premier has now confirmed publicly that he knew before question time on 16 May 2019 that his government had decided not to fund Brand SA and that the Premier had prior knowledge of that decision and, indeed, he had personally signed correspondence to Brand SA announcing his government's decision before he made his statement to the House of Assembly in question time.

The member for West Torrens alleges that the acknowledgement by the Premier that he had signed, before question time on 16 May, a letter to Mr Joy concerning the fate of Brand SA funding was synonymous to the Premier 'announcing that the South Australian government had made a decision to not continue to fund Brand SA'.

I have read the answers provided in the other place by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment and I cannot find any reference in those answers that indicate there was going to be an announcement or that any information would be provided in the form of an announcement prior to the release of the budget papers on 18 June. At the time the answers were provided to the Legislative Council and referred to by the Premier, there was nothing to suggest that the government's intention was to make an announcement about ongoing funding to Brand SA.

The fact that Mr Joy chose to disseminate correspondence he had received concerning the government's movements on Brand SA funding cannot, in my opinion, be considered sufficient enough to be regarded as the government's announcement in relation to Brand SA's funding. In my opinion, it would be reasonable to assume that the Premier's correspondence to Mr Joy was sent as a courtesy, informing him in his role as chair of Brand SA of sensitive, early advice—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens and the member for Kaurana can leave for five minutes for laughing during my finding.

*The honourable members for West Torrens and Kaurana having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** In my opinion, it would be reasonable to assume that the Premier's correspondence to Mr Joy was sent as a courtesy, informing him in his role as chair of Brand SA of sensitive, early advice ahead of any official government announcement or the release of the budget papers.

In the Chair's opinion, whilst I can understand the merits of this submission, this is not a matter of privilege for the reasons I stated earlier. In the Chair's view, the matter could not 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties'. Accordingly, I do not propose to give the precedence that would enable any member to pursue this matter immediately as a matter of privilege. This decision does not prevent the member for West Torrens or any other member from proceeding with a motion on the specific matter by giving notice in the usual way.

#### **MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (11:09):** I rise on a matter of privilege. On the last day this place sat, Thursday 16 May, during question time I asked the Minister for Child Protection the following question:

Is the minister outsourcing the assessment of foster or kinship carers to a Victorian company, Assessments Australia, or any other private or non-government organisations?

The minister answered 'No.' That was the minister's complete answer. This response is demonstrably false. We on this side say the minister has intentionally misled this house. The response of a flat-out no, when the answer is yes, can only be seen as impeding or obstructing the house in the discharge of—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: raising a question of privilege is to identify the evidence that is to be presented to support that, not an argument about what is demonstrably untrue or not. That is a matter for you, Mr Speaker.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to say this once: if I feel that the member for Badcoe is deviating from what a matter of privilege should entail, then I will intervene and only I will intervene.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I have not finished. It is reasonable that members do provide, much to the displeasure of some, some preamble sometimes to these matters, so I will listen carefully to make sure that I capture that. Obviously, that will be reined in if it is abused, but I will listen carefully to all the matters of privilege, as I have done in the past and as I will continue to do. I appreciate the Deputy Premier's sentiments and I will be listening carefully, but the member for Badcoe is able to provide me with some relevant basis for the matter of privilege so that I can adjudicate on whether a prima facie case may or may not exist. Member for Badcoe.

**Ms STINSON:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I know that you are fond of McGee and *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand* and, as we heard only moments ago from your very lips, it states that the test for a matter of privilege is defined as a matter that can, and I quote—

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms STINSON:** Honestly!

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier will be seated. The member for Badcoe, let's get to the point. I am aware of what the test is; please get on with it, thank you.

**Ms STINSON:** I quote:

...genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the House in the discharge of its duties.

The misleading and indeed false response of the Minister for Child Protection is a stark example of such impeding and obstruction.

**An honourable member:** This is outrageous.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kavel can leave for five minutes.

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

**Ms STINSON:** Firstly, it clearly obstructs and impedes the house for a mistruth to be told. That in itself is an impediment to the integrity and smooth running of this house. Secondly, were it not for the untrue statement, follow-up questions would have been asked by the opposition. That opportunity was lost. That is a clear obstruction and impediment to the work of this house, not to mention the opposition's duty to hold the government to account on behalf of the people. Thirdly, this wanton misleading of the house demonstrates not just a disregard but a contempt for the validity and integrity of this place. I will of course provide documents to you, Mr Speaker; however, this question is one of such obviousness that one would hope that the minister simply owns up to the falsehood. For some time, the assessment—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Get to the evidence.

**Ms STINSON:** I am getting to the end here. For some time, the assessment of foster carers has been done by external agencies, including not-for-profit groups, that recruit foster carers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Ms STINSON:** This is not a difficult fact to verify. However, the minister responded, no, that foster carer assessments are not outsourced to private or non-government organisations. Secondly, the Victorian-based company Assessments Australia is and has been completing kinship care assessments for the department. Why else would their website have forms with the Department for Child Protection logos on them for department workers to refer kinship carers to Assessments Australia for assessment? I have that document and I will submit it to you, sir. The minister has misled the house. We ask you to consider the material, make inquiries with the minister and rule on this stark example as a matter of privilege.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Badcoe. I ask the member for Badcoe to please present me with all relevant evidence that she has in her possession and I will come back to the house at a reasonable time.

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today year 12 students from Pembroke School, who are joining us at some stage, and also year 6 students from Blackfriars Priory School, hosted by the Minister for Child Protection. Welcome to parliament today.

#### **STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:14):** I move:

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

**The SPEAKER:** An absolute majority is present. Is it seconded?

**An honourable member:** Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

### *Condolence*

#### **HAWKE, HON. R.J.L.**

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:14):** I move:

That the House of Assembly express its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Robert James Lee Hawke AC, former Prime Minister of Australia, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service, and as a mark of respect to his memory that the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Bob Hawke was a man whose memory is revered by people from all walks of life: from workers, as he represented them; business leaders, as he engaged them in the cause of economic growth with equity; young Australians, encouraged as he gave them more opportunity to get a better education; followers of sport, as he watched and played with them; punters, as he bet with them; beer drinkers, until he became prime minister; world leaders, as Australia's international influence grew under his leadership and our relationship with the United States remains steadfast; and, of course, our senior citizens, as he became one of them.

The economic and social contribution of our nation's 23<sup>rd</sup> Prime Minister is enduring. It touched millions; it still does. As South Australians, we take pride that he was born in our state. We welcome the fact that his legacy is permanently honoured in the Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Library at the University of South Australia. In between, he lived a remarkable life. For most of it—for more than 70 years—he was a member of the Australian Labor Party, having joined in 1947, but across the political divide Bob Hawke is rightly remembered as one of our greatest leaders.

He was born at Bordertown on 9 December 1929, the second son of Clem and Ellie Hawke. His father was a congregationalist minister, his mother a teacher. Their first son, Neil, died at the age of 17 from meningitis, then a condition for which there was no cure. With their hopes invested in their second son, Clem told him, 'Son, you should do your best to improve the lives of others.' That is what Bob Hawke set out to do as he prepared for a career in the trade union movement and then in the Australian federal parliament.

The family moved to Western Australia, where he went to university before going on to Oxford as a Rhodes scholar, writing his thesis on wage fixing in Australia and establishing a world

beer drinking record—a yard in 11 seconds. The contrasting dimensions of the famous Hawke character were evident from an early age. By 1959, he was the ACTU's advocate in the national wage case, which resulted in a weekly rise of 15 shillings—three times the award of the previous year. This was regarded as a personal triumph for him.

A decade later, Bob Hawke became president of the ACTU, a position he held until his election to the federal parliament in 1980. During his leadership of the union movement it became much more politically active. In 1971, his commitment to the selection of sporting teams on a non-racial basis led to a ban on the South African cricket team touring Australia. His abhorrence of apartheid would lead to further effective action while he was prime minister in support of human rights in South Africa.

While Gough Whitlam was prime minister, Bob Hawke was also federal president of the Labor Party. This became a clash of the two colossal intellects. The two did not always agree. Bob Hawke learned a lot from Gough Whitlam about how to avoid chaos and crisis in government. When the Whitlam government was dismissed by the Governor-General, there were calls for a nationwide strike. Bob Hawke insisted that the issue had to be dealt with through the ballot box and not in clashes on the streets. This underlined a key theme of his public life: the desirability for consensus rather than conflict in resolving industrial and political challenges.

In the late 1970s, the ALP and the union movement were deeply divided about uranium mining. Again, Bob Hawke's advocacy was courageous and convincing. He memorably told the 1979 ACTU national conference that banning uranium mining would be a monument to futility. South Australia remains indebted to his consistently strong support of the industry. Without it, the Olympic Dam mine would not have been able to proceed in the 1980s. By then, Bob Hawke had become prime minister and insisted that his government support South Australia's opportunity to develop this world-class mine. This was not the only issue on which he successfully challenged prevailing party orthodoxies and assumptions.

During his leadership of our nation, the Commonwealth Bank, Qantas and TAA were prepared for privatisation, Telstra was opened up for competition, personal and company taxes were reduced, the entry of foreign banks was allowed, the financial industry was deregulated, the dollar was floated and tariffs were cut. He urged the opening up of Australia's trade and economic relations to the rest of the world, particularly with China. In fact, Bob Hawke anticipated before most the China opportunity.

He encouraged all aspects of our relationship with China, but human rights, not economic ties, became his priority in the immediate aftermath of the student uprising in Tiananmen Square in 1989. To his eternal credit, our prime minister granted more than 40,000 Chinese students permanent residency when they feared persecution should they return home.

In a lot of what he did, Bob Hawke was supported by the federal opposition led by John Howard. Their relationship showed what can be achieved when political discourse rises above meaningless slogans and cynicism. The respect between the two endured in their retirement years. Both had been political winners. Each won four elections. Each gave the government they led strong, sensible direction and each was able to rely on competent ministries operated through good cabinet processes and sound Public Service advice. Each led significant policy reform as nation builders. Each contributed to a golden period in our nation's politics.

Uniquely, Bob Hawke was a leader and a larrikin: a leader with a brilliant mind able to advocate with great passion and conviction; a larrikin with a common touch. At times, he wore his heart on his sleeve; occasionally, there were public tears. His love of his nation and its people was beyond doubt as he took them with him on his long journey of successful reforming government.

In what he was able to do while prime minister, we should remember the contribution made by the constant support he received from Hazel, while his retirement years were enriched by his marriage to Blanche d'Alpuget. To Blanche and his children, Susan, Stephen and Rosslyn, we send our sympathy and our gratitude for a husband and father who put it all out there for Australia. We thank Bob Hawke for a life of outstanding public service to our nation. Vale, Robert Hawke.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (11:22):** I thank the Premier for his remarks and take the opportunity to speak on this important motion before the house. Bob Hawke, Australia's longest serving Labor prime minister, was a leader, a reformer and, yes, indeed, a lovable larrikin. Over his 50-plus years on the national stage, he gave Australia confidence of its place in the world and economic structures to secure that confidence for many decades to come. Every Australian's life benefits from his social, economic and political legacies.

Bob was born in Bordertown on 9 December 1929, the year of the Wall Street crash. The son of a preacher and a teacher, history records that the future prime minister's name, Robert, was chosen after his mother's premonition that her son was destined for greatness, hence the name Robert, which means 'of shining fame'. His early childhood in South Australia was against a backdrop of the Great Depression, with unemployment hovering at 30 per cent, supply shortages and indeed an age of austerity.

As a religious leader, Bob's family became a cornerstone of the Bordertown community. Care and concern for the community would have dominated dinner table discussions. When he was six, his father was called to a new ministry in Maitland on Yorke Peninsula. Parishioners awaited the arrival of little Bobbie with the forewarning that he was a terrible kid but also lovable. That proved to be the case. While Bob was described as a scrapper at school, mothers found him very endearing, very friendly, full of wit and daring—a marker of his future exploits.

There were early setbacks. The climate of Maitland did not agree with Bob and he stopped growing at a normal rate due to a respiratory illness. So, at the age of 10, the Hawkes moved Robert to the west, establishing their home in the high-density, working-class area of West Leederville in Perth. Bob received a scholarship to Perth Modern School, in those days a place for upward scramblers from the working and lower middle class trying to escape their impoverished backgrounds. Bob excelled academically and was popular at school for his quick wit, high marks and sporting skills. He was already proving to be the classic Australian all-rounder. He was a keen and capable cricketer, showing early leadership skills.

Politics would first emerge in his life at the tender age of 18 at the University of Western Australia, where he formed the first ALP club on campus in 1948, emerging as a student politician. This was the beginning of seven decades—70 years—of active contribution to the labour movement. There would be a side story, however, that leads to an unusual piece of Australian folklore and that, of course, is that shortly after winning his first job, with Mobil Oil, he won a Rhodes Scholarship.

During his scholarship and tenure at England's Oxford University, where the lovable larrikin characteristically engaged and emerged, he set a new world record for beer drinking: 2½ pints in 11 seconds. I challenge anyone in this place to match that record. More importantly, his thesis at Oxford University focused on the Australian system of industrial relations conciliation and arbitration. That academic work would later secure Bob a role as a researcher and industrial advocate with the ACTU. So it was that the seeds of change would start to grow.

Each next step was guided by the early advice of his father: 'If you believe in the fatherhood of God, you must believe in the brotherhood of man. You should try to improve the lives of others.' Just over 60 years ago, the wages of all Australians were determined by centralised wage fixing. Bob's role at the ACTU as an advocate placed him at the very centre of the national industrial and economic affairs.

By 1967, he was elected as the president of the ACTU, promising, importantly, to 'work in harmony with all sectors of the movement'. During his time at the ACTU, Bob achieved the reputation of being the most intellectually gifted and successful advocate ever to pursue the cause of the working man. Bob's public image began to grow. Often described as a good performer, a great crowd pleaser and able to fill the halls, he began to look at the political stage and bigger challenges that could shape the future of our nation.

After taking a little longer than anticipated, in 1980 Bob entered parliament as the member for Wills. Immediately, he was appointed to the shadow cabinet by Bill Hayden, as the shadow minister for IR. In 1983, Fraser, the Liberal prime minister who ended the Whitlam era eight years earlier, called a general election to capitalise on internal ALP tensions. Simultaneously, Bob Hawke ended those tensions by taking over the leadership from a generous Bill Hayden. Fraser had gone

to the Governor-General seeking to campaign against Hayden, and when he left the grounds of Government House he was facing the ascendant Hawke.

The script was rewritten with a new ending for Fraser and Labor was back in power, this time with skills and experience not evident in the Whitlam era. A new era would change Australia in so many ways. The Hawke government transformed our country's economy. Bob was able to fuse his experience as a trade union leader and acute knowledge of the workings of the economy with the levers of government. His prime ministership was described as a force of consensus but on Labor's terms.

He led a cabinet he described as 'universally regarded as probably the best cabinet since Federation', and they set about the business of founding a modern Australia. The first year of the Hawke government got the big ideas out to the Australian people: recovery, reconciliation, reconstruction and the social wages concept. Such an approach reflects Bob's leadership ability to announce and sell a vision to the electorate while raising the inspirational umbrella that articulated a proposed reform.

Bob saw the historic wages accord as a necessary precondition to serious structural reforms required to modernise our national economy, yet the wages accord was not just a means to an end. It spoke to Bob's core values and those of the labour movement: the concept of justice all round. The ability to bring business, the union movement and government together on a shared mission set a fine political example for all future politicians. It broke down the barriers, ushering in enterprise bargaining and providing balance to the Australian IR system. The social legacies were entwined with the economic reforms.

The Hawke government ensured access to taxpayer-funded universal health care and universal compulsory superannuation contributions—both vital security nets. These initiatives stemmed from the values of the labour movement. The Hawke government doubled the number of childcare places and public housing funds and increased the old-age pension. Focused on the importance of education, Hawke's era oversaw a unique equalisation of education, with school retention rates rising from the lowest in any developed nation to 70 per cent.

With Bob as PM and Paul Keating as treasurer, the federal Labor government set out to open Australia for business. The floating of the dollar and the decision to deregulate the financial system exposed the domestic market to global competition, driving efficiency and productivity improvements. Our own state's wine industry began to see new and bigger markets: a shift that has driven growth, wealth and jobs in our state for decades, amongst other reforms that affected South Australia.

With major reforms occurring at home, Bob was also able to make a substantial contribution on the global stage. Bob's hatred of bigotry, wherever it was, showed itself, and he judged men and women on the merit of their argument rather than on their remuneration, political affiliation, colour or creed. Bob was the international flag-bearer for the imposition of financial sanctions against South Africa, later described as 'the dagger which finally immobilised apartheid'. Nelson Mandela himself later confirmed to Hawke that it was only 'because of you' that he was freed from imprisonment on Robben Island.

I had the benefit of meeting Bob a couple of times, but one occasion undoubtedly stands out above all others in my mind. In 2007, I was the campaign manager for the Wakefield campaign in the federal election. Nick Champion was the Labor candidate back then. It was an important Liberal-held seat and one that Labor needed to win to form federal government. All sorts of offers were coming in for marginal seats back then, and rumours were going around that Bob was willing to travel to campaign. He was well known for that. I got on the phone to his office—Julie I think was the name of his loyal assistant—to arrange a time for Bob to come to South Australia. It was all very spontaneous and last minute.

I received a phone call on the Thursday before the weekend advising that Bob was able to join us on Sunday and that arrangements should be put in place. We could not really arrange or do much at short notice, so I thought, 'What can we do with Hawkie to win votes in the seat of Wakefield?' There was not much we could do apart from take him to a shopping centre, so we decided to take him out to Munno Para. I got a phone call the day before he arrived, or something to that effect, and Julie said to me, 'There's one thing we need you to arrange for Mr Hawke's convenience.' I said, 'Oh,

yes, what's that?' She said, 'We need you to arrange a car and a driver.' I thought, 'I can arrange that.' So I cleaned out my car.

I had heard that Bob had actually hit a hole in one playing golf the week before. He was a pretty keen golfer. So I was cleaning out the car and I found a golf tee in the mess in my car. I thought that, rather than ditch it, I would put it on the console of my Commodore. As I was driving with Bob in the front and Blanche in the back with Julie the assistant, I was incredibly nervous. When Bob got in the car he said, 'G'day, lad.' I said, 'Mr Hawke.' He wasn't saying too much. He just got in the car and started doing his crossword. He said, 'How long is the trip to Munno Para?' I said, 'It's going to take us around about 35 to 40 minutes.'

It was a Sunday morning. I was incredibly nervous. We got to Gepps Cross and not a word had been spoken. He was just diligently doing his crossword. He put the paper down and he saw the golf tee and said, 'You play golf, son?' I said, 'I don't mind playing every now and then. I heard you hit a hole in one last week, Hawkie.' The paper went down and he was off, telling me all about his hole in one. So the conversation started.

We got out to Munno Para and—I will never forget this—I introduced him to Champs (to Nick) and he said, 'Right, here's the way it's going to work, Nick. I am going to walk into the shopping centre and introduce myself to people and then I am going to introduce them to you. Are you okay with that?' and Nick said, 'No worries.' So we walk into Munno Para shopping centre completely unannounced; no-one knew we were there or that we were going. It was a Sunday morning, Munno Para shopping centre, systems normal, people going through their routine.

We walked in and there were a few people around. The first shop on the right was a fruit and veg shop and there was some fellow, on a low wage, just going about his business stacking apples, and he looked up and there was Bob Hawke. He looked at Hawkie and as soon as Hawkie acknowledged the recognition he made a beeline for this bloke and said, 'G'day, mate. My name's Bob Hawke!' and the man goes, 'Strewth, I know, Hawkie!' and they started chatting. Bob said, 'I will introduce you to my friend Nick Champion,' and they had a bit of chat.

Then he moved to the next shop and the next shop, and within about 15 minutes word had started to spread throughout Munno Para shopping centre that something special was going on and crowds started to form. Then I witnessed the magic: you could see the way he lifted, the way he started to respond to ordinary people. Within about 30 minutes, there was an energy and a buzz that I have never seen in my working life; it was utterly extraordinary.

There was a hairdresser with three ladies sitting there getting their hair cut, going about their ordinary business. The next second, Hawkie was banging on the window at the ladies getting their hair cut and they were all saying, 'Hawkie!' He walked into the hairdressing salon and stood behind the little lady in the middle who was getting her hair done. She was looking in the mirror and, before you knew it, he was picking up her hair and snipping away at it—it was just magic.

We walked further down, to the Wendy's. The crowd was buzzing and Hawkie was up and about. A lady at the Wendy's was halfway through her soft serve ice cream, I kid you not (and, if I am honest, this lady was no oil painting), and she said to Hawkie, 'Do you want some ice cream, Hawkie?' He said, 'No worries,' and he ate a big scoop of her soft serve. Then he had ice cream all around his lips and, before you knew it, she said, 'Give us a kiss, Hawkie!' and he went straight for it on the lips—and everyone absolutely erupted.

The magnetism, the enthusiasm and the raw energy that came from Bob were sincere. Kim Beazley put it beautifully recently when he said that there was a prevailing sense of confidence and enthusiasm and a love for people and their affection for him, but there was never narcissism. He did not see the narcissism in Hawkie that is often attributable to those sorts of characteristics, and I think that is what made him incredibly unique. He was a giant.

There is never going to be another Bob Hawke, and everyone who wants to emulate him should stop trying. He was an extraordinary human being, a giant of our great movement. Most importantly, this country is a fairer place because of Bob Hawke. That is a legacy that will never leave him and one that should always be honoured.



**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:38):** I rise to support the Premier's motion and acknowledge the contribution made by the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition in respect of the outstanding contribution that Mr Hawke has made to political life, and indeed to public life generally, covering the period that he led the ACTU. I would like to make a few comments and reflect on Mr Hawke's visits to South Australia in the 1970s, during his time as the leader of the ACTU, which I think was an important developmental and educational period for the purposes of, ultimately, public life in the parliament and in government.

As the minister now responsible for gambling, I would hope that if the commissioner for liquor and gambling reads any of this contribution he understands the context in which it is presented—the 1970s, which predated him and the laws that currently apply, which fortunately are not retrospective. But let's place it to this: Mr Hawke did frequently visit South Australia, as I am sure he went around to other regions of the country. He visited South Australia for a number of activities associated with both his leadership of the ACTU and his meetings with other leaders of very powerful unions that operated both here and around the country.

He came for a number of other extracurricular activities, and I will address his membership of the round table for poker playing. I will not mention who else was at the table, other than the fact that my father was one of them. The regular sittings they had of these occasions were in a context of a time when gambling was still largely done through SP bookmaking and when the Totalizator Agency Board was a new concept being developed but was not yet in place.

The card playing also predated the era of the 1980s, which came with the advent of the Casino and subsequently, in the latter part of the that decade, the establishment of poker machines. It is within that context I say these few matters. Firstly, it was a game that had various different leaders in politics and industry around the table. It was also a time whilst I was at school and university when I was frequently the handbag for my father in relation to events, given my mother was not there.

Can I say that what developed from the camaraderie around the table was a capacity for Mr Hawke and others at the table to pick up the phone at any time and discuss matters of mutual interest. It meant that they were able to deal with a transport dispute on a Christmas morning, for example. Where there had been a problem, phone calls were made. My father would not come to the Christmas lunch table until these issues had been resolved, and it invariably meant some phone calls to Mr Hawke and others to get on to someone else, who might be the head of another union, to sort out that issue. That was a type of direct conversation and resolution of major industrial matters, which did not always culminate in there being a strike, but frequently there were frequently threats to be a strike.

Remember that this was an era also when there was a very high level of membership of the union. The ACTU, the Transport Workers Union and others were very powerful unions in Australia. I will never forget the capacity of these men—they were all men—to translate the resolution in a dignified manner to be able to arrest damage, to be able to place productivity back on the agenda, to provide for fair entitlements obviously for the membership of the unions, etc.

It was an extraordinary era during which I am sure all the men around that table, who went into different areas of enterprise, learnt the value of that level of camaraderie. It did translate for me in having to pick up from the airport all sorts of odd bods, including a very young Laurie Brereton and an even younger Patrick Conlon, who was working for one of them at the time, and drive them out to the property, where they would have conversations and inevitably end up having a game of cards.

I just make this point: it is important in public life, whether one aspires to and achieves the prime ministership, as Mr Hawke did and whom we recognise today, to maintain a level of civility, maintain a camaraderie but also a powerful pursuit of what we are here to represent, but obviously ultimately to resolve it in a manner which is for the benefit of the public.

I hope that Mr Hawke will be remembered for the good he has done for our country as a prime minister. Sure, he had some other extracurricular activities. Some of them helped, perhaps some of them did not, but he was a man who stood by his conviction and administered that for the benefit of the people of Australia. I hope that my father is up there setting up the cards as we speak.

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:44):** It must have been around 2005 or 2006 that I went to see *Keating! The Musical* at the Festival Theatre. I do not know if anyone else here went to see it, but it was a tremendous show, not least because the fantasy ending was that there were a whole lot of ballots that were found down in Antarctica, I think, that proved that Keating actually did not lose the 1996 election and that he had won after all. Of course, we were all in some way suffering through very many years of a Howard government, and, as a pretty lefty audience, we revelled in it. I think a lot of people were at that event because of an affection for Paul Keating, an affection that was born out of enjoying his razzmatazz, his verve and his vigour in policy.

Early on in the show, the character of Bob Hawke comes out. He is in a dressing gown and has a beer in one hand, and he sings a song—don't worry, I am not going to burst into song—that was something like 'I love Australia and Australia loves me'. It took me, my friends and all of us in the audience right back to what it was like when Bob Hawke was our prime minister. Some of us had allowed the Keating excitement to overshadow the absolute significance of Hawke becoming Labor's longest serving prime minister and allowing the Hawke-Keating partnership to exist at all, a partnership that then became the Keating prime ministership.

The affection which Bob Hawke genuinely held for Australia and the way in which it was reciprocated, as has been so beautifully illustrated by the story from the leader, was an immeasurably important part of why Bob Hawke, and the Labor Party, was successful at that time. I wish that some of the younger people who were sitting here before—for whom the Hawke government must seem like ancient history—were here to listen to all these contributions, because the way in which Australia has been profoundly shaped by the Hawke prime ministership should never be forgotten.

A country that was still clinging onto an old way of running itself required a government that not only was immensely and courageously reformist but also able to capture and keep the confidence of the people of Australia so that it could be a long-lived government. The Whitlam government had done a huge amount to change, reform and modernise, but it was such a shooting star of a government and so short lived that it was unable to maintain some of the reform.

The fact is that Bob Hawke was able to reintroduce what had been Medibank, and then became Medicare, and keep it long enough to become part of what Australians expected, so that, when the conservatives came back into office, any tentative move to think about removing universal health care was rebuffed, not just politically but also by the people of Australia. It had been there long enough for it to be treasured and woven into what we expected.

There is much made, as there should be, of the modernisation of the economy that occurred under Bob Hawke. That was twinned with deep concerns about fairness, about the wages that people receive, about the conditions that people receive and about preparing people for a retirement in which they are not necessarily going to be able to depend entirely upon the state. The way in which equality was prized in the form of the Equal Opportunity Employment Act of 1987 and the way in which environmental reform was twinned with social and economic reforms enabled us to make huge strides, not just in the spectacular saving of the Franklin but also in the very difficult negotiations that occurred over forests in the Eastern States and in dealing with land clearing.

None of the reforms that occurred in that time were perfect. None of them were complete, but nothing that has happened since, and nothing that will still happen, would have been possible without that tremendous intellectual courage and without the fact that the people of Australia liked and trusted their leader. He was a complicated human being, as we all are, but he was more spectacularly so perhaps.

My own life was profoundly affected by his leadership. In 1983, when he won the election, I was 15 and I ran out and joined the Labor Party because of the enthusiasm which he brought to the country and with which he was greeted, as the leader referred to, and the excitement he made all of us feel about the endless possibilities that were before Australia, so I rushed out and I joined the party and I have been a member continuously ever since.

Later on, having become an active volunteer and so on through those many elections during the eighties and early nineties, I decided to stay at university to undertake a doctorate and that I would do it about the impact of the Hawke and Keating era. In fact, my supervisor was Professor

Dean Jaensch, who I will forever feel great affection for, not least because I wrote my entire thesis to disprove the most recent book he had written, to argue that it was wrong. He found it tremendous that he had a student who was prepared to take him on head-on. In fact, we had a very big clash over the 1993 election, which incidentally I got right and he got wrong, and I never allowed him to forget it.

The privilege I had in being able to write about that era and to understand what happened then to the party that has given me so much was enormous—to understand the traditions that were dragged through by Hawke, the labourist traditions, the traditions of fairness, the traditions of every person being treated with dignity, but the modernisation that needed to go with that, the modernisation within our party as well as in larger policy. Not only has Australia been affected forever by the courage of that government, and also its capacity to keep winning elections, but so has my party, so has this great, old, fierce Labor Party.

As we contemplate a loss a couple of weeks ago that hurts many of us deeply, we do not ever forget what we have learnt from the leadership of Hawke: the priority of trusting and believing in the Australian people, in democracy and in always seeking to learn what they are saying to us, never being patronising, never being narcissistic, as the leader pointed out, in expecting the love and adoration but in showing it and showing faith in the people.

I am honoured to be able to speak about Bob Hawke. I am very sorry that it is on the occasion of his death. I am sure I am not alone in having shed a tear when I heard that he had died. Yes, he was old; yes, he had lived a magnificent life. It felt like an era had passed and I want to mark that; I want to mark our gratitude on this side of the chamber as well as on behalf of all the community. Vale, Bob Hawke.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:52):** I thank the house for the opportunity to rise and make some brief remarks on the passing of our 23<sup>rd</sup> Prime Minister, Bob Hawke. It is not often that we have the opportunity to pause and reflect on significant leaders. This is one such occasion and I think it is important that we reflect on a truly significant giant of particularly the 20<sup>th</sup> century in Australian politics.

To the extent that my life growing up was immersed in politics, and particularly national politics, it was also very much characterised by and in the context of that time being under the leadership of Bob Hawke. It is plain that he brought the country together in 1983 and his leadership was characterised by the politics of consensus. His key intellectual driving force was his ability to use consensus, persuasion, negotiation, a bringing together as a means of achieving effective outcomes over the long term.

That is a message that I think is more relevant today perhaps than it ever has been as we consider, in not just Australia but globally, an increasingly polarised political culture. Bob's involvement in politics was driven by an aspiration to collaborate, as the Deputy Premier has exemplified, to reach across political boundaries and institutional boundaries to make things relatable and to achieve practical outcomes. That legacy as a consensus leader is one that I feel pleased to have grown up with, and I look to carry it forward, as I think we all ought to.

More than just a consensus leader—and we have had the opportunity to reflect on Bob's life over several decades, not just in his passing—I think the significant thing that I and Australians across the board are left with is Bob's love of life and, in turn, his love of the people of Australia and his belief in the people of Australia and what we can all achieve.

In these remarks I do not want to eulogise Bob, and there has been a lot said about the course of his life's journey. But the way in which he engaged through a prism of a love of life juxtaposes on the one hand the serious, intellectually capable, hardworking side of someone who dedicated his career to public service with the lighter side that he wore just as easily. He would flick from one to the other and often with a view directly to making a complex issue relatable to a broad audience, an entire audience.

There was never a sense in which you got the impression that Bob would talk about an issue in closed terms. It was always about how this may be difficult but you can understand it this way and you can be persuaded by relating to it and understanding. So it was the strength of the personal qualities that I think was the genius, unique aspect of Bob Hawke. It is important to note that

sometimes, if you are going to chart a course in that way as a leader, you need some cover, and as prime minister he was well and truly ably covered in that respect by Paul Keating as treasurer.

I think those serious aspects of capacity are the sorts of things that can lead to the big reforms: the floating of the dollar, getting rid of tariffs and the wages accord that he managed to negotiate. There is a particular magic, I think, in the wages accord that was negotiated through the 1980s. Perhaps one could compare the journey that was going on for similar towering leaders of the time such as Thatcher in the UK achieving similar reforms but in circumstances that were inevitably much more beset by confrontation.

On the personal side, I think at all times, and particularly in the course of his time as prime minister, Bob reminded us who we are as Australians. He made us proud of who we are as Australians and he made us feel good about ourselves and each other. In that sense, I often draw the parallel to those similar qualities of Ronald Reagan in the US. They were two people who were of their time. They lived comfortably in their own skin and they exuded an embrace of the people they set out to lead.

So he combined the two: the serious intellectual capacity and that extraordinary ability to reach out and relate. In doing that, I think he managed to achieve a transcendence of the usual divisions that you could easily draw between capital and labour or politics and party. Over time, I think we became used to laughing with Bob, to being drawn in and to expecting to see human qualities we could admire in our leadership.

There is a particular case study that I would encourage people to glance at in a spare moment; it is one of hundreds, perhaps, but one that sticks in my mind. It is an interview that he gave on one of Roy Slaven's and H.G. Nelson's programs. It was then called the *Channel Nine Show*, for some odd reason. He came along and gave an interview six years after he left the parliament and seven years after he finished up as PM. It was around mid-1998, immediately after Suharto had resigned and shortly before the Queensland election of that year. It is only a relatively short piece.

For those who are familiar with Roy and H.G. and their particular brand of humour, Bob was able to come on to a show and mix the serious with the humorous. He was able to relate to an audience with the same depth of understanding that they were able to display. There was a question asked: 'What's going on with Suharto? What's happened?' Bob dealt with that very seriously and said, 'Well, he's come to the end of an era. He had to go.' He then flicked it to reinforcing that there are 200 million Indonesians who are at our doorstep and how important it is to understand these good people in Indonesia, and that we have to make sure we keep building bridges to them. He related it as an ordinary person.

He then flicked to dealing with questions about the good diplomatic results that could be achieved on the golf course. He told stories about experiences with individual leaders on the golf course and took the chance to remind the whole audience that there are some really wonderful people working in the Public Service and the government who help bring together our international relations. He brought it home and he made it relatable. He talked about the wonderful skills of interpreters and his particularly famous meeting with Gorbachev, the one that famously was supposed to go for 20 minutes and ended up going for 3½ hours. I think it was the one time it has been reported that Bob regarded himself as being out-charisma'd by a leader.

He was then asked about what the then looming threat of the rising popularity of One Nation in Queensland posed ahead of the 1998 Queensland election. We know that One Nation went on to win 11 seats. It was a high-water mark for that party, and history has panned out to tell a story. He was asked to analyse where we were at. He had no hesitation in saying the threat of that party at that time was the result of fear in the community in Queensland and that there was a job for leaders to do to overcome that fear in order to confront the looming threat.

He said what were very memorable words for me at the time I first heard them. Without hesitation, he said, 'It will be a dark day for Australia if One Nation takes a seat.' They had that high-water mark at that point. Again, he took the opportunity to be emphatic about the importance of Asia to our country going forward. Others have reflected on how prescient that appreciation was and how important that ongoing authority of Bob's on that topic was.

Finally, but importantly, he was asked to reflect on whether Australia should have two cricket captains back in 1998. He flicked straightaway to a completely authoritative and serious answer.

**An honourable member:** What was that?

**Mr TEAGUE:** The desirability of having one. If Mark Taylor at the time was regarded as perhaps not being able to hold his place in the one-day team, he might have had to have a transition, but ideally one would be a good idea. He gave the answer very seriously and thoroughly, as credibly as anyone might in Australia.

In the course of those remarks, and in the course of reflecting on the benefits of participation in sport, he said, 'One thing I would say is that perhaps people professionally these days are playing too much sport and getting jaded. What's important in the sporting life is that the players retain the *joie de vivre*.' Everyone raised an eyebrow, saying, 'What's this? Speaking French?' He said, 'Oh, yes, the joy of life. It's important that you keep the joy of life.' That piece is just one example that I think highlights what we will most remember about Bob: someone who was ultimately driven in his public engagement by the joy of life and the love of all Australians in the process. Vale, Bob Hawke.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (12:07):** This parliament has a close connection to the Hawke family. Former Prime Minister Hawke's uncle Albert Hawke served in this house. At the age of 23, he was the youngest member of parliament ever elected to the House of Assembly, a record that has not been bested. He served here between 1924 and 1927 and then, after being defeated by George Jenkins in the seat of Burra Burra, he moved to Perth, where he went on to become a member of parliament and premier of Western Australia, which is probably why the Hawke family moved from South Australia to Western Australia: to be with Hawke senior's brother, who was then a senior minister in Labor governments.

Bob Hawke, without a doubt, is the most prominent Labor figure we have ever produced, probably more prominent than Curtin and Chifley. He is someone whose hallmark is on every subsequent government. Every Labor government I know, and every Labor minister I know, wants to govern in the same responsible manner of the Hawke-Keating tradition, which serves, I think, as a great example and testament to their longevity. It is a great honour for them that so many state parliaments, state governments and federal parliamentary Labor parties want to continue to govern in that tradition.

We talk about Bob Hawke as a giant of Australian political history, yet he served in parliament for only 12 years. When you listen to the man's life story, you assume that it was a lifelong parliamentary career, but the truth is that he entered parliament in 1980 and left in 1992—12 years only—yet in 12 years he fundamentally changed the landscape of Australia forever. The reforms that he introduced will never be undone. Anyone who attempts to, I think, will face the wrath of the Australian public because they have become institutionalised changes. But they were not always that way.

Medicare was not inevitable; compulsory superannuation was not inevitable; the accord was not inevitable. The reforms of the Hawke-Keating government were not inevitable. Floating the dollar was not always going to happen. Lowering tariffs was not always going to happen. Former treasurer Howard argued strongly against lowering tariffs and opening up Australia to the world. Just in terms of political courage, think of this for a moment: when the Hawke-Keating government removed tariff protection on Australian manufacturing, the manufacturing workforce in Australia halved in two years. That is a reform that would make most prime ministers weak at the knee.

I want to tell a very quick anecdotal story about Bob Hawke's impact on my family and me. I am Labor because of Bob Hawke. I was 11 years old, and we were heading towards the 1983 election. My mother was a staunch Liberal. When I say 'staunch Liberal', these people pale into insignificance compared to my mother's adherence to conservative ideology. She grew up in the aftermath of the civil war in Greece. She felt that anyone left of centre was a communist or a communist sympathiser and that we should have nothing to do with them.

My father, on the other hand, was a factory worker and a Labor voter. He worked in a factory for 20 years, and my mother was a cleaner at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and a seamstress. They eventually bought their own business, a chicken shop—the story of many migrants to Australia. I

remember that it was March, and my mother was having these rolling arguments with my father: 'You can't vote for this man. This man is dangerous.' My dad said, 'Yes, no worries. Don't worry.' She said, 'I know you have always wanted to vote for him, I know you like him, but you can't this time. It's too important.' He said, 'Don't worry. I won't.'

On election day, we were at the shop. We drove to the shop on Saturday morning and prepared it for opening. I was doing whatever I was doing at the back. My mother went to vote, and she came back with a Liberal Party how-to-vote card. She said to my father, 'Don't do anything stupid. This man is dangerous. Do not vote for him. If you vote for him, we will have to take all our money out of the bank and put it under the bed.' You may remember that scare campaign that Fraser was running. My dad said, 'Don't worry. I will take the boy with me, and he will be my witness.'

So we got in the Ford XB and off we went to the Netley primary school, which Rob Lucas closed a few years later. We got to the polling booth, and my dad took all the how-to-vote cards from the volunteers. We walked in and he got his name ticked off. We got to the booth and he said, 'Which is the Labor one?' I said, 'But mum said—' He replied, 'Don't worry about what mum said. I'm a man; I will vote for whoever I want to. Which is the Labor one?' I found the Labor one. He said, 'Quick, vote for Hawke.' I was 11. I followed the how-to-vote card.

Thinking back, I assume that we voted for John Scott, the federal member for Hindmarsh, in Netley, or it might have been the member for Hawker, Ralph Jacobi or his predecessor. I cannot remember. Anyway, we voted, and we voted Labor. We got in the car—silence. Dad did not speak the whole way back. We got to the chicken shop. When I walked in I had a big smile on my face, and my mother knew instantly what had happened. She said to my dad, 'You voted Labor, didn't you?' Dad said, 'No, no. Ask the boy.' I said, 'I don't know. I just did what dad said.'

My dad never drank. He did not drink socially: he only drank on occasions. He drank at baptisms, funerals, weddings and christenings but never with a meal. That night, as the election results were on TV, my old man cracked open a Southwark Bitter. He looked at me with a big smile on his face, winked and said, 'That's your Uncle Bob.' That day, I knew I was going to be a Labor voter for the rest of my life. He fundamentally changed me. After that election, my father took great pride and joy in telling my mother how wrong she was. In 1984, she voted Labor for the first time in her life, and she has continued to vote Labor ever since.

That was the impact that someone like Bob Hawke had on our family. He was someone who spoke to the working-class aspirations of migrants, people who wanted to save, wanted to buy a second house and wanted to invest. They felt safe and secure in the knowledge that the Hawke-Keating government spoke to them and their aspirations. That is the Labor Party that I joined. That is the Labor Party that I fight for. It is the legacy of Bob Hawke that has given us the ability to speak to the entire nation, not to just a small group of Australians. Bob Hawke did that for all of us, and we are eternally grateful.

Last night, on *Four Corners*, there was an excellent program on the 30-year anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre. It showed in full force the evil of communist regimes and what they can do to their own people. Bob Hawke was under immense pressure internationally. This country was going to become our largest trading partner. Make no mistake: the bureaucracy in and around the prime minister's office at the time would have put immense pressure on the prime minister not to allow those students to stay: 'Do not upset this country. We need to trade with this country. We've lowered our tariff barriers; we are now a trading nation. We need to export and import from this country. They are to become our largest customers.' But Hawke took the moral option, and that was a function of leadership.

The last time I saw Bob Hawke was in Darwin. I was at an event in Darwin with the then chief minister Adam Giles, and Bob Hawke was speaking at the parliament. We went out for dinner afterwards. Bob Hawke's great ambition was for Australia to have a nuclear life cycle. It was not just about the mining of uranium; it was about processing uranium and storing its waste. We had a long, deep conversation about that and many other issues, but the one topic he wanted to raise with me the most was the closure of Stanley's Fish Caf on Gouger Street. He was devastated that you could not get a King George Whiting and sit outside and have a cigar in Adelaide anymore, and he wondered whether the treasurer could give once-off funding to keep this restaurant open. I said, 'No, I'm sorry, Prime Minister, I cannot.'

That was my last meeting with him. He was a great intellect. He was a giant. I think it is fair to say that he was beloved by all Australians, even those who did not vote for him, and that he has made this country better for his service. God rest him.

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:16):** I rise today to add to the condolence motion to remember the life of Robert James Lee Hawke AC, the 23<sup>rd</sup> and longest serving Labor Prime Minister of Australia, former federal leader, Rhodes scholar, Oxford graduate and proud son of the township of Bordertown and the South-East of South Australia. Bordertown is a town with a vibrant community that is proud of its heritage and its connection to Bob Hawke and sits in my electorate of MacKillop on the Dukes Highway, about 20 kilometres from the South Australian-Victorian border.

Bob Hawke's life and legacy as a leader have been well documented and celebrated in the township of Bordertown for many years. Bob Hawke was born on 9 December 1929 in Bordertown, South Australia. He was the younger of two sons born to parents Clement Hawke, a congregational minister, and Ellie Hawke, a schoolteacher, who were both of Cornish heritage. His father, Clem, was posted to Bordertown from 1928 to 1935 and was in charge of the largest parish in the district.

The family, comprising his mother, father and older brother, Neil, lived in a sandstone house that can be found at 63 Farquhar Street, Bordertown. The home, built originally in 1885 by the National Bank, became home to the Hawke family when his father served as the congregational minister for Bordertown. Bob Hawke's family eventually took the next step in 1936 and moved to Maitland on Yorke Peninsula before moving to Western Australia after the tragic death of Bob Hawke's older brother, Neil, at the age of 18. Today, their Bordertown house is used by community organisations to service the town and districts.

In reflecting on his early life in Bordertown, I have learnt that Bob Hawke was the product of a religious, protective and loving home. I understand that he was encouraged to speak his mind and use his intelligence and that he had a strong sense of social obligation instilled in him by his parents, values and traits that stood him in good stead for his life at university, in politics and beyond.

During his time in government, he saw a significant period of change and some undoubtedly turbulent times, including the introduction of Medicare, the floating of the Australian dollar on international money markets, the initiation of a charge for tertiary education and the initiation of an assets test on age pensions. As I belong to a conservative farming family that has existed on the sheep's back since the 1860s, with all the highs and lows of the wool industry, this gives me the opportunity to highlight the importance of the role that Bob Hawke and his government played during a very difficult time for the wool industry.

The Hawke government was swept into power in 1983, after what my forebears would describe as a disappointing Liberal government. The new Hawke government faced the wide comb dispute, one of Australia's most significant farming industrial relations battles. The Hawke government described an outcome that delivered efficiencies and outcomes that the industry enjoys today. This dispute had been going on for many years before the arrival of the Hawke government, and this issue belongs to an industry that founded the Australian Labor Party. The shearing industry also founded the Australian Workers' Union.

At the same time, the Hawke government was bringing the Australian economy into the new world, building new ties to the rest of the world and looking for further prosperity. It created an economic summit that was pushing new reforms not seen in Australia before. Developed as part of the new reforms, the accord embedded arbitration and brought change through its liberalised financial controls and reduced tariffs and changed the economic order of the time. This change was a testament to the conviction that Bob Hawke had as a leader navigating these changes in his early days in government.

Today, the legacy of Bob Hawke's significant achievements and proud beginnings in this small country town are captured in the Bob Hawke Gallery, located in Woolshed Street in Bordertown. The gallery includes a number of pieces of Hawke memorabilia, including the Australia jacket he wore when Australia won the America's Cup and a motorbike from his youth. The collection also includes photographs, newspaper clippings, cartoons, paintings and memorabilia that acknowledge and celebrate Bordertown as the birthplace of our country's longest serving Labor prime minister. The collection also includes a portrait of Bob Hawke by artist Michael Henwood.

Bob Hawke has been and will continue to be remembered within my electorate through a bronze bust of the former leader, which is located outside the council chambers at 58 Woolshed Street. The sculpture was unveiled by Hawke's father, the Reverend Clem Hawke, in 1987 and was a gift to the citizens of Tatiara from the sculptures of the Giannarelli family.

From this beginning in a conservative country town, history will portray Bob Hawke as a successful leader. His values and character were embraced by the nation. Ironically, it would seem that the conservative values embedded in him by one of country's most conservative regions were used to his country's benefit through his involvement in the union movement and the Labor government. Bob Hawke left a lasting legacy in federal politics and our country and has left a significant impression on his birthplace in Bordertown. He will continue to be remembered for his long service to Australia and his party and by his family. Vale, Bob Hawke.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:22):** I rise to speak to the condolence motion for the Hon. Robert James Lee Hawke. It sounds strange to refer to the previous PM with those official words in such a formal way because to me, my family and the majority of our community he was always 'Bob' or 'Hawkie'. He was one of us and the best of us because he brought the best out of Australia.

From the sixties up until he retired, my father worked across a number of manufacturing and labouring roles at Chrysler, the Port Stanvac oil refinery in Lonsdale and Monroe/Wylie. Dad worked long hours and my mum stayed at home to raise the family; as it was with most families in that period, we relied on the wages of our father. Although many Australians look back at this time as the golden era, when life was much simpler, the workers in factories and workplaces, like the Port Stanvac oil refinery, knew that to improve their lot they had to work together.

As an example, in 1962, metal workers from the amalgamated engineering union and federated engine drivers' and firemen's association members at Port Stanvac went on strike for six days. The strike occurred because their American employer, Kellogg Overseas Corporation, failed to give them a wage rise after two months of negotiations. The unions are a little more patient these days. Through those years of the sixties and onwards, my father participated in a number of strikes, and I know that, without unions having our backs in those days and Bob Hawke as a key unionist, we would have struggled.

In 1964, members of the amalgamated engineering union, the Australasian society of engineers, the Electrical Trades Union and the ironworkers and boilermakers' union all went on strike after their employer refused their request to negotiate their conditions of employment. This type of industrial environment, where the bosses had such disregard for their workers that they would not even meet with their representatives, was very challenging for workers, not just from a material perspective but also from an emotional one.

Even now, workers do not want to take industrial action to force an employer to negotiate fair and reasonable wages and working conditions. They only do so when things are so bad that there is no other option. I know that when my father and the millions of workers like him in those environments knew that they had a prime minister elected in 1983—Bob, the man at the top—who would look after them, they were relieved. That is what Bob did: he looked after Australians, and he connected with us.

Bob brought unions, employers and the government together to negotiate the Prices and Incomes Accord, which created industrial peace. In a speech to the ACTU Congress in 1987, Bob said that his government had seen:

...a 60 per cent reduction in the number of working days lost through industrial disputes—a record which forever must condemn the industrial relations practices and attitudes of the conservatives in government.

This is the glorious part of the legacy that Bob bestowed upon Australia. He showed us that when workers feel respected, when they feel listened to, when they have the basic right to have their say over their working lives and, God forbid, a small pay rise to keep up with the cost of living, the whole country works a lot better. The country is better now. The economy and society are better when the government works for all Australians.



Bob also taught us that economic markets could be opened up to the world while protecting the society in which they operate. It was an enormous challenge, and in this respect Bob was the people's prime minister; he looked out for the people first and, lo and behold, the economic spoils followed. Instead of letting the market rip and trying to pick up the pieces afterwards, Bob's government made sure that the economy worked for the people. It seems strange to have to make the point that the government should represent the interests of the people, but apparently we still need to have this argument over and over again.

Bob showed us why a people-centred approach is good not only for the health of a society but also for the health of an economy. Yes, we loved Bob's common touch. We loved his larrikin style and, as a girl who grew up watching Test Cricket on the black and white television during summer holidays, I know we loved it when he celebrated our America's Cup win. When he said, 'Any boss who sacks anyone for not turning up today is a bum,' it is something we will always remember.

This was Bob's quintessential Australian charm, but what we loved most of all was what Bob did for Australians: delivering universal health care through Medicare, striving for gender equity and caring for our natural environment. Bob was the people's prime minister and that is why the people loved him. My family loved him, our community loved him and I loved him. He was the first prime minister I voted for. We could see that he always put us first. This simple idea is at the heart of the Labor Party purpose, just as it sat in the heart of Bob's legacy. Bob's vision is Labor's light on the hill. We will miss Bob Hawke. Vale, the Hon. Robert James Lee Hawke.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:28):** As many others have done in such a lovely way, I also rise to speak today with so much pride and so much admiration for the late former Prime Minister Bob Hawke—a much-loved giant of Australia who was so important to many Australians and who will continue to inspire me and many others.

I first had the incredible pleasure and honour of meeting Bob Hawke in 1993, when I was a very, very young member of the Labor Party, during the federal election campaign for the seat of Hindmarsh. I had the pleasure of hearing him speak, giving a voice to those who felt unheard. I saw how he treated and connected with people, how he valued them and how he brought them together.

I knew from that moment that when you met with and spoke to Bob Hawke your voice was heard. You felt heard; you knew that you had his full attention. You knew that he cared about you, your views and your thoughts and feelings. You also knew that Bob Hawke had that effect on everyone he came into contact with and on the Australian people at large. He was an authentic leader and a thoroughly decent person. He listened deeply to people, got along with them and fought for what he and they believed in. He relentlessly built consensus around what mattered.

Bob Hawke was an incredibly popular leader because of this genuine, authentic, inclusive leadership. He was hugely popular and never a populist. He created and progressed our discourse, and discourse across the globe, on some of the biggest challenges our nation and our world confronted. He was so clever, so sharp, and his abundance of wisdom was equally matched by an abundance of an innate ability to organise people, to build collective sentiment and voice on those issues that required depth of thought, discussion and commitment, on those issues that required effective, genuine leadership and that inspired and engendered such leadership in others.

As Barrie Cassidy said, Bob Hawke was disgusted with apartheid in South Africa and absolutely could not abide the timid responses around the world. He led responses that were absolutely not timid, that were brave, that set an example of what global leadership against human atrocities and racism should look like. He abhorred racism and he tackled it head-on. He encouraged conversation about it, and he led the way in that conversation here in Australia and beyond.

His signing of the Barunga Statement, his work to amend the Aboriginal Lands Right Act to return Uluru Kata Tjuta National Park to the Anangu people, and his deep and sincere listening to Aboriginal people were a measure of his understanding of and compassion about dispossession and the need for justice, for reparation, for reconciliation. His leading with an intolerance to racism saw him inspiring global actions to stamp it out. This is and was a mark of his ability to have courageous conversations around the issues that have shaped our views as a nation and characterised what we stand for. They were and are a mark of his unbridled ability to build consensus.

I absolutely thank Bob Hawke for his rejection of racism and all that divides us and for building consensus against hatred. I also thank him for his bold, visionary leadership on the environment, against the damming of the Franklin and mining in Antarctica and Kakadu. Whether you agreed with him or not, the positions he secured on these issues through bold conversations, through taking a long-term view and through bringing people together to deeply thrash out these issues, helped to shape the focus on the environment by our nation that remains today. Bob Hawke brought environmental issues into our national discourse and international consciousness. He saw how integral to our future that discourse was and he pursued it without fear.

As others have, and as millions of Australians do to this day, I recognise and heartily thank our much-loved former Prime Minister Hawke for his vision, which gave us universal, accessible and affordable health care, which gave us Medicare. Before this outstanding signature reform driven by Bob Hawke, Australian families were at risk of being pushed into poverty every time a family member required a hospital visit, needed to see a specialist, or was forced to grapple with long-term illness.

This reform was all about both fairness and security. It utterly characterised the ideal of every Australian having a fair go, having access to the support they need, particularly when things were tough. It also ensured financial security and peace of mind. It was a safety net that meant people did seek the treatment they needed, that they went to the doctor when they needed to without fear that doing so would send them broke—a fear real in my family and in so many others.

Medicare was the biggest and greatest Australian social reform, and it continues to characterise our nation's desire and commitment to fairness, to equality of opportunity and to ensuring that everyone could access basic support when they needed it. It continues to improve people's lives to this very day.

I also deeply thank Bob Hawke for fighting for the rights of working people, for decent wages, for equality in the workplace, for super, for secure jobs and for leading our Australian union movement in the way that he did. He was at the centre of change in our industrial relations system and in our economy. Like no other, he brought together every group in our economy to strike the accord. In doing so, he reshaped our economy, but at every point he ensured that the hopes of working people were heard and enabled. He fought for workers and, through the sheer force of his wisdom, of his charisma and of his negotiating skills and ability to organise, he resolved disputes for the benefit of all.

One of my fondest memories of Bob Hawke will continue to be singing *Solidarity Forever* with him at an ACTU Congress and my reflections at that time and since about how his energy, his force, his sheer humanity, his love for all people and his deep commitment to achieving equality made such a difference to so many and inspired them to fight for their rights in a system that enabled them to do so.

I know there is much celebrated about Bob's remarkable ability to down a yard glass of beer in under 12 seconds—very impressive and a feat that did a lot for Australian breweries and the beer industry. However, there is also a lot to celebrate about the time when he did not drink, when he bravely grappled with alcoholism and when, whilst he served in parliament, he refused to touch a drop and, when he did so, courageously went through such a hard personal transformation in the most public of environments.

There is so much to remember and celebrate about Bob's character: his incredible intellect; his charisma; his incredible ability to just talk well with all people, to have a chat, listen and get along with literally anyone, and not just get along but make people know that they were important; his vision; his leadership on the global stage; his building of relationships that have positively shaped our nation; and his desire to fight for fairness to ensure that everyone was treated with dignity and respect.

Today, I thank Bob Hawke for his incredibly strong, authentic and inclusive leadership, for being a giant of real reform that touched people's lives and that helped them. I thank him for his humanity, his wisdom, his love for Australia, and indeed for all people, his capacity to love well and to be well loved and for changing our nation for the better forever. Solidarity forever, Bob Hawke. You will continue to inspire me, our party and our nation. My love and condolences to your loved ones.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:37):** I also rise to say a few words about Bob Hawke. A lot of his amazing life has been covered, as a union leader, a politician and a prime minister, and also the contribution that he made after retiring from politics. Much has been said about what a transformative government it was, ably led by Bob Hawke, but with an amazing team around him.

There is also the impact of the people who made up that ministry as part of that cabinet. As a nation, we still bear the very positive mark of much that was done then in transforming the economy: opening up the Australian economy and the reduction of tariffs, the deregulation of financial markets and the floating of the dollar. As was said, these were brave decisions. In hindsight, there appeared to be some sort of consensus about these decisions, but there was not. A lot of people within the Labor Party at the time would have been doubtful about this particular direction.

However, given the intellectual calibre of Bob Hawke and the calibre of the cabinet, those changes were introduced, and the important element—and it has been touched on repeatedly—was that those changes were twinned with very significant social reform. The wages accord has been mentioned, as has Medicare, a stand-out piece of policy that has made a profound difference to the lives of a lot of people.

When you look at healthcare systems around the world, it is universal healthcare systems that make those countries that have not gone in that direction pale when it comes to health outcomes. Medicare is now part of the institutional framework of this country, but we should always be vigilant because there have been attempts in the past to undermine and destroy it. Indeed, Medibank, the first equivalent of Medicare, which was introduced by the Whitlam government, was removed.

There were actions taken in relation to the environment. The last wild river, the Franklin River in Tasmania, would not be here now if it were not for the Hawke government. There was the work done at Kakadu. The Antarctic has been mentioned. The role Australia played when it came to the Antarctic has been forgotten. There was an incredibly strong environmental legacy. The changes to the age pension were important changes. Compulsory superannuation was an important change, and the changes to higher education—and I was at uni when some of those changes occurred—were also incredibly important reforms.

One of the things that stands out for me as a person from Whyalla was that, in the early 1980s, I worked in the steel industry as a steel descaler. The 1983 election that Hawke won is often referred to, but the important election for people at Whyalla, Port Kembla and Newcastle was the election held on 1 December 1984. There was a minor swing against the Hawke government, but it did go into that election. Hawke went into that election with a 75 per cent approval rating, which is pretty astounding in this day and age, so they comfortably won that election.

The important thing for communities like mine is that they made this commitment before going into the election—that within 100 days of being re-elected they would develop a steel plan. The steel industry in Australia at that time back in the mid-1980s—I feel a bit of *deja vu*, having been elected in 2014 and knowing what the steel industry faced recently—faced an existential crisis. The leadership provided by the Hawke government through the Button steel plan was what got that industry at that time through that crisis.

The leadership that was demonstrated took into account that the changes that needed to happen in the steel industry would have a marked effect upon communities like Whyalla, Port Kembla and Newcastle. There was that assistance to put in place structural assistance packages. These packages are always hit and miss, and it would serve us all well to bear in mind the nature of these packages, what works, what does not work, why it works and why it does not work.

We have a legacy in Whyalla today where the steelworks continue to fight another day, but the pain that was exacted over a period was very significant. We went from an industry in Whyalla that employed over 6,000 people to one that employed around 2,000 people, but without the leadership of the Hawke government at that time we would not have a steel industry in this country. They intervened in the market. They worked with both BHP and the union movement to put in place a tripartite agreement that called for no compulsory redundancies, so there were voluntary redundancies over an extended period of time. To me, that was incredibly important.

I remember my dad, who was an active trade unionist and a fitter at the steelworks, in these negotiations saying, 'These are not our jobs to give away.' They were thinking about the people who were going to come after who would need work but realised they had to compromise because if they had taken a pig-headed view towards this, the result would have been no steel industry.

I look back on those Hawke years with gratitude and gratitude on behalf of my community. It is interesting to reflect on the crisis that the steel industry went through. Even though it is still a national industry, it was left to this previous state government to provide the leadership and the drive, even though, within the steel industry nationally, more people were employed outside South Australia than within South Australia. That is not to say that the federal government did not do anything, but they were not as willing as the Hawke government to demonstrate that degree of leadership.

There is much to be thankful for in Australia. Our economy has not been in recession for almost 30 years and a lot of that to do with the solid foundations that were put place in by the Hawke-Keating government. Of the social reforms that were carried out, most are still with us today to the great advantage of our nation. Vale, Bob Hawke.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:46):** I rise to speak in support of the condolence motion moved by the Premier and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. As a nation, we deeply mourn the passing of Robert James Lee Hawke, Australia's 23<sup>rd</sup> Prime Minister. For those of us in the labour movement, few will ever reach the level of admiration and adoration we share for the man who insisted he be called Bob. He became the heart and soul of the Labor Party.

Much has been said and I am sure will continue to be said about the incredible service Bob Hawke gave to the country and to the people he loved—and the people loved Bob. In fact, during his first term in office, Hawke received the highest popularity ratings of any prime minister since the introduction of public opinion polls. He was a political leader the likes of which Australia had never seen.

Born in Bordertown to a congregationalist minister, Clem, and a schoolteacher, Ellie, Bob was raised in a loving family environment. The sudden death in 1939 of his older brother, Neil, after contracting meningitis brought the Hawke family closer together, and Bob was smothered and even more loved by his protective and upstanding parents. This parental love gave Bob a deep-set sense of self-worth and self-confidence that lasted throughout his life. It informed his approach to everything that he undertook from then on.

From an early age, Bob's mother and father believed he was destined for greatness, instilling in him a great sense of social obligation and compassion for his fellow man. After an impressive academic career, with tertiary studies culminating in a Rhodes Scholarship that took him to University College in Oxford, he embarked on his first full-time job at the Australian Council of Trade Unions at the age of 26. There, he rose up through the ranks and in 10 years, before he was 40 years of age, he held the ACTU's top job.

An excellent conciliator, Hawke effectively resolved many national industrial disputes. He was respected by workers and also by employers and maintained his principles and the priorities of those he was representing throughout the disputes he sought to resolve. He played a key role against much public sentiment in highlighting the dreadful realities of apartheid in South Africa, eventually turning public opinion in Australia against the policy.

Hawke knew what he stood for, but he also knew the value of working with others and bringing people together. As Prime Minister, Hawke's strong belief in governing by consensus saw him achieve extraordinary success by brokering agreement between business and the workers in the pursuit of economic growth. Like Labor's 1983 election slogan, 'Bringing Australia Together', Hawke's consensus style was evident right from the very start.

A month after taking office, Hawke held a national economic summit aimed at forming a national consensus on economic policy, involving all political parties, unions and employer organisations. Hawke believed that ignorance is the enemy of good policy and so every participant at the summit was provided with the same information on the state of the national economy and the challenges it faced as what was presented to the government in a way that had never been done before.

Remarkably, the summit culminated in a near unanimous communiqué—unanimous except, of course, for Queensland premier, Joh Bjelke-Petersen—whereby participants agreed with the analysis of the economy but also accepted what needed to be done to turn around Australia's economic woes. Indeed, much of the economic success of the period beyond 1983 stemmed from the summit.

Improvements in economic performance were pursued by other consultative means, including a tax summit, the economic planning and advisory council and the Australian Labor advisory council. The historic tax package of 1985 saw the top marginal tax rate cut from 60 per cent to 49 per cent and for average wage earners from 46 per cent to 40 per cent. New progressive taxes on capital gains and fringe benefits were introduced, along with the closing of tax loopholes.

Double taxation on company dividends was abolished with a lift in the company tax rate to help finance the reform. The level of industrial disputes dropped and the only prolonged dispute was with the airline pilots in 1989, in which the government intervened to protect general pay restraint. As Australia's longest serving prime minister, Hawke presided over an historic shift from a protectionist to a free-trade economy, embracing market-based reforms that reshaped our economy and exposed it to the world, delivering benefits to all Australians and increasing national prosperity.

The Labor government, led by Hawke, was transformational for our country. No government before or since has pursued and delivered such a broad and lasting suite of economic, social and environmental changes. His leadership did not drive all the reforms, but his cabinet, often noted by historians and commentators as one of the most talented in the nation's history, drove much of this reform. Hawke's role as their leader and prime minister was to help drive the political support for these policies, within the Labor caucus, inside the parliament and throughout the community.

The economic reforms of the Hawke government are well known by most now: reducing tariffs, floating the dollar, reforming the tax system, deregulating the financial system and introducing superannuation. These reforms were often hotly contested, particularly from the then Liberal opposition, despite what more recent political commentators have claimed to be broad-based support for these reforms. Can anyone imagine a current federal government issuing 16 new banking licences into the market at once? These were extraordinary reforms. They re-enlivened the recommendations of the Campbell report into the financial system, which had lain dormant under the previous Fraser government since 1981.

Equally as impressive were the generational advances in social and environmental policy: the introduction of Medicare, Landcare, the higher education contribution scheme, negotiating the Prices and Incomes Accord, increasing school funding to improve retention rates and doubling childcare places across the country. He moved to stop the damming of the Franklin River. His government established the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody. He moved quickly to assist new waves of refugees and migrants into Australia, most notably those fleeing China following the Tiananmen Square massacre.

Abroad, Hawke ran a foreign policy that deepened ties with Asia—most notably with China—and renewed the United States alliance. Fundamentally, though, Hawke showed us what collegial, pragmatic and determinant political leadership can deliver for our country. As prime minister, he set out to lead a country and to change it for the benefit of the community. Hawke later remarked:

The essence of power is the knowledge that what you do is going to have an effect, not just an immediate but perhaps a lifelong effect, on the happiness and wellbeing of millions of people and so I think the essence of power is to be conscious of what it can mean for others.

Importantly, though, Hawke was a man of the people, a leader who could relate to the average Australian. He appeared to move seamlessly between featuring on the world stage with global leaders and speaking with regular Australians simply looking to improve their lives. Perhaps it was his uniquely Australian strengths and flaws, notably his alcoholism, that endeared Hawke to the Australian public. He promised to give up the grog, and he did so when he was prime minister. He was not just a larrikin then: he was also a man of his word.

Through his enormous national profile, Australians also came to observe Hawke as a deeply human and sensitive man, with that sensitive side never far from the surface. Australians saw Bob

raw and emotional on television when revealing the extent of his children's battles with drug use, along with the pain and hurt that his infidelities had caused his family and his first wife, Hazel.

Undoubtedly, with a record of securing four election victories from four contests, Hawke shall forever remain one of the true giants of the Labor Party and he stands tall in comparison with all other Australian prime ministers. He will be remembered as a leader who showed the country just what could be achieved by a government.

His government was one that changed our nation, wrenching us economically, socially and environmentally into modernity. His government was responsible for the economic reforms that have given our nation nearly 30 years of unbroken economic growth and massive increases in our standard of living. His government placed the equal entitlement to affordable health care for all Australians at the heart of Australian social and political policy. And, amongst all the reforms, he shaped our national conscience with his leadership on humanitarian issues.

Bob Hawke was a remarkable and, sadly in this day and age, unique politician who showed Australia what is possible for our country. Most of all, he was 'a bloke who loved his country and loved Australians', and he will be deeply missed. Vale, Bob.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (12:55):** I also rise in condolence on the passing of Robert James Lee Hawke. Along with other members of this house, I was deeply saddened on hearing the news a few weeks ago of the passing of Bob Hawke. As a child of the 1980s, there were two things you knew: Allan Border was captain of the Australian cricket team and Bob Hawke was prime minister. He was certainly an inspiration to me when I was growing up and epitomised what it was to be a politician and what it was to be a political leader.

Bob was a leader who drove consensus. He was a leader who tried to bring Australia together, and he achieved some magnificent reforms in his time as prime minister. With hindsight, those reforms look easy. They look like they were inevitable. They look like everybody supported them. But they were contentious. They took an enormous amount of hard work and convincing to get the Australian people to support some of those very significant reforms, particularly in terms of opening up the Australian economy.

The floating of the dollar has been talked about a lot, but I think some of the big reforms in terms of trade and tariffs were enormously hard to stomach by people on our side of politics in the labour movement, but ultimately a lot of the reforms in the 1980s have led to almost 30 years of continuous economic growth in Australia since then. As I said, he sought to unite Australia. He was elected in 1983 on a platform of reconciliation, of bringing Australia together, and that is what he sought to do and that is why he is so beloved. That is why his passing was such a sore, sad point for so many Australians over the past few weeks.

Of course, we remember some of the big successes in his time as prime minister, with Medicare being number one on that list. This was brought in under the Whitlam government but then abolished under the Fraser government. We have to remember that, through that Medibank reform that was abolished, getting a reform passed does not necessarily mean that it is forever. You have to continuously win elections to convince the Australian people that something should be in place forever. That is what happened with Medicare: it was through the length of the Hawke-Keating government that it became so that the Howard government could not abolish it. It is now supported by the Australian people and no-one would ever dare try to abolish it.

In terms of health, there were many other reforms, including improvements to pharmaceutical benefits, the first ever mental health plan for Australia and the leading work that was done by Neal Blewett, under Hawke's leadership, in tackling HIV, which was a big issue in the 1980s. We really led the world in tackling HIV and AIDS in Australia.

There were many other issues in terms of the environment, such as protecting the Great Barrier Reef, protecting our forests in Tasmania and protecting Antarctica. There are lasting legacies for the Hawke government in terms of opening up Australia to the world not only in terms of the economy but also in terms of our leadership in the world and our position on the world stage. Bob Hawke always made sure that he spoke out against racism in Australia—from apartheid to any other type of racism in Australia.

One of the most important things that is not focused on enough is the work to alleviate poverty in Australia over that period. A huge amount of work was done to reshape social services for housing, child support, child care and family benefits, which brought down child poverty rates substantially and led to a more equitable society. We will significantly remember and thank Bob Hawke for all those things, and he will live forever in our hearts and memories as one of the greatest Australian political leaders ever.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. L.W.K. Bignell.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

*Bills*

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (SCREENING) BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**SENTENCING (SUSPENDED AND COMMUNITY BASED CUSTODIAL SENTENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions*

**CYCLING INFRASTRUCTURE**

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning):** Presented a petition signed by 996 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to significantly increase funding for cycling infrastructure in order to create a safe, connected bicycle network for the people of South Australia.

**SERVICE SA MODBURY**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Presented a petition signed by 100 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with the proposed closure of the Service SA Modbury Branch, announced as a cost-saving measure in the 2018-19 state budget.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**ANSWERS TABLED**

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

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament year 10 students from Christies Beach High School and Southern Vocational College, who are guests of the member for Reynell.

**PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Dangerous Substances—Dangerous Goods Transport—Miscellaneous No. 2

Fair Work—Declared Employer

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

Summary Offences Act 1953—

Dangerous Area Declarations Authorisations Report for Period 1 January 2019 to  
31 March 2019

Road Blocks Authorisations Report for Period 1 January 2019 to 31 March 2019

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Fees No. 2

Limitation of Actions—Revocation

Rules made under the following Acts—

Magistrates Court—Criminal—Amendment No. 73

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.A.W. Gardner)—

University of Adelaide, The—Annual Report 2018

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia)—Remote Area  
Attendance

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Aquaculture—Fees

Fisheries Management—Fees No. 2

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

Essential Services Commission of South Australia—Review of Water Third Party Access  
Regime Final Report May 2019

Technical Regulator—Plumbing Standard published by the Technical Regulator pursuant  
to the Water Industry Act 2012

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Bills of Sale—Fees No. 2

Community Titles—Fees No. 2

Harbors and Navigation—Fees No. 2

Motor Vehicles—

Fees No. 2

Fees No. 3

Passenger Transport—Fees No. 2

Real Property—Fees No. 2

Registration of Deeds—Fees No. 2

Roads (Opening and Closing)—Fees No. 2

Strata Titles—Fees No. 2

Valuation of Land—Fees No. 2

Worker's Liens—Fees No. 2

*Question Time*

#### **VETERANS SA**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Are you abolishing Veterans SA as a standalone agency?



**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** Veterans SA has historically been attached to various offices. Prior to coming to government, I think it was within Treasury. We moved it back into the central agency, DPC, but we have made a decision to locate it in the office of Defence SA so that it can share some of the overheads that are associated between those two agencies.

#### VETERANS SA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08):** My question is to the Premier. Will it retain a status as a standalone agency within Defence SA?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08):** I will get the precise detail and bring it back to the house. Veterans is extraordinarily important. It is an area we have put a great focus on. I may be incorrect, but I think I am the first Premier to hold the portfolio.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It's very important. I take my role as the Premier very seriously, and I often get the opportunity to meet and congratulate people who have made a contribution to society here in South Australia, and that gives great joy. But I think when we meet and honour our veterans community, they are in a completely different category. Men and women who have put their lives on the line to protect our freedom—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —are a very important sector and will always remain that under this government.

**The SPEAKER:** During the Premier's answer there were multiple interjections. Consequently, I call to order the following members: the members for Badcoe, West Torrens, Elizabeth, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Lee, the member for Kaurana and the member for Hammond. The Leader of the Opposition.

#### VETERANS SA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier guarantee that the Director of Veterans SA, an Iraq veteran, Mr Rob Manton, will continue in executive employment?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09):** Well, that is a matter for the chief executive to make, not for myself to make, but Mr Manton has a contract, and there is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I am not sure if they know how these things work. They have only been out of office for 14 months.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Maybe when Labor were in power they made direct appointments—

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

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —via chief executives. I think we've now got a very clear indication of the way in which Labor operated when they were last in government. Mr Manton has a contract. There is no suggestion that that contract will be broken. He is doing an excellent job, and I

enjoy working with him. His service to Australia and to the veterans' community in South Australia has been exemplary.

### FEDERAL ELECTION

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house about the result of the recent federal election and what this means to South Australia?

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10):** What an excellent question, sir, and in the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —many words of our continuing Prime Minister, how good was that election? A lot of people were out there talking doom and gloom about the federal election for a long period of time. A lot of people were out there talking about how they were measuring up the office for a long period of time, but isn't it great—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to live in a democracy where people within the bubble, within the media—the opinion leaders—don't decide who is going to be in government? Every single person who is eligible to vote casts their vote once every three years federally, once every four years here in South Australia, and they decide who is going to be in government.

I was absolutely delighted on 18 May when we went to the polls that the Coalition government was re-elected to continue their service to our nation. They have already delivered much for the nation and for South Australia in their first six years, and I have every confidence they will continue to do so. Here in South Australia, the Liberal Party defended all of its seats. We were very happy to advocate for our federal colleagues.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We were extraordinarily happy because the people on this side of the house can see the benefits of working with like-minded people in Canberra. We have forgotten all of the fake fights that existed under the previous government that failed to deliver for the people of South Australia, and what we have been able to do is sit down—

*Mr Szakacs interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —with our counterparts in Canberra and work on outcomes for the people of this state, for the people of our nation. I am happy to remind the house of some of the great benefits. In particular, I would like to commend the Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, who has worked extraordinarily hard with his federal counterparts to make up the deficit in forward planning that we inherited from those opposite to deliver very substantial infrastructure investments into South Australia.

I was particularly delighted in the lead-up to the election to hear so many projects announced that will bust congestion here in metropolitan Adelaide and record investments in country SA—part of our state that had been neglected for far too long, so congratulations to the minister there. We congratulate our federal counterparts on the way in which they worked with us in terms of the Skilling Australians payment, which the Minister for Innovation and Skills here in South Australia negotiated—two great examples of our government working with the government in Canberra, delivering for the people of South Australia.

And who could forget the City Deal, which we signed up to with the federal government and which will centre around Lot Fourteen—a major show of confidence by Prime Minister Morrison in the future of South Australia and a very substantial investment on that site. The national Space Agency is coming to South Australia, the Cooperative Research Centre is coming to South Australia, mission control is coming to South Australia and the Space Discovery Centre is coming to South Australia.

More than that, the federal government has seen fit to make a very substantial investment into our ambition to establish a globally significant Aboriginal art and cultures gallery, something which will really differentiate us. I would like to say that I am very much looking forward to continuing to work with the Hon. Simon Birmingham, the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. This is a very important project, if you like, between our two jurisdictions to deliver for our state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We are going to grow that area. We have already fulfilled some of our election promises, opening a new office with the federal government co-located with Austrade in Tokyo, and we have done the same in Shanghai. Very soon, we will announce our plans with regard to Malaysia, the Middle East and North America because we want to grow the economy. So this was a good election result not just for the Liberal Party, not just for South Australia, but for the people of our nation.

#### VETERANS SA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** My question is to the Premier. How can the Premier guarantee that Mr Rob Manton's contract won't be broken when he just informed the house that he has no responsibility for that contract?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** I'm not aware of any plan whatsoever. The breaking of a contract like that would surely be something that would be brought to the attention of the minister.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned.

#### VETERANS SA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. Where will the Premier be taking advice on matters relating to veterans when the Premier has sacked retired Colonel Chris Burns, retired Lieutenant Colonel Greg Nettleton and retired Lieutenant Commander Malcolm Jackman from state government executive positions and can't guarantee the security of Mr Rob Manton?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** Another extraordinarily poor question from the Leader of the Opposition. He has just had a couple of weeks off. I know it has been a difficult couple of weeks. There was that moment on 18 May—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that put him behind the eight ball.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The reality is that I take advice from many very senior veterans in South Australia. In fact, we are very pleased to have a Veterans Advisory Council in South Australia and a Veterans Health Advisory Council in South Australia. More than that, get out to your local RSL, the local sub-branch. Speak to our veterans—

**The SPEAKER:** I do.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —who have contributed so much to our state. I really enjoy it, sir. I know that you enjoy it at your RSLs. Perhaps some of those opposite could enjoy this same opportunity that we have enjoyed in the past.

#### VETERANS SA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** My question is to the Premier. Post imminent changes to Veterans SA as outlined by the Premier, who will take responsibility for promoting the wellbeing of the veterans in our South Australian community, coordinating cooperation between ex-service organisations and monitoring and providing advice on official recognition and commemoration of the service of veterans?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16):** That work will continue in Veterans SA.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens and then the member for Colton.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens has the call.

#### AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:17):** How good is Vickie? My question is to the Premier. What did the Premier learn from former Trump adviser Anthony 'The Mooch' Scaramucci during his time at the Palazzo Versace on the Gold Coast over the weekend?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Over the weekend, I attended the Australian Leadership Retreat. There were plenty of excellent speakers. One of them was Anthony Scaramucci. Of course, it's Chatham House Rules at these things, so I can't go into a lot of details, but let's just say that he was very insightful with his comments regarding the White House and, most importantly, the relationship between the United States and Australia.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It is a complicated period of time that we are in at the moment. We know that the breakdown in terms of the trade deal between the US and China has very significant implications for Australia, so this was a major focus for the retreat. I note also that we received an excellent presentation from former prime minister Kevin Rudd on the same topic. He is now based in the US and has specific, very detailed insight into the implications of the breakdown of that trade negotiation, which occurred while I was actually in the US only last month.

#### COASTLINE PROTECTION

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:18):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister please provide further information on how the Marshall Liberal government is working to protect and secure our metropolitan and regional coastlines for future generations?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:18):** I thank the member for Colton not only for his question but for his substantial advocacy, some might say pestering, over a lengthy period of time. He has fought so hard to be an advocate for the community that he represents, in particular the suburb of West Beach but also the adjacent suburbs of Glenelg North, Henley Beach South and Henley Beach, coastal suburbs that rely so much on having healthy, thriving, robust, resilient coastlines.

We know that our coastlines are a front line in the defence against climate change, increasing storm events, rising sea levels and challenges from increasing use and population. We need to strengthen the resilience of our coastline and not just in metropolitan Adelaide. Obviously, metropolitan Adelaide has a particular amount of pressure placed on it as a result of the population and human-made interference along the coastline, but we have another 5,000 or so kilometres of coastline outside of metropolitan Adelaide.

All of it is so important to invest in and to care for and to make sure that it has resilience in the face of that changing climate so that it is there to protect our assets on land, continues to provide critical habitat for native species and also plays a role as a carbon sequestration device, in terms of blue carbon, through seagrasses, mangroves and other elements of our marine system.

It has been great to work alongside not only the member for Colton but other members of this place who have substantial coastlines within their electorates. I visited Yorke Peninsula only last week with the member for Narungga and had a conversation with him—

**Ms Bedford:** Clock.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** You don't want to hear about this for too long, member for Florey?

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** There's no coastline.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There is no coastline in Florey. However, it was great to visit Narungga. It has been great to have conversations with the member for Finniss, the member for Flinders and the member for MacKillop, in particular about the coastal challenges facing their electorates.

The Marshall Liberal government has made a very substantial investment in the 2019-20 budget in coastal protection, recognising these challenges and making a very clear commitment that we will spend \$52.4 million: \$4 million through our regional coast restoration fund and \$48.4 million in devices and strategies to protect and sustain the West Beach area and those surrounding beaches.

This will involve the completion of the much-needed pipeline. The previous government failed to do this. It created a significant weakness in our metropolitan coastline. We will do it. We will combine that with a significant investment and injection of sand into the West Beach cell. We will also look at a whole range of dune restoration projects, which will ensure that local communities are partnering with government and councils to get plants into our sand dunes to increase the resilience of those sand dunes because, of course, they are the final piece of the puzzle that will hold this project together.

#### AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:22):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier stay at the Palazzo Versace during his visit to the Gold Coast?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22):** Yes.

#### AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:22):** Did taxpayers foot the bill for the Premier's registration to the Australian Davos Connection Leadership Retreat at the Palazzo Versace and how much was it?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22):** I don't have the details of that, but I'm happy to provide the details to the member.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee and the member for Mawson are called to order. The member for West Torrens has the call.

#### AUSTRALIAN LEADERSHIP RETREAT

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:22):** My question is to the Premier. Given that Anthony 'The Mooch' Scaramucci survived as a Trump adviser for just 10 days, does the Premier believe that his trip to the Palazzo Versace represents good value for taxpayers?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23):** The retreat was held over three days, in fact. It's an excellent program and I think it is genuinely very important for us to keep abreast of a range of issues. I must say that I was joined by politicians from all sides of the political spectrum, from federal and state jurisdictions, as well as many thought leaders and quite a large contingent of people from South Australia.

In particular, there was a major focus this year on defence, which is very important to South Australia; space, which is very important to South Australia; blockchain, which is very important to South Australia; cyber, which is very important to South Australia; and of course the implications of the trade negotiation breakdowns between the US and China.

### MINING INDUSTRY

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:24):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the importance of the mining industry to growth in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:24):** Mining is outstanding.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Where's the bill?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kurna and the member for Lee are also warned.

**Mr Malinauskas:** We talked about it at dinner the other night. You've got our support; bring it on.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** The bill you can't support.

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** You would think they would have the courage to stand up and ask the question, Mr Speaker, wouldn't you? The mining industry is incredibly important for our state—absolutely vitally important—and has been for decades. It employs thousands and thousands of people across our state. It represents approximately a third of our state's exports and of course produces vital material, which we use in South Australia and in Australia as well.

The Marshall Liberal government has taken \$10 million of the Economic and Business Growth Fund and put it towards the advanced discovery fund. It is important to point out that, as well as the money from the Economic and Business Growth Fund, that fund has supported agriculture, tourism and a range of other industries as well. The advanced discovery fund will be \$10 million over three years to support discovery in the minerals industry in South Australia. Importantly, it is to support expenditure and discovery that would otherwise not have happened without that taxpayer support and will enable more and more economic growth.

Mr Speaker, as you would know, royalties paid from our mining industry to government pay for our schools, our hospitals, our roads and our services. The mining industry not only employs people, not only shows purchases and capital and not only creates exports, but contributes to all the services that government supports throughout the state. This work will be an expansion of what typically has happened for nearly 30 years now. This is a big step, and it won't just be about supporting industry to drill holes.

While that is an opportunity, and it continues to be very important, this will be an opportunity for industry to partner with government and put their own money on the table to invest in additional geoscience, or collaborative technology investment, or logistics that support exploration in remote communities. There is a wide range of opportunities, much wider than has ever before been the case in South Australia.

It is very important for the house to understand that historically, over successive Liberal and Labor governments, when money has been on the table for this type of work, it has attracted, on average, 20 times more investment from private industry to match that. We have every reason to believe that the \$10 million over three years that we put on the table will attract another \$200 million, which will be spent in South Australia.

That money will be spent in South Australia. That money will create jobs and contribute to our economy, which will then flow through to benefits for our entire state. Every single citizen benefits when our economy is strong. But, of course, we do want some of this exploratory work to be fruitful and to work its way through to being productive and safe mines—safe mines with regard to people who work there, safe mines with regard to the environment and productive mines that contribute to our economy.

The Marshall Liberal government is taking a short, medium and long-term view with the budget. The money is on the table. It will leverage 20 times more money—that expenditure will start to flow quite quickly—but it will also support new mines that will start up in South Australia in the next five, 10 or 15 years, which will support our economy for decades to come.

#### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier yet arranged a meeting with the Prime Minister and premiers of basin states to discuss the royal commission on the Murray-Darling Basin?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28):** Thank you very much. It is a very important issue. I can report to this parliament that I wrote to the Prime Minister shortly after the election result was clear, and I sent that letter off within the first couple of days after he was sworn in. I have not checked with my department today, but I will check if there has been a response.

#### MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** My question is again to the Premier. When will the South Australian government respond to the royal commission report on the Murray-Darling Basin?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:29):** The Royal Commissions Act is of course—

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —an area of responsibility of the Attorney-General. I indicate that, subsequent to receiving Mr Walker's report on the commission—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —there were a number of—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —matters raised by Mr Walker. In particular, Mr Walker raised the validity of aspects of the water act, the application of the water act by the authority and other structures within the model that currently operates and a number of recommendations that he made in what I will describe as a non-legal area but which were important recommendations to be considered.

The Attorney-General's Department has taken responsibility, via the Crown Solicitor's Office, to provide advice to the government in respect of a number of both legal and constitutional issues raised by Mr Walker. We are yet to receive the report, but I did have an indication from the Crown Solicitor's Office that that would be at least by the end of May, so I would be expecting an update shortly. Other aspects in relation to recommendations have been referred largely to the Minister for Water's department to contribute to a response. Doubtless, when they come together we will then prepare our response formally.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:30):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Has a revenue target been set for SAPOL for attending commercial events?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:30):** No.

### TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:31):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house on how the Marshall and Morrison governments are fixing congestion in our northern suburbs?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:31):** I thank the member for Newland for his question and note that traffic congestion in the north and north-eastern suburbs is a big issue and one that this government is very keen to get on and tackle, building on the relationship that we have with the federal Morrison government as it continues. What was really exciting about that election result was that that money that was secured in the federal budget that is going towards delivering these three intersections in the northern suburbs of Adelaide is secure after a lack of bipartisan support shown during the election campaign.

These are three very important intersections for a variety of different reasons. The first, around the Grand Junction/Hampstead/Briens roads intersection, which is essentially the border for the Port Adelaide Enfield and Florey electorates, carries 58,000 cars a day and is due to reach capacity in 2021. This is part of our road network in dire need of an upgrade, and there is \$19 million on the table—fifty-fifty from the federal and state governments—to deliver that. We know that it is an important part of the existing freight corridor.

Noting that we are going through a process of assessing GlobeLink and how moving freight around the Hills can be part of our future, this is an issue that is part of our traffic present and one that we need to get on and tackle. Making sure that trucks turning right from Grand Junction Road onto Hampstead Road in a safer and quicker time frame means that we can open up and unlock capacity at that intersection for those other through movements, for those people heading east-west, as well as those people heading north-south.

We then move on to Main North Road/Kings Road/McIntyre Road, an intersection that would be very dear to the hearts of the members for Wright and Playford, with \$13 million to fix up an intersection that takes 78,000 cars a day. Essentially, the real issue with that intersection is once again those right-hand turn movements for people heading up Main North Road and turning right onto McIntyre Road.

The ability to provide extra capacity at that part of the intersection also means that we can get increased through-running for people at that intersection. It will also help to improve road safety by making sure that everybody sticks to their lane and that those who want to turn can do so without getting in the way of traffic that simply wants to get through to get home.

The third, and possibly the most iconic intersection of the three, is the upgrade to Scotty's Corner, a part of our road network that takes 66,000 cars a day. Especially for people heading out of town and wanting to turn right down Nottage Terrace, the bank up and line up in peak hour is of real concern. For the huge number of buses that take that road into town, the route 22 buses that head up Main North Road into town, the ability to provide a longer bus lane as well as a corresponding left-hand turn lane from Main North Road into Nottage Terrace is extremely important to help that part of our road network flow more smoothly.

I also want to dispel the myth that Hit 107 was talking about this morning in trying to predict the demise of Scotty the Scotsman. I can put paid to that rumour, it being false, and say that the Scotsman is safe, but note that there is a lot of work that we need to do at that intersection to upgrade again what is a pretty difficult and unsafe part of our road network.

This \$51 million upgrade to these three intersections forms part of a massive injection of money that we have managed to secure by having a good ongoing relationship with the Morrison



Liberal government, and I was really pleased to see minister Tudge and minister McCormack returned in their respective roles. I have already reaffirmed those relationships, as soon as possible after the election result was known, to make sure that we can build on the good work of sitting down and working constructively across two spheres of government to deliver better productivity, better road safety and better congestion-busting outcomes for the people of South Australia.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:35):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Will there be any costs to event organisers for policing events at Adelaide Oval?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:35):** I thank the member for the question, and I think the Treasurer has outlined the user-pays scheme in some of his dialogue.

What we are trying to do with this scheme, just to be abundantly clear in case the member isn't aware, is that police will provide police services as they always do. They provide police services for free right across our state. What we want to look at here is where people excessively use police services over and above for their own security purposes. This is something that happens in all the mainland states, and it's a model that we are looking to adopt here.

What we do see is that people who are having events—let's say it's a rave party or an event where they think there might be the use of drugs or excessive alcohol—are phoning police and saying, 'We need you to come and provide this extra security for our event.' So what we are going to do is the police are putting a model in place. They are going to work with event organisers to make sure that the general services are provided and, if they need over and above, then we can look at a user-pays scheme.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:36):** Will there be any costs to event organisers for policing the Royal Adelaide Show?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:36):** That will be negotiated with police as the model is put in place.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens can leave for the rest of question time. He has been on two warnings. He keeps interjecting. He can leave for the remainder of question time, please, and then the member for Lee can have another question when he leaves.

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

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:37):** A supplementary for the Minister for Police based on the minister's answer: why are additional costs foreshadowed for the Royal Adelaide Show but not for events at Adelaide Oval?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:37):** I didn't say that. What I said was that events would be looked at in conjunction with the police to determine what resources are needed and, if extra resources are needed over and above, they will be discussed with police and a formula will be created. That's how the scheme will work.

#### **SCHOOLS WITH INTERNET FIBRE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on progress of the government's improvements to school internet infrastructure, including in my King electorate?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:38):** I thank the member for King for this question. I know how passionate she is about schools in her electorate and

representing them, as she is about representing the community. I'm very pleased to have the opportunity to talk to the parliament about the Schools With Internet Fibre Technology program—SWiFT internet technology.

**An honourable member:** Wow!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Do you like that? I am very, very proud of the acronym, amongst other things. This is an important program because, of course, prior to the commencement of the program South Australian schools had some of the slowest internet connections in the country. Indeed, when we came to power only about 25 per cent of our schools in South Australia had any sort of fibre-optic connection known as the quickest scalable opportunity to get fast internet.

I think that's why we made an election commitment, and the Labor Party made an election commitment, that we would improve internet services—because it was so desperately needed. We had the slowest internet on the mainland. They had 16 years before the election, of course, to do it and didn't. Nevertheless, this is something that I am pleased we have bipartisan support for. In December last year, the Premier and I announced an \$80 million commitment to it.

There were some pilot schools beforehand, of which Golden Grove High School in the member for King's electorate was one. I am very pleased to advise the house that we now have 71 schools connected across South Australia to this fibre-optic rollout, with nearly 40,000 students—in fact, today I think it has tipped over 40,000 students across our system—and more than 4,000 educators.

This is a great program for students, who have access to curriculum opportunities, as teachers do to professional development and class programs, and having reliable internet that you can just turn on and turn off with the reliability of a tap is critical if schools are being able to engage in the opportunities that the internet provides.

I have mentioned that Golden Grove High School in the electorate of King has been connected. I can advise the member that on 18 March Greenwith Primary School was connected and on 9 May Salisbury Heights Primary School was also connected. Two hours ago, Salisbury Park Primary School has also been connected, with a 100-megabyte fibre connection replacing its old wireless technology which was much slower and less reliable.

This is great news for schools in King, of course, but I can also advise other members. The member for Playford, I am sure, is keen to know that Karrendi Primary School is being connected today or tomorrow. This week the member for Mount Gambier in his electorate will have Melaleuca Park Primary School, Reidy Park Primary School and McDonald Park School all being connected as well. The member for Reynell will be pleased to know that Reynella South Primary School is being connected this week. I am very certain that the member for Unley is going to be pleased about Glen Osmond Primary School's imminent connection.

In the southern suburbs, again, the member for Kaurana might be interested to know that Old Noarlunga Primary School is about to be connected, and the member for Elizabeth can sleep well at home tonight knowing that Playford Primary School will be connected within hours. Next week, the member for Badcoe can be advised that Forbes Primary School is not far away. This is a great project for schools across South Australia to ensure that our South Australian students have the opportunities to engage with professional development, to engage with the curriculum opportunities to do SACE online subjects in their high school curriculum.

By the end of next year—in fact, during 2020—all of our schools across South Australia will be connected, with the exception of four very remote schools. I was pleased, with the member for Stuart, to visit Marree and Leigh Creek a couple of weeks ago and talk to those schools about the opportunities that will be available for those schools. Oak Valley and Kangaroo Island will also have their own bespoke approaches presented. It is expected that those options will be worked through with Telstra, hopefully by the end of July this year but not far behind, that will best meet the needs of those students. This is a great project being delivered by the Marshall Liberal government.

#### SA WATER

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:42):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. How many burst water mains and/or pipes are required for an area to be automatically included in

SA Water's pipe replacement program? What is that program's budget? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Ms BEDFORD:** The Ingle Farm-Valley View area is now unfortunately well entrenched in the SA Water top 10 hotspots list but is not designated as a focus area on the water main replacement program nor are those areas in my electorate, which have to include Pooraka after the burst on Sunday, part of the proposed works schedule.

**Mr Hughes:** You need a cardboard cut-out.

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

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

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Environment and Water has the call.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:43):** I thank the member for Florey for her question. That is a very valid question. Given its level of technical questioning involved there, I am happy to arrange a briefing for the member this week so that she can be brought up to speed with our strategy for not only the preventative maintenance strategy around those assets in her electorate but also how we assist people who are impacted by burst water mains.

I am very hopeful that we have made significant leaps forward in terms of dealing with this problem, particularly how you deal with people following the impact of a burst water main on their lives. There was no doubt in my mind a significant lack of empathy displayed by the previous government and a lack of turning up as well. Of course, as the member for Giles reminds us, the cardboard cut-out wasn't because of the burst water mains. It was because of the previous minister's inability to turn up and show empathy to those people who were impacted by burst water mains.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** So I have, where possible, reached out and connected with communities, talked to local members and also got out on the ground where I have been able to—and I acknowledge that isn't always possible but where possible—quietly go out into communities, talk to the people who have been affected and ensure that SA Water and associated organisations such as Allwater are providing an empathetic, rapid response to people whose lives are being impacted by burst water mains.

When you deliver water to over a million people in a metropolitan context, there will always be challenges with that sort of delivery of that sort of service, but we can do better. It is my desire to see particularly that customer service side of things continually improve. I think it has improved substantially in recent years and I look forward to that continuing to improve as we seek to minimise the impact of burst water mains on the day-to-day lives of South Australian households and businesses. I reiterate my desire to speak to the member for Florey and ensure she gets that briefing from SA Water as to how we are dealing with those issues in her community.

## SA WATER

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:45):** Supplementary: minister, does that mean my constituents who are still waiting for out-of-pocket expenses and accommodation costs to be refunded will be assisted sooner rather than later?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:45):** Absolutely. We know that historically SA Water used not to deal with out-of-pocket expenses and damage to property and instead referred people to their insurance companies to work through that matter. That is not the case anymore. SA Water will support people through the claims process, whether that is a partnership between SA Water and their private insurers, and I will ensure the cases that the member for Florey brings to the house's attention are followed up forthwith.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:46):** Will there be any costs—

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** Who is the question for?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It's for the Minister for Police, for the Minister for Energy's benefit.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee has the call. Let's get on with it.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My question is to the Minister for Police. Will there be any costs to event organisers for the policing effort at the Adelaide 500?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:46):** I thank the member for the question. I can see where he is going here. He probably is going to tick through every event that could possibly be on in South Australia. What I do want to let the member know, if he wants to listen—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I will let the member know—as I think I have already outlined but just to reiterate—this is not in place until next year, so there will be consultations through this process, as I have outlined in my previous answers as to how that will come about and what the reasoning will be. But he may also want to perhaps look into New South Wales, where I think the Labor government introduced a very similar scheme. We will be looking at what they have done interstate and what the other states and jurisdictions are doing and rolling out a similar scheme here.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:47):** My question is again to the Minister for Police. Will there be any costs to event organisers for the policing effort at the Glendi Greek Festival?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:47):** He could have almost bundled them all into one question there and just listed every event that he wants to go through, but clearly they have run out of questions, so we can do this one at a time; that's fine. I will give the same answer as I gave just a few moments ago, and that is: that will be negotiated with police. They will work through that but I stress the point that, where general policing services are required, they will be delivered as they always have. As far as extra services are concerned, if someone is looking to utilise police to cover their security, then that will be negotiated with police and that's how the scheme will operate.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:48):** Supplementary to the Minister for Police: why are consultations and negotiations necessary if there is no revenue target for police attendance at commercial events?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:48):** I thank the member for the question. To clarify that, there are no individual targets set. There will be a revenue that will come.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** It does sort of go without saying, but as far as working out what the revenue will be for each individual event—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —that has not been calculated. There will be a revenue through the entire scheme.

### MEMORIAL DRIVE REDEVELOPMENT

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:49):** My question is for the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister please give an update on the progress of the Memorial Drive upgrade and how the project will complement the recently completed new outdoor courts to reinvigorate the Riverbank Precinct and inspire the next generation of South Australian athletes?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:49):** I thank the member for Morphett very much for that question. I know he is a very, very passionate tennis fan, as I hope many of us are in this place. I know I certainly am. It was with great pleasure that I was with the Premier just a few weeks ago. Also in attendance was Darren Cahill, one of South Australia's great tennis players but also, more specifically, a great tennis coach. He has coached three players to world No. 1—an absolutely outstanding achievement. Kent Thiele and Steven Baldas from Tennis SA were also there as we turned the first sod on this exciting new project.

It is just another way that we are building South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government is very focused on this, and we are delighted to be delivering. This is a \$10 million investment into tennis here in South Australia, putting a roof on Memorial Drive courts so that they can be used all year round. We don't have an undercover tennis facility here in South Australia. The next generation of aspiring tennis stars currently have nowhere to train during the winter months and that just drives people out of South Australia.

Added to that, Mr Speaker, you may have been down there just recently and seen the roof being lifted off both the northern and southern stands. It's very exciting. A lot of people going to the football have been raising with me how exciting this looks. That is why we are taking great pleasure in building South Australia.

A lot of people follow the Australian Open at the start of every summer. Now we will have a lead-up event to the Australian Open: both the WTA, the women's tennis event, and the ATP. We haven't had ATP tennis here since about 2008, and we have never had a WTA tennis event here. This is really exciting. We are going to have some of the world's best tennis players. It coincides with the fact that Ash Barty is going so wonderfully well over at the French Open. We are excited to see that. I won't put the mozz on her. She is going wonderfully well. We will do all we can to try to get Ash to play here at Memorial Drive when the roof is put on.

Again, it's about the big events, which are fantastic. That's the investment we are making into South Australia to draw tourists here, to draw the big-name tennis players here. More importantly, we want to get young people playing—and anyone playing, actually; age is not really relevant here. We just want to get people active in South Australia. By having the roof on this facility, people will be able to play all year round. Young aspiring stars who want to grow their tennis skills and potentially get onto the world stage will be able to use this facility, so it's incredibly exciting. The other thing we should note with this event is that, by putting the roof on, it has enabled us to steal the WTA and the ATP event from Sydney. That's always a little sweetener. We do like to do that.

What I can also say about the roof going on at Memorial Drive—and you will see it take shape over the next few weeks—is that it complements the Adelaide Oval and the Riverbank Precinct down there. It's really going to give added value to that area. The ability to have concerts and events there as well is going to truly add to the Riverbank Precinct.

When we talk about growing sport, we want to do that at the international level, and I have stressed that point. We want people playing at the grassroots level as well. That's why we are also investing in putting together a state sports infrastructure plan, so that we can make sure we are delivering into the right parts of the community.

When I get out and speak to different sporting organisations they say, 'Everyone wants everything. We all want this, but no-one knows what the stepping stones are.' They were left in a

mess from the previous government, and they are really keen to make sure we are delivering at grassroots level. They also talk about our sports voucher program.

The previous government, of course, had no money budgeted for that whatsoever. We put that back in the budget and we upped it again. We took it to \$100. Families are so appreciative of that. It puts \$100 back in the pocket of every South Australian family that has a young person playing sport when they are at primary school level, so this is sensational. We have also invested in the home of football at Gepps Cross, the SA Athletics Stadium and the Adelaide Super-Drome as well. We are building South Australian sport.

#### GOVERNOR OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:53):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier speak to former foreign minister Julie Bishop about taking up the role of Governor of South Australia?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:53):** I won't be making any comment on this whatsoever. There is no precedent whatsoever for the opposition to be asking questions like this in the parliament. It is a hopeless, grubby practice that only this opposition would stoop to.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

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

#### GOVERNOR OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:54):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier speak with Amanda Vanstone about taking up the role of Governor of South Australia?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54):** I refer to my previous answer.

#### GOVERNOR OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:54):** My question is again to the Premier. Are there any other current or former Liberal MPs that the Premier has canvassed about taking on the role of Governor of South Australia?

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** What about John Olsen?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson can leave for the rest of question time.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54):** I refer the member to my previous answer.

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

#### VEGETABLE INDUSTRY

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:54):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is interjecting. He is on two warnings. He has had a fair crack today. He can leave for the rest of question time.

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

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

**The SPEAKER:** And the Premier is warned.

**Mr CREGAN:** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on the achievements of the South Australian vegetable industry?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:55):** I thank the member for Kavel for his very important question, and I can. I know that he supports a number of his growers, not only the Barker Boy processors, but he also has the Samwell and Cranwell families who grow the majority of the state's brussels sprouts, kale and spinach—all those healthy green vegetable products.

Last month, they were part of an audience when I attended the 2019 AUSVEG SA Awards. Those awards recognise some of the outstanding achievements by our food producers and aspiring exporters. We saw 250 growers and industry members present, and it was an outstanding celebration of the industry—about a \$700 million vegetable industry—here in South Australia, highlighting how important it is supplying not only fresh produce domestically but they are also now starting to break into export markets, which is not only important for our trade but it is important that they now grow their businesses to the next level, and we are a government working with AUSVEG SA to give them that capacity.

Some of the winners on the night were Mark Pye from Zerella Fresh. Mark is an outstanding broadacre horticulturalist. He has a number of operations nationally, and he is recognised in the Mallee at Parilla for his outstanding work producing not only some of the global-leading potato products but also carrots and of course his onion line. He is an outstanding grower and ambassador for the industry by and large.

Daniel Hoffman is the Young Grower of the Year. I was speaking with Daniel on the phone only this morning, looking at ways we can put better traceability into our fresh produce, not only into our domestic markets but also into our international markets, so that they can trace from paddock to plate and understand who has been growing those products, what pesticides they use and what types of processes that fresh produce have been through.

Another winner was Jason Clark from Symons Clark Logistics, another great recognition of logistics and the important role that they play in transporting from farm to markets, to port and to airports making sure that those products arrive safe, fresh and undamaged.

Bianca Marrone from Marrone Fresh won the Women in Horticulture Award, and I had a conversation with her. She is a single mother of three managing a large fresh produce business on the Adelaide Plains. Hers is an outstanding success story and I congratulate her. Barbara Hall from SARDI was awarded the Researcher of the Year. Barbara has dedicated her life to research at SARDI and has done an outstanding job. Sadly, she is about to retire, but she is leaving her role in good, young hands at SARDI, and we know the important work that SARDI undertakes.

Peter Petsios from SA Tomato Company won the Biosecurity Award, a very important award, using integrated pest management techniques—that is, beneficial insects instead of using chemicals on his products—and that recognition was through a lot of hard work and dedication. I know that he works with a number of those suppliers of the beneficial insects. It was just a great recognition of his work and dedication.

I also want to acknowledge the government's Clean Your Farm project. That project has been an outstanding success. It's an educational program making sure that the mentoring scheme works in our vegetable industry, making sure that they clean up around their growing areas and making sure that we are recognised as growing clean, green, fresh produce.

#### MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Was more than \$500 spent on alcohol by the minister's office?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:59):** That's a very interesting question. If we are talking about \$500 spent on my office's alcohol budget account: no.

#### LIFESAVING WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. What was the value of the recent grant from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing to Surf Life Saving SA to compensate for storm damage incurred during the world surf lifesaving championships?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:00):** I thank the member for the question. That wasn't administered through the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. What happened was that there was some storm damage during the event that they had.

Because of that storm damage, some of their programs were potentially under threat unless they could find a funding source: programs for the CALD community, programs for education and programs for Little Lifesavers and Surf Babies. These programs have been a marvellous success, in particular over the recent summer. The engagement of young people and families in these programs has been outstanding. With that, and with the situation that the organisation was in, the Marshall Liberal government committed \$150,000 to making sure that those programs would continue.

### ROAD SAFETY

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister provide the house with an update on what response the government is taking to address driver behaviour?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:01):** I thank the member for Finniss very much for his question and note that he is a big advocate for road safety in his community. He has contacted me quite a number of times about issues in his area, and I look forward to continuing to work with him to make sure that we can keep people as safe as possible on our roads. I know that that is a bipartisan approach. Everyone in this house wants to make sure that people on our roads are being as safe as possible, but it has been frustrating.

Since I spoke about National Road Safety Week in this place a little while ago, we have continued to see people dying on our roads. It is tragic, it is sad and we need to do everything we can to make sure that we reduce the 'road toll', a phrase I don't like to use. I don't think anyone does because a toll is a price that we have to pay, but we know that police say that every fatal crash we have had this year was avoidable. They could have been avoided. People have made bad choices and done the wrong things when they have been either on a motorbike or behind the wheel.

We are delighted that the federal government has seen the importance of this as well and appointed someone to be in charge of road safety at a federal level. We welcome Scott Buchholz, the assistant minister for road safety and freight transport. I look forward to working with him. I was out on the weekend at the State Emergency Service training day. They had a competition, a challenge, to see who were the best operators, with the winner going off to the national championships. I commend the Tea Tree Gully team for winning that.

I speak to emergency service workers all the time when I travel around the state, but the weekend drove it home. When we think about these road traffic accidents and what happens on the road, which we often hear in the morning on the radio or see at night on the TV, spare a thought for the emergency service workers because they are the ones who actually go out there, a lot of the time in the middle of the night. They are the ones who literally have to pick the bodies up off the road and deal with the tragic scenes that you could only imagine unfolding before you.

As we see the number of people dying on our roads rise, I implore everyone to spare a thought for these people—the CFS, the MFS, the SES and SAPOL as well—who have to go out and deal with these things firsthand. It really is quite traumatic. A lot of these people are volunteers, and we thank them very much for the work they do. It is something we must be conscious of.

As a government, we are continuing with our advertising campaigns and our promotional campaigns. They are one element of road safety. In the last 12 months, we have spent 15 per cent more than we spent in the previous 12 months under the Labor government. We are investing very heavily in that and also in roads. Again, I commend the Minister for Transport, who is working very hard with his federal counterparts to invest more than \$2 billion into making our roads safer. Road safety standards and concepts will very much be built into those roads as we deliver them going forward.

The police are out there doing everything they can. I can understand their frustrations when it's reported that a man was picked up on the weekend four times over the blood alcohol limit and



driving at 140-odd km/h in a 110 km/h zone. I don't think anyone in this place condones that. I don't think any South Australians condone that. When they are putting people's lives at risk, there are no excuses for those actions.

At our end, we are doing everything we can. I know that everyone in this parliament is doing everything they can. Member for Finnis, I know it's something that you are very, very focused on. We will keep making sure that we do what we can to keep people as safe as possible on our roads across all those elements and across all those sectors, and I'm sure that we have a bipartisan approach in delivering that.

#### LIFESAVING WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:05):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Can the minister advise the house of the cost of the storm damage incurred by the Lifesaving World Championships?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:05):** I thank the member for that question. I don't have that detail, but I'm happy to look into it. If I can get my hands on the figure, I will let her know.

#### LIFESAVING WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:05):** My question is again to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Can the minister outline the process that Surf Life Saving SA, the Lifesaving World Championships and the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing went through in awarding funds to compensate for damage incurred during the Lifesaving World Championships?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:05):** I refer the member to my previous answer.

#### LIFESAVING WORLD CHAMPIONSHIPS

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:05):** My question is again to the Minister for Recreation and Sport. Can the minister advise the house of the amount of other debt, not related to storm damage, incurred by the Lifesaving World Championships and for what this debt was incurred?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:06):** I thank the member for the question. Again, I refer her back to my first answer because she may not have listened to it, but I will add a few more specifics just to be clear because, clearly, the Leader of the Opposition didn't listen either.

The event was run by the South Australian Tourism Commission, in association with Surf Life Saving SA. It wasn't run through the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing, so I wasn't privy to that detail. What we do know is that it was one of the best events that the international world lifesaving association had seen, and they were very, very complimentary, even with the extremely tough weather they had to deal with. I know you were down there as well—I saw you a number of times—and it was heartbreaking to see the infrastructure washed away through that storm. The volunteers rallied and pulled it all together to get things back up and running. To pull off the event was truly outstanding, so I commend everyone for doing that.

But the fallout was that, to cover the costs of what happened and the losses that were made, there was a situation where Surf Life Saving SA was at risk of not being able to deliver on those other programs I outlined before: Little Lifesavers, Surf Babies, CALD community programs and education programs helping people learn to swim, which are, as we know, a vitally important range of programs right across our state. When they were in danger of losing those programs and not being able to deliver on those programs, it was thought that this would be a good investment of money to make sure we keep delivering them.

Surf Life Saving SA do an amazing job. There are 22 surf lifesaving clubs along our beaches delivering these programs throughout the summer. They are volunteers keeping South Australians

safe and putting back into our communities. I can't thank our volunteers enough. It was Volunteer Week a fortnight ago and I mentioned the SES, CFS, MFS and SAPOL. Whilst they are paid entities, they do go over and above.

A number of people in Surf Life Saving SA put hours and hours in on our beaches trying to keep people as safe as possible and also put back into communities, like the CALD groups. The response we have had from those groups for their appreciation of these programs and the results they deliver has been truly outstanding. I think it's vitally important to help ensure that Surf Life Saving SA keeps delivering those programs.

In the last budget, we announced \$5,000 for each of those surf lifesaving clubs to help them with equipment and resources to make sure they are fully resourced to deliver these programs. We make no apologies for supporting our surf lifesaving clubs in South Australia.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **DRUG-RELATED CRIME**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:08):** I rise to speak on an alarming trend—that is, the increase in drug-fuelled crime on our suburban streets. Increasingly, on the evening news we are seeing this drug-related criminal activity, and it is to my great disappointment that I report to the house that it is happening with all too much prevalence in my electorate.

I am also aware that I am not the only local MP whose community is suffering from this. It is happening in our local streets in a large number of suburbs in the metropolitan area and it is also happening across regional communities. This criminal activity is horrifying for those living nearby, and it is disturbing more generally for all of us in South Australia that our communities are suffering from this.

In my electorate of Lee, over this past weekend there have been two incidents that have left many of my constituents living in fear. In Seaton, at 5.30am on Sunday, police patrols and ambulance crews were called to Pedlar Street after reports of a man having been injured following an altercation with a man known to him, after being allegedly struck in the head with a stick. The reports of the incident on the evening news were shocking, with one resident explaining that he heard a group of males shouting, 'I want my drugs. I want my effing drugs.'

In Semaphore Park a few hours earlier, at 12.30am on Sunday, patrols and paramedics were called to a house on West Street after a man had received cuts to his arm. A woman was later charged with aggravated assault causing serious harm. This follows an incident in late March this year, when a townhouse complex on Tapleys Hill Road, Seaton, was shot at, leaving numerous bullet holes in the property.

Many families who live between West Lakes Boulevard, Tapleys Hill Road, Frederick Road and Trimmer Parade in Seaton and also in Semaphore Park have had to experience disruption on their local streets for too long. SAPOL is well aware of the issues facing residents in this section of Seaton. Many of these residents are living in Housing Trust properties and others own their own homes. Together, they are fed up with what is happening to their suburb.

It is not just in Seaton. I am contacted by many people living in sections of Semaphore Park and Grange who are at their wits' end because of this sort of behaviour. The feedback from many constituents has been clear: ice use and ice dealing is on the rise, and so is crime in the local community. I have heard some heartbreaking stories of constituents whose children are suffering from addiction, and who need assistance in coping with the stresses of their child's drug addiction and the lack of available rehabilitation options to ease this burden.

I have spoken with constituents who want to move out of their home to avoid the disturbances caused by people affected by this insidious drug. Last week, chair of the Law Society's Criminal Law Committee, Craig Caldicott, said in *The Advertiser*:

...the link between ice and violent crime was different to that of other drugs such as heroin, cocaine and ecstasy.

Twenty years ago people were using heroin and they would do anything to get their fix...But heroin was and is expensive, so they would rob banks or commit armed robberies in order to be able to afford it.

In 2019, we're hearing it's actually cheaper to buy ice than it is to buy alcohol, with a purity ranging from at least 50 per cent up to 70 and 80 per cent.

These days people aren't offending to be able to buy ice—they're offending because they've consumed ice, and that offending is violent.

I have held several community forums with residents to hear their concerns about this sort of behaviour. A huge number of residents come to these forums, and the stories they have shared about the disturbances, the violence, the drug dealing, the arson, the house breaking, the vandalism and the terror they live through, have to be heard to understand the impact this is having on their lives.

To their credit, SA Police and staff from Housing SA have attended these forums to hear about the extent of the problem. Neighbourhood Watch leaders and the Housing Trust Tenants Association have also come along to represent their communities. Police have advised residents that they need them to report suspicious or criminal activity as soon as they see it to enable SAPOL to attend and take action.

Over the past three years, I have been assured that patrols have been stepped up and that a more visible police presence has been placed in the community to try to deter this behaviour. Housing SA staff also encourage residents to report to them any criminal or disturbing behaviour so they can try to intervene in these situations. Many residents have cooperated with police and Housing SA to provide such intelligence; however, many residents feel that despite reporting this behaviour and criminal activity, it continues.

There is now a sense of helplessness amongst many. My office raises issues on behalf of constituents in relation to antisocial behaviour, including alleged drug use and manufacturing at Housing SA properties in this area, and has done so on many occasions. I understand that the government has sought to toughen the approach of the Housing Trust with the new 'three strikes' policy to try to eradicate this behaviour. This is not the first minister to promise tougher action; however, converting a minister's policy to on-the-ground action is not guaranteed.

I wholeheartedly support a tougher stance on people perpetrating this criminal behaviour, but it has to be carried out by the officers on the ground. Residents are being forced to endure the worst type of the behaviour in communities they have lived in for 20, 30 or even 40 years. Home owners and Housing Trust tenants alike are proud of their streets and suburbs. It causes them tremendous distress to see what is happening to their community. We need to see our parliament and government act in ways to alleviate this suffering in our communities.

### **DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:14):** I am going to speak about being the change we wish to see. I am thankful for the important discussion I have been having with my colleagues in our Liberal government about the opportunity to lead further change in eradicating family violence. This is urgent because violence against one in three women is unacceptable, and it is heartbreaking that over 60 per cent of parents have children in their care when violence occurs. The good news is that this significant social problem is also ultimately preventable. It is time to address the underlying factors that cause the problem, and this includes our acceptance of disrespectful attitudes and behaviours.

An ANROWS report about young Australians' attitudes to violence against women and gender equality suggests that Australia is on track to achieve positive changes in factors contributing to violence against women. However, there are young Australians who hold attitudes that may contribute to violence against women and perpetuate this cycle.

Preventing violence perpetrated or experienced by young people requires a twofold approach. As well as addressing norms and practices among young people themselves, attention needs to be given to norms, structures and practices in the wider community, as these also influence young people's experiences, attitudes and behaviours. As South Australian community leaders, we must start to role model attitudes and behaviours that will help stop violence at the start.

Let's reflect on our behaviours in this parliament. For the past 15 months, I have felt uneasy being part of an environment where parliamentarians yell and interrupt each other aggressively—especially when one person is trying to deliver their answer or speech—and sometimes violently

thump their desks while yelling at us and use threatening, non-verbal behaviour, such as indicating hanging and slitting throats as a person is speaking. Most alarmingly, often when this disrespectful behaviour is occurring, there are large groups of children sitting in our public galleries watching us.

I have asked myself: how can our kids learn to be respectful to each other when their community leaders set the example that it is okay to behave this way? The routinely disrespectful and overly combative behaviour of members of parliament gets in the way of a healthy debate, which should be focused on what is in the best interests of our community, and creates an inappropriate behavioural model for our youth.

In any other workplace this disrespectful behaviour would not only be unacceptable but the elected members could also expect to face serious disciplinary action from their employer. It never would have been acceptable in my previous workplaces to have a large number of colleagues yelling nonstop at me while I was speaking. I do understand that it is difficult to sit quietly while other people may tell untruths and make personal attacks; however, there are parliamentary processes to address this.

I believe that behaviour in this house is out of step with community expectations and that it is time for us to set a better, more respectful leadership example for our community and our younger generation. We all deserve to work in a safe workplace, just as everyone in South Australia has the right to feel safe at home, school, work and on our streets.

Smart, talented women I have spoken to about politics have said to me: why would they want to subject themselves to this disrespectful behaviour that they have seen in parliament? While combative, disrespectful behaviour continues, many good, skilled people may be dissuaded from even trying to run for office. Anyone who claims that I, and women, need to somehow toughen up completely misses the point of what I am talking about today.

An important way to change this undesired behaviour is through education and, more directly, through strengthening the social sanctions against it. I commend our Marshall Liberal government for delivering a raft of domestic violence responses, such as new strangulation laws, more crisis accommodation and the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme. But it is time for us also to work together and deliver real change to stop violence at the start. We must hold ourselves to account for more respectful behaviour. I thank you, Mr Speaker, for agreeing to add the consideration of the White Ribbon Workplace Accreditation Program to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee agenda.

The White Ribbon Workplace Accreditation Program engenders a whole-of-organisation commitment to stop violence against women and, yes, it comes at a cost, but this is a very small investment when compared with the billions of dollars it is costing our state to cope with the consequence of cycles of violence and the millions of dollars we are investing in domestic violence crisis response.

### **HURTLE VALE ELECTORATE COMMUNITY EVENTS**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:19):** I wish to congratulate Kalyra Communities and Southern Montessori School on the launch of the new Australia-first co-located middle school and aged-care facility. It is an intergenerational site in the heart of Hurtle Vale, and I attended the opening on 27 May. Principal Noel Browne invited Onkaparinga Mayor, Erin Thompson, to formally open the middle school after a wonderful smoking ceremony conducted by Major Sumner. Sara Blunt, CEO of Kalyra Communities, emphasised the importance of the benefits from the intergenerational collaboration. It recognises that elderly people have a meaningful contribution to make within their community, regardless of their housing option.

The research around intergenerational learning is extremely positive, showing that shared activities such as music, art, history and cooking provide a really enriched and positive experience for the young and the young at heart. The James Brown Memorial Trust program is just part of the \$20 million redevelopment of the centre, with the conversion of an existing building into a classroom and an additional two new buildings built to establish a community hub.

The Montessori curriculum includes an area called 'practical life', which is focused on experience and interactions. The residents in Kalyra will be able to opt in to the program, which aims

to improve quality of life and present new opportunities. Being respectful, graceful and courteous is also part of this. Students from years 7 to 9 are at an adolescent age where there is a real emphasis on finding a place in the world.

The co-location with Kalyra is a perfect setting to experience different parts of our society. The students are looking forward to the barista training so they can work in the new cafe, and they also have plans to work with the Kalyra men's group to build a pizza oven in the coming months. It really is an exciting time for them. I look forward to catching up with all the students and residents of Kalyra over the coming months and seeing the benefits to the community.

I also ask the house to reflect on the cuts that we are seeing from the Premier and the Marshall Liberal government. The budget has not even been delivered yet, but we are seeing plans to cut, privatise and abandon some critical public services. I am horrified at what actually may be hidden in the budget papers by those opposite, given their current record. This week, we have heard about a ruthless 25 per cent cut to state-funded mental health services from 1 July, meaning that one-quarter of South Australians accessing critical mental health services may go without.

Vulnerable South Australians living with mental illness will find it very hard to access the preventative and early intervention services they desperately need. This will put additional strain on our health system and clog up already blocked EDs and hospital beds. It will also further contribute to the homelessness statistics in our state. Only two weeks ago, the Zero Project, coordinated by the Don Dunstan Foundation, confirmed that Adelaide's inner city homelessness population has skyrocketed over the past 12 months from 143 to 227.

At least 70 per cent of rough sleepers have a medical problem, at least 70 per cent have a mental health problem and 70 per cent have substance abuse problems. In fact, half the number of rough sleepers have a combination of all three comorbidities. To quote Shelter SA:

If this situation was caused by a bushfire or flood we would immediately open an emergency shelter and provide food, bedding, clothing and financial assistance, not just sit back and read it in the paper.

Ministers Wade and Lensink are cutting mental health and community services from their budgets, and our homeless population is simply going to climb.

On Sunday, overnight temperatures in Adelaide were as low as 5.9°. Last night, Monday night, they went down to 5° and lower. It is worse in the regions. On Tuesday and Wednesday night, it is forecast to be 5°, but I can bet you that it will be lower than that. Minister Lensink in the other place must initiate a Code Blue to bring rough sleepers in from the cold to protect our most vulnerable members of the community.

The minister must consider the danger that rough sleepers are being placed in during this freezing weather, particularly while South Australia is experiencing such a horrid flu season. People's lives are at risk if they are not adequately protected through the triggering of a Code Blue. We have to be agile and we have to trigger this. Governments must use what triggers they have available to them. It is not good enough to hide behind a stuck policy while people freeze to death.

## SA WATER

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:24):** Sunday saw the burst of yet another Adelaide water main, sadly, in the seat of Florey. This time a pipe in Pooraka, under Bridge Road near Dulkara Road, erupted causing flooding in nearby homes, which has been catastrophic for the occupants. It has immediately uprooted their lives and they will be in a parlous state for the coming days and weeks and, most likely, long after that. In an all too familiar pattern this pipe, and others in the immediate vicinity, were reported by residents months ago. They were told that things were performing normally.

How can the community have confidence that their concerns are acted upon when repairs are insufficient and protect them for only a matter of months? For a then opposition to have paid such great attention to incidents of this nature over past years, I am sad to learn from my constituents that circumstances around and after this sort of incident have not improved a great deal.

Luckily, the SES emergency personnel are the one bright spot for any residents in this dire situation. The presence of the SES and their handling of callouts such as these are comforting. However, while I am told in the one case I have been able to substantiate post event that the

SA Water contact officer has been helpful, there seems to be a lot to be desired when dealing with insurance claims.

Since the boundary redistribution, I have become responsible for the residents in the now SA Water top 10 hotspot areas for water main bursts of Valley View, Ingle Farm and now Pooraka. This has led to my much keener interest in this issue and the Metropolitan Water Main Replacement Program. We will all no doubt recall the long-suffering residents of Willow Drive, Paradise, who became regular features on our nightly news services and in daily papers. Luckily—and I do not want to jinx them—they seem to have had the remedial work done and I have not seen them in the news for a while.

A quick look at the interactive map on the SA Water web page shows their area is no longer in the water main replacement focus area. It also shows that Pooraka, Ingle Farm and Valley View are not either, which leads to the question: what has to happen to an area before they become automatically the focus of attention under this program? The cost to the individuals financially, physically and emotionally is enormous and so too must be the cost for departments in calling out emergency repair crews after hours and then having to race to get intersections ready for peak periods.

The very informative SA Water web page also tells us that the agency is responsible for 27,000 kilometres of pipelines across South Australia. In the past 10 years, 638,000 metres have been replaced. Also, in the four years ending in 2020, a further 375,700 metres will be replaced. I am not sure yet how many metres were replaced on Nelson Road in 2012 or how many metres are involved in the new and current problem areas in Pooraka, Ingle Farm and Valley View, but I do see that 530 metres have been attended to in the Cugera Avenue and Mary Leonard Drive, Ingle Farm, area. It is due for completion in June, for which I am sure these residents are very grateful.

While welcome, that leaves a lot of residents in the Pooraka, Ingle Farm and Valley View area still waiting for works to be performed. While they are waiting, it would be good to know that the minister, the department and SA Water are doing all they can to assist people who by sheer accident are left high and dry, when they wish they really were, and on their own. If this was an isolated emergency event, you could perhaps patiently keep asking for improvements to the process. But, as it is not, my electors and I are looking for improvements, especially around accommodation, out-of-pocket expenses and insurance claims.

In one recent event, when the pipes were ruptured by a contractor who dug before they dialled, in the following confusion and responsibility with insurance assessing we now see residents needing to pursue claims and satisfactory settlements and restorations many weeks after the event. This disruption of everyday life is an additional burden and stress on people. I look forward to working with the minister, his department and SA Water to streamline the process. I am also very concerned that household policies are not providing new-for-old replacements and the level of insurance that may be necessary to ensure prompt and satisfactory event resolution.

Reactive soils are throughout the north-eastern suburbs, and in the former parts of Florey I cannot recall as many events as there have been of late. The old Nelson Road boundary quarantined then Florey from the horror of regular mains and pipes bursts, so I am not sure how that reactive soil is any better in Modbury Heights than it is in Pooraka, Ingle Farm and Valley View.

Another great worry is the passing on of the repair costs in increasing water bills to everyday citizens. Along with my staff, the Florey electorate office is working with local residents on the broader question of water supply and emergency repairs and maintenance of the water pipeline network. None of us ever wants to be in this situation, but if we are we would all like to be assured the government is really there to help us.

## STATE BUDGET

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:29):** I rise to speak on the government's continued cuts that are hurting small businesses, workers, disengaged or marginalised young people, tourism and investment in our economy. I speak about the cuts to Brand SA, cuts to the Adelaide Fashion Festival and cuts to Reclink, cuts that tell mum-and-dad investors, mum-and-dad small businesses or young innovative entrepreneurs not to even bother trying to start up in this state, cuts and privatisations that prevent small businesses from growing and thriving so they can employ more people, putting more

South Australians in jobs, cuts that reaffirm this government's penchant for big corporate interests like banks and industry monopolies.

This government is not the friend of small business, illustrated by \$1.6 million in cuts to Brand SA, the highly successful not-for-profit organisation that promoted our state and our economy on the world stage. This is what Brand SA executive chairman, Peter Joy, had to say about these Liberal cuts:

A great team of smart, young and passionate people doing nothing more than helping local businesses, sharing positive stories and translating government policies into private business opportunities stopped in their tracks. A bad, short-sighted decision.

It is a short-sighted decision that is bound to be a kick in the guts to thousands of small businesses from our great state making a go of it, both here and abroad. It is a kick for Fleet Space, headed by the inspirational Flavia Tata Nardini and based in my electorate in Beverley. Fleet Space designs, manufactures and launches nano satellites to connect billions of devices around the globe. It is a kick to Gripset from Woodville North, a family business generations in the making that has invested in significant people and capital expansion in part because of the loyalty of people wanting to support local South Australian brands.

It is a kick for Cutler Brands in Woodville that has been part of the manufacturing chain for the Lockie seatbelt fastening device. Then there is Swedish Tarts in Findon, in fact, directly across the road from my own electorate office—another business leveraging off Brand SA. To deprive these businesses of this invested brand capital is a bad, short-sighted decision. It is bad, short-sighted decisions like these that seem to be the hallmark of this government.

Another bad, short-sighted decision by this government impacting upon our state's reputation, economy and capacity to create investment and also to encourage new business is the decision to cut funding for the Adelaide Fashion Festival. It is another decision that hurts not only small business but also entrepreneurs, fashion and design students, as well as further depriving consumers the choice of clothing and textiles manufactured locally and according to Ethical Clothing Australia certification.

The Adelaide Fashion Festival was our state's premier fashion festival, supported by a \$2 million investment by the former Labor government to take this to the international stage. This festival supported up-and-coming models and designers and showcased the extraordinary wealth and creative talent we have right here in South Australia. But, again, this government does not believe in supporting industry or creativity. This government would rather stifle growth and cut support for these things that support our state.

It takes a lot of courage to put yourself on the line, to take a great idea, to give it a go and to see what comes of it. You would think that the government of the day would support those who do it. Well, not this government, not the Steven Marshall Liberal government. They have turned their back on the small and medium businesses of this state. It is not just industry this government has turned its back on.

It is not enough for them to create a roadblock for investment, but they are going after young people as well. Sporting organisations like Reclink SA, which engages young people, have been told that their government funding of \$50,000 a year will be finishing at the end of this month—a lot of notice there. As with Brand SA, the government has no interest in preparing anyone for their cuts—'That's it, no more for you. Pack up your bags. Off you go.' Reclink had to largely rely on community donations and fundraising. This cruel cut, which is a figure of little significance to the government but is everything to Reclink SA, will gut the organisation and have a major impact on their ability to run services to disengaged young people.

### **EPILEPSY SERVICES**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:35):** South Australians of all ages experience the chronic and debilitating health impacts of living with epilepsy. One in 25 people will have epilepsy at some point in their lifetime, and it is a chronic health condition for many South Australians. It can result in ongoing medical expenses and can require, and often does, constant medical attention. Many people living with epilepsy are usually able to live full and productive lives through medication, self-management

and lifestyle changes. However, public confusion on epilepsy can cause challenges to people who live with this condition.

Government, families and the community need to work together to provide quality support services for those with epilepsy. To this end, I recently hosted an epilepsy round table, giving consumers, government representatives, members of parliament, neurologists, paediatricians and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. Stephen Wade) a chance to discuss how best to manage the care for people living with epilepsy in South Australia.

The round table was opened by the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, and I thank him for his participation. The panellists included Dr Diana Lawrence, Executive Director Medical Services at SAHLN; Naomi Burgess, the state's Interim Chief Pharmacist; Dr Carolyn Harris, a GP and consumer; Mrs Vikki Threapleton, a consumer; and Dr Damian Clark, consultant paediatrician and neurologist at the Women's and Children's Hospital.

I would like to thank everyone who attended and participated for sharing their personal stories, especially Vikki Threapleton, Carolyn Harris, Kym Meers, and Mark Elliott for his moving contribution on his family experience with epilepsy. I thank Katherine Height, who came all the way from Mount Gambier. I also thank the many others who came to the forum and took the time to make a contribution and to share with me, the minister and those health practitioners their lived experience in Australia and for bravely sharing their stories and their family's stories. I also thank the member for Mount Gambier for attending the forum and highlighting the difficulties that many families face in regional South Australia.

The round table was an opportunity to consider the availability and accessibility of existing epilepsy services in our state and to explore current and future service needs. The participants had knowledge, understanding and experience of the condition and were able to make a valuable contribution to the discussion on how best the Marshall Liberal government can assist people living with epilepsy. The round table explored a number of opportunities for the government to consider in relation to improved support and services for those families.

In particular, there was a lot of discussion around the Victorian and NSW models. These were highlighted as centres of excellence for the treatment and care of those living with epilepsy, especially the provision in those states around inpatient wraparound services. Many good points were raised and ideas discussed, including increased access to support services for families and the community, including face-to-face support after initial diagnosis and referral by the health system to ensure that all families have an appropriate care plan.

There was also a lot of discussion about the positive impact that families have experienced through access to medical cannabis and the need for easier CBD access in South Australia. Those pharmacists who are prepared to provide that service was an issue that was also raised, as was the time that it takes to see a paediatric neurologist. I hope that we soon will also have a better epilepsy model of care here in South Australia based on some of the fantastic feedback we received that afternoon.

Diagnosis and management are critical to supporting those affected by epilepsy in our community. I know that minister Wade is already considering the ideas raised at the round table and the important opportunity we have for those living with epilepsy to take the next step in terms of care management in South Australia. I look forward to working with the minister to deliver tangible outcomes for all South Australians affected by this condition.

I would also like to thank the Epilepsy Centre for the work they do in South Australia. The Epilepsy Centre is a member of Epilepsy South Australia and is committed to providing quality, caring services. It has dedicated and professional staff who provide counselling, training, practical assistance and advocacy. It has been the lead provider of epilepsy services in South Australia since 1976.

The government is looking at optimising health services across the state, and I believe that we need to include support services for South Australians living with epilepsy. It is not only important to raise awareness of this condition but also to see what we can do and to see what best practice is around the nation to ensure that we deliver the best services to our South Australians.



*Personal Explanation***CHILD PROTECTION**

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:40):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** On 16 May 2019, I was asked a question in this house, and I quote:

Is the minister outsourcing the assessment of foster or kinship carers to a Victorian company, Assessments Australia, or any other private or non-government organisations?

I replied, 'No.' I believe this answer to be accurate because these care assessments were outsourced a number of years ago. In 2017, the member for Port Adelaide in the previous Labor government, as the minister for education and child development, committed this outsourcing to Assessments Australia. Neither I nor the government have taken any steps to change this arrangement.

*Condolence***HAWKE, HON. R.J.L.**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.S. Marshall (resumed on motion).

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:41):** I rise to join this condolence motion for the man who I believe was the greatest prime minister Australia has ever had. I want to point out that a lot of people have mentioned that Bob Hawke was born in Bordertown and was a famous son of the South-East. However, it is worth pointing out that the South-East is hardly a hotbed of Labor politics.

I was also born and brought up down in the South-East and I had a great-aunt called Auntie Girlie. From the earliest age of our watching television, every time Bob Hawke, who was then the ACTU president, would come on the television my great-aunt Girlie would make a hand motion like a pistol and then she would click her fingers to shoot Bob Hawke on the tele, so he was not exactly the toast of the town in the South-East, shall we say.

A lot of people have also talked about how we remember Bob Hawke's slogan in the 1983 election campaign, which was 'Bringing Australia Together', and I think he really did that. As a 16 year old in 1983, I was doing politics, economics and a few other subjects, such as communications, at Blackfriars Priory School. I was in year 11 in 1983 when I went in my school uniform, without a ticket, to the Festival Theatre to see Bob Hawke give his 'stump' speech about bringing Australia together and why he wanted Australians to vote for him and his vision a week or so later.

The other day it was interesting to hear Chris Schacht, who was the state secretary at the time. He said that, when Hawkie wanted this 2,000-seat auditorium booked, he was a little bit worried because Bob Hawke had been the leader of the Australian Labor Party at the federal level for only a matter of weeks. Obviously, he came in after Bill Hayden moved aside. Schachtie was a little bit concerned that they might have 2,000 seats and not have a very big audience there. Well, Schachtie reckons that about 5,000 people turned up. I remember getting there really early, sneaking in and getting a seat front and centre, as I said, in my school uniform.

Again, let's just go back to where I was brought up in the South-East with a family who had always voted Country Party or Liberal Party, with the exception of dad, who voted for Des Corcoran because he said that Des was a good bloke who worked hard for the area, so he voted for the man rather than the party. I had been pretty much indoctrinated since my birth and all through those Whitlam years, when dad was really upset with Gough Whitlam and his vision. I do not know why, but that is what I remember.

At Blackfriars, I had some outstanding teachers. Rene Schinkel and I used to have great discussions and debates (I think the rest of the class was asleep) and Rene was a big supporter of Gough Whitlam. He took one view of the dismissal and, as a 16 year old, I had a different view at the start of the year. My economics teacher was Kathy Snelling, Jack Snelling's mum. Obviously, he went to Blackfriars as well before coming in here.

I had turned up to this thing with Bob Hawke, and he talked about bringing Australians together. He said that it was not about bosses versus workers: it was about bosses and workers sitting around the table together and coming up with agreements, which went on to become the accord. I had never seen so many people so excited. It was almost as big as the Split Enz concerts that I used to go to back then. People were really excited by the guy because Bob Hawke had charisma. Anyone who was ever in a room with Bob Hawke will know that he had charisma.

Despite 16 years of living in the family home and being indoctrinated one way in politics, while Bob Hawke did not get me totally over the line that night, he led me on a path where I thought that Labor might be a better option. At the end of his speech and great rapturous applause, I raced out, got under the security ropes in between a couple of security guards or federal police and grabbed whatever I could on the way. It just happened to be a Greens triangular 'No Dams' sticker. I had my pen on me, and I got him to sign it. I still have that Bob Hawke signed 'No Dams' sticker, along with my 'Bringing Australia Together' stickers. I have about five of those left. I have my 'Bob for Jobs' badge as well.

That night, just a week or 10 days before the federal election of 1983, was a defining moment in my life. I have since met a lot of people who went out and joined the Labor Party after being there who had not considered joining a political party until they heard Bob Hawke speak at the Festival Centre that night. Fast-forward a few years and I was working as a journalist. I got to meet Mr Hawke a few times, not only through press conferences and things like that.

One of my very dear friends at the Adelaide News while I was a cadet journalist, Janine Young, became a cadet photographer. Janine's dad was Mick Young. I was quite often down at Janine's place, and Mick was always there with plenty of advice on my family upbringing in the South-East and who I should be voting for. Quite often, Bob was there as well. Particularly if I went around on a Saturday morning, Bob and Mick would be sitting out on the sundecks at Sunlake Place at Tennyson going through the form guides.

Mick had this big Commander phone at home with about six lines coming in. We all thought it was because he was special minister of state and immigration minister, but it was so he could have people from Sydney, Melbourne and all around Australia ring in each Saturday morning to get the latest mail. Speaking to Janine, she said that she knew all the racetracks in Australia from the age of five because Bob Hawke used to ring up on a Saturday morning and she would have to take long notes if Mick was on the other line.

I got to meet Bob a few times there. One time that really stands out was in 1987, when he came over with Mick, who was the member for Port Adelaide, and also Kim Beazley, who was the defence minister. They came to Adelaide to announce that the Collins class submarines would be built here in Adelaide. It was a tremendous announcement. We went down to the Brompton Park Hotel, which was then run by Mick's son Michael, and then down to the Colac Hotel, which was owned by the Labor Party.

There was a great little band that Mick used to get to all his shows called The Good Time Rascals. They sang well into the night. Hawkie slipped off a bit earlier, but I remember Kim Beazley and Mick Young standing on the tables singing, 'We all live in a yellow submarine,' until well after midnight, when the Irish songs came out as well. Bob was a terrific fella who brought all Australians together. The deputy leader mentioned before that Australians loved Bob Hawke and Bob Hawke loved Australians.

Another thing worth saying is that Australians trusted Bob Hawke. Even though he asked Australians to change in a way that we had never seen change of that scale before, we trusted Bob Hawke not to do the wrong thing by us. He took us on a journey of great change: bringing in a different industrial relations system with more discussion on both sides, floating the dollar, making huge tariff changes and other changes that really strengthened the Australian economy for years to come. You cannot bring about change without trusting those people who are going to take you on that journey of change.

During the 2001 federal campaign, a little bit like our leader I got to go down to the Airport to pick up Bob and Blanche and take them around. It was incredible to see the impact he had on people.

Even 10 years or so after he had left the role of prime minister, people still idolised Bob Hawke and wanted a photo with him or an autograph and the like.

I should also mention a fellow called Bob Bell. I am not sure whether too many people will remember Bob Bell. I thought the member for Giles might have mentioned him. In 1989, Bob Hawke visited Whyalla and some bloke gave him a bit of lip. Bob Hawke yelled out, 'You silly old bugger,' as Bob would. It became the big national story for about three days. It just shows you that Bob never lost his approach that it did not matter that he was the prime minister; he could still interact with people and have a bit of a go. If they were having a go at him, he would have a bit of a shot back at them.

Bob Hawke will be remembered as our greatest ever prime minister. He will be remembered as someone who changed not only the Australian economy but also our sense of social justice because he took people who had a particular view on race, gender and other issues and made it okay for them to change their mind and be more caring and understanding of other people's points of view. We should never forget that great thing that he did for Australia. He had an immense effect on us as a nation, and he also had an immense effect on us as individuals.

At the 1983 function, many of us who were not aligned with the Labor Party went to the Festival Centre just to see Bob Hawke in action. He changed so many of us. He had such an effect on us. I want to skip forward a generation to seven years ago, when I took my son, Conor, who was then 14, to see Bob Hawke give a talk on Asia. Conor was doing his third year of high school study in Mandarin. He heard Bob Hawke talk about how important Asia was and how important China was. Afterwards, I introduced Conor to Bob Hawke. It was like Conor was the only bloke in the room. He gave him his time and spoke to him about what he wanted to do in the future and what he was doing at the time. Conor said, 'I'm studying Mandarin.' Bob asked, 'How are you finding it?' Conor said, 'I'm finding it really tough.'

Conor was about to pull out of his Mandarin studies, but Bob Hawke inspired Conor at that meeting to persevere, and he did. At the end of that year, he spent three months of year 10 living with a Chinese family in Shanghai and studying Mandarin. He is actually in China at the moment on his fifth trip. As he said to me on the night we heard about Hawke's death, 'It was so hard to do Mandarin, but those words that Bob Hawke spoke to me inspired me to stick with it and go on with my studies.' He is really glad he did. I am really glad that Bob snapped me out of the conservative political beliefs that I had as a 16 year old. I think Conor and I and a lot of Australians are in a better place because of Bob Hawke.

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:54):** I rise to make a short contribution on this condolence motion remembering Bob Hawke. It is very difficult to find something new or original to say about a man who led such a storied life and a life that is enmeshed in popular Australian culture.

Certainly, for those who grew up in the 1980s, as I did, Bob Hawke loomed very large. I think it is very rare for a politician to cross that divide between politics and popular culture. In fact, there is probably an argument to be made that Hawke was the only person who truly did that. When the media compiles snapshots of the decade that was the 1980s, Hawke is always there, but it is not just a cursory shot of him coming to power: it is the famous interview after Australia's America's Cup victory; it is footage of Bob playing cricket and of Bob shedding a tear during the press conference when he was asked about his daughter's drug use.

My earliest memory of Hawke was the speech he gave in 1989 following the Tiananmen Square massacre, in which he famously broke down. I think it is fitting that today is the 30<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Tiananmen Square massacre. I do not think any words could have truly brought home to an eight year old the significance of what had taken place, but watching the prime minister cry—the leader of our country—on the ABC news told me that something truly significant had taken place. I think one of Bob's great skills was how he could always find a way to engage with people on a completely different level.

It is all too easy to mark the passing of someone as significant as Bob Hawke by bandying about all sorts of wild comparisons to other leaders. As a member of the Labor Party, I think comparing anyone to John Curtin is tantamount to jumping the shark, but I think there were genuine comparisons in the way that Curtin's leadership brought the country together during World War II and

the way that Hawke's leadership brought the country together in the early 1980s after a very divisive time in Australian politics.

The manner in which Curtin and Hawke achieved this unification was different. Curtin was stoic and incredibly resilient in the face of threats to national security and his own failing personal health. Hawke's great gifts were his ease of association and supreme social intelligence. He had the ability to harness our love of the larrikin and he resisted the temptation of the dog whistle.

Bob Hawke enlisted our capacity for love and compassion and never resorted to making political capital out of a battler, the oppressed or the dispossessed. For Hawke, these were people to embrace and fight for; they were not to be turned into scapegoats, or stereotyped into scared and loathed interlopers intent on taking the things we have and hold dear. Perhaps the most important quote from Hawke, at least in terms of what contemporary society needs most, is this:

I think it is just stupid economics for a government to approach economic management from a strand of thinking regarding unions as enemies.

This was the platform on which Hawke built the accord. It was an achievement that demonstrated the unthinkable: that bitter enemies could come to the table and work together for the common cause of making Australia a better place for all. In doing so, Hawke overcame a century of enmity and distrust to put Australia on the path to the prosperity that we still enjoy.

In a wider sense, of what relevance is the idea of an accord to the imperative of today's political, social, economic and environmental concerns? What would Robert James Lee Hawke say about the division that is allowed to fester—and is even encouraged—for cheap political gain with regard to taking action on climate change, homelessness or youth employment? The problems may be different from those of 1983 but they are every bit as serious, and in the face of impending disaster we have retreated to our respective camps.

At this point, you may expect me to conclude that we need a leader like Hawke to step forward, but the truth of the matter is that, in this day and age, no political party would elect someone like Bob Hawke to be its leader. Had there been Facebook in Bob's day, I am sure some of the contents would provide cause for concern and ammunition for those who sought to oppose him.

On that note, I will finish my remarks by urging all who crave a return to the kind of leadership that was the hallmark of Bob Hawke's prime ministership to reflect on why such people are not drawn to public life and why we have never since seen the likes of Bob Hawke.

**The SPEAKER (15:59):** I also pass on my sincere condolences to the family and close friends of the Hon. Bob Hawke. May he rest in peace. The condolence motion has been moved by the Premier and seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. I ask members to please rise so that the motion can be carried in the customary manner.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

**The SPEAKER:** The house will stand suspended until the ringing of the bells.

*Sitting suspended from 16:00 to 16:10.*

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:10):** I move: That Orders of the Day Nos. 1 and 2 be postponed and taken into consideration after Order of the Day No. 3.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:10):** Point of order: standing order 182:

No motion to be made without previous notice. A Member may move a motion initiating a subject for discussion only if notice of that motion has been openly given at a previous sitting of the House and has been duly entered on the Notice Paper.

The exception is: leave be sought of the house. The minister did not seek leave.

**The SPEAKER:** I believe that it is a procedural motion. Member for West Torrens, I see what you are saying. The exception is:

With leave of the House, however, matters of a procedural nature may be moved without notice and the question put at once without debate.

I have the point of order. Would the Attorney like to seek leave?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am happy to do so, Mr Speaker, because, of course, the Speaker is always right.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is sought; is leave granted?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** There is a dissenting voice. Leave is not granted.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leave is required and leave has been denied.

### *Bills*

## **LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL**

### *Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 16 May 2019.)

Clause 24.

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

That progress be reported.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

## **VICTIMS OF CRIME (OFFENDER SERVICE AND JOINDER) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 April 2019.)

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (16:17):** I rise as the lead speaker on the Victims of Crime (Offender Service and Joinder) Amendment Bill 2019. I note that this is a relatively short bill and that it amends the Victims of Crime Act 2001 to remove the requirements for a claimant to the Victims of Crime Fund to serve a copy of their application on the offender. As I said, it is a small bill, but for the relatively small proportion of victims who might be impacted by this it would obviously have a significant impact.

I am advised that around 90 per cent of claimants to the Victims of Crime Fund have legal representation; hence, this change would not apply to them. There is no current requirement for those people to personally serve, but in practice it is the legal representatives who serve a copy of the application on the offender in those 90 per cent of cases. However, I understand that there is a concern that, for the approximately 10 per cent of claimants who do not have legal representation, they may be forced to serve the papers on the offenders themselves.

If this were to happen, it is likely that this would be distressing for the victims. There would be particular concerns for a range of different classes of victims, whether they be victims of domestic violence, sexual violence, or where the victim is a minor. Applications can also contain personal details, including medical reports, which may not be appropriate to provide to offenders.

In her second reading explanation, the Attorney-General represented that South Australia is the only jurisdiction where a claimant to the Victims of Crime Fund is required to serve a copy of their application on the offender. If that is the case, then it makes sense to bring South Australia into line with other states and to make sure that this practice would not have to happen here in this state.

That is something the opposition supports. We support the bill through the house. It is a very small bill with a couple of clauses which seem appropriate to us and which I am sure can be dealt

with readily. I am sure that the member for Heysen will have a full 20 minutes to discuss it but I certainly will not use my unlimited time to debate it.

I would make one note. When discussing victims of crime, I think South Australia owes a great deal of debt to the former victims of crime commissioner, Mr Michael O'Connell, who served with distinction in that role. He was recognised very highly, not only by victims in this state but around the country and internationally for his role and leadership in this area. Even though he is no longer in the position, he is continuing to advocate for victims. He is a person that this side of the house will continue to listen to for his guidance.

We think it is very disappointing that the government, particularly the Deputy Premier, decided not to continue with Mr O'Connell in the position. They basically forced him out, as they have done with the DPP, as well who was also doing an excellent job. I think the way he was treated was very disappointing, and I think that South Australians have a pretty dim view of the way he was treated. We absolutely respect the role that he has played and will continue to listen to his advice in making sure that victims are listened to in our judicial system.

I think there has been a lot of progress over the past two decades on this front, but there is a lot more that can still be done to make sure that we are listening to victims and that victims have rights in the legal system and that those rights are expanded upon and protected. With those words, the opposition supports this bill.

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (16:21):** I rise today to make a brief contribution to what is a brief bill, the Victims of Crime (Offender Service and Joinder) Amendment Bill 2019. I note that on coming to this place I communicated that I was very keen to support legislative reform that is practical and puts forward common-sense change. I certainly believe that this bill is of that nature.

As I said, it is a very short bill with two parts and five clauses. Operationally, clause 4 of the bill removes section 18(4)(c) of the Victims of Crime Act 2001, in practice removing the requirement to serve offenders of those applicants who have made an application to the Victims of Crime Fund. Clause 5 changes clause 19 of the Victims of Crime Act, providing flexibility for actions that have already been commenced through the court process.

Historically, the reason for these current provisions being in place was to allow offenders the opportunity to make submissions to the Crown Solicitor's Office during the victims of crime application process. This is not necessarily a desirable process from a policy perspective for a range of different reasons. The Crown Solicitor's Office has advised that submissions are very rarely received by offenders and that it is quite rare that the award for compensation is reduced by an offender's submission.

Why are we doing this? I think it is important to draw out a couple of key points. The member for Kaurana has already placed the first on the record, and that is that this brings us in line with other jurisdictions around Australia. South Australia is the only state and the only jurisdiction where offenders are served with applications made to the Victims of Crime Fund. Certainly, there is a risk of retraumatisation for those who do not have legal counsel and who are at times asked to provide the application by themselves. This is especially important in applications that involve domestic violence matters. Consequently, many victims are scared to comply with the requirements of the Victims of Crime Fund and instead make their applications for ex gratia payment.

It is also important to understand the quantum of this issue. The Crown Solicitor's Office has provided estimates-based figures that on average 1,350 claims are made to the Victims of Crime Fund each year. While they do not necessarily categorise the applications down to those that are relating to domestic abuse or assault or breach of intervention orders, they have, using the work group, provided us a base assumption that 25 per cent of those applications (in the range of 330 claims per year) would fit that category.

Importantly, I think we must also recognise that it is not just domestic violence victims who may be at risk from the service requirements. It may also be problematic for patients of James Nash House, particularly for the staff involved in that process. Claimants who have been assaulted by a neighbour or somebody known to them would certainly be potentially vulnerable when a claim is served, as well as home invasion victims who would rather remain anonymous and when material may be shared in correctional facilities.

This is certainly a bill that I think makes a lot of common sense. It is certainly a bill that I support in regard to a shift towards assisting victims of particular instances. I also note that the Crown Solicitor's Office, the Bar Association and the Victim Support Service are all supportive of these amendments to the bill. I commend the Attorney for bringing the bill to the house.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:26):** I rise also to make some brief remarks in support of the Victims of Crime (Offender Service and Joinder) Amendment Bill 2019. As has been observed, this is a relatively short piece of legislation that is directed towards making the path that victims must travel towards obtaining appropriate compensation just that little bit less traumatic than it inevitably is.

There are two substantive aspects to the bill. They have been addressed previously. The first is an amendment to section 18 of the Victims of Crime Act so as to remove the previous obligation for a victim to serve their application for compensation on the offender. That previous obligation will be gone. Bear in mind, the compensation process is a two-stage process, the first being the submission of an application to the Crown Solicitor for compensation. It is that application that the victim will no longer be required to serve on the offender.

Then, in the event that an amount of compensation is not agreed following the application being served on the Crown Solicitor and an application to court being required to be made, the provision requiring that the offender at that point ought to be joined to the proceeding is now modified to give the court a discretion in all circumstances not to require that the offender be served. Previously, the discretion of the court to make such an order was limited to circumstances where the whereabouts of the offender were not known or could not be readily ascertained.

This is about shifting the focus towards ensuring that the victim can go about applying for appropriate compensation in an orderly way. It means that the offender will not necessarily be involved at all, and that will be particularly the case in those circumstances where the amount of compensation is settled by agreement with the Crown Solicitor. It may mean that in a number of cases the offender will not be involved, even in circumstances where an application is made to the court after there being no agreement. That application to the court is made pursuant to section 18(5) of the act.

In both stages of the application process, there is now an opportunity for the victim to proceed without necessarily taking positive steps to engage the offender in the process. This is a reform that continues, appropriately in my view, a focus that has been increasingly applied to the wellbeing of victims—indeed, to providing as full and thoroughgoing as possible, justice to victims as part of our justice system. It is one that I applaud and we ought to continue in every way to ensure that all the objects of our system of justice are served. That is largely concerned with the appropriate punishment of offenders. It is also substantially and relevantly concerned with providing justice for victims. This is certainly a substantial step in the right direction.

At this time when the parliament contemplates further reform in relation to the rights of victims, it is appropriate that we take the chance to step back and get some perspective of the time frame in which victims have been considered in the system of justice. It has not been very long in the history that a focus on victims has been applied. On a day when we have spent considerable time appropriately reflecting on the life of a great Australian political leader, one whose origins commenced in South Australia, I think it is appropriate in the course of this debate that we take a moment to reflect on the contribution in this area of Ray Whitrod.

Ray Whitrod was born 104 years ago and died more than 15 years ago after an extraordinary life of service to police and to our justice system in a number of ways. I would encourage members to reflect on the extraordinary scope of his contribution. As is well known, Ray Whitrod was a very significant South Australian. He perhaps came to greatest national prominence during the time he was the police commissioner in Queensland. He became known nationally when he relinquished that role in protest against the corruption of the then Queensland government. He made some very hard decisions about maintaining his commitment to integrity. That was in the early 1970s.

He returned to South Australia and, in 1979, founded what was then known as the Victims of Crime Service. He was an instrumental factor in the commencement of an organised structure that was looking to provide practical support for victims. It has since become known as the Victim Support

Service and it has since gone national, and models along the lines of that which Ray Whitrod set up back in 1979 have been rolled out across the country.

The original service that was set up by Ray Whitrod was, in fact, independent of government and called on community to get around victims and to provide practical supports. There has since been the provision of a fund from which compensation can be paid. The concept that Ray Whitrod brought to focus on victims has since been formalised and very much brought into the public framework, but it is good to recognise that a great South Australian, as part of the significant work of his life, was a founder for this now national structure.

I am very proud to reflect on Ray Whitrod because he encouraged me, and I still have his copy of the Queensland Criminal Code, which he gave to me 25 years or so ago and which he held dear to him as a reminder of the difficult times that he went through as commissioner in Queensland. He was someone who throughout his life in all sorts of ways stood up against corruption. He stood up for those who were, for whatever variety of reasons, left in circumstances where they could not fully speak for themselves, and in so many ways he provided an example for all of us of the enormous achievements that can be made when one commits oneself to community service.

This bill is another step along the way to ensuring that victims can achieve as full a justice as we can deliver for them. I commend the bill to the house, and in particular would take the opportunity to dedicate my remarks to the memory of Ray Whitrod, another particularly significant South Australian and great contributor in this area.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:38):** I indicate my appreciation to all speakers for the contribution to the consideration of this bill. I thank the opposition for their indication of support for the bill, and members on this side, the member for Colton and the member for Heysen, for their supportive comments.

In concluding the consideration of the bill, can I just also place on the record my appreciation to the Commissioner for Victims' Rights, Ms Bronwyn Killmier, a former longstanding member of the South Australian police force and who now has the role of commissioner, for her support to this advance.

I did listen to the member for Kaurana's contribution and his concern about the failure of this government to reappoint Mr Michael O'Connell as the Commissioner for Victims' Rights. I remind the member that the contract of employment for Mr O'Connell had concluded. He was invited to apply, and he did. Ms Killmier was the successful applicant, and she comes with a commendable record.

I do not know whether the former commissioner made any presentation to the former government that the ill that we are remedying in this bill should have been attended to in the 16 years of their government by former attorney-general Atkinson. The time of their government overlapped the time when Mr O'Connell was first the victims' rights director and subsequently the commissioner. If he did, clearly he was not successful in getting the former government to act on this important reform. That is disappointing because the passage of this bill will relieve literally hundreds of applicants of indignity and potentially quite stressful circumstances by virtue of no longer having to serve the offender.

On the other hand, if he did not do it at all—I can only think that there are two circumstances—he did not think it was a matter of such moment that it needed remedying, which I think would be concerning. I read his annual report each year when he tabled it in the parliament. There were a few years when I did not read it because it came to my attention that the former commissioner for victims of crime had failed to lodge his report. I think at one time it was a period of some four or five years since he became the commissioner that he had not lodged a report at all.

I raised the matter with then attorney-general Rau at that stage to ask, 'What happened to this annual report? Has Mr O'Connell submitted this report to you and you have just forgotten to table it in parliament?' 'I will make some inquiry' was his shortened response, and he did. He found that Mr O'Connell just did not think that it was necessary for him to do that, that it was not a pressing matter for him. He thought that he might be in the role for a number of years and that, when he thought it was appropriate, he might report to the parliament what he had been doing.



I am pleased to say that the former attorney reminded him about what the act said and that he was required to tender an annual report, and he did so, covering the work that he had undertaken for that period, to comply with the obligations under the statute. Since that time, in the time that overlapped his appointment and at least my being in the parliament, I duly read his annual report because I think it is important for all of us as members of parliament to keep ourselves informed of these important statutory officers. If they have recommendations for us to consider as a parliament, then we should look carefully at those recommendations.

I do not recall this issue being raised by the former commissioner for victims' rights. As the previous government did not raise it, I would certainly be alert to the fact that it is something that we should consider. I would have considered at least presenting it to my own party at the time to progress it as a private member's bill. It has always been a concern to me. I have done cases in relation to these applications right back from the commencement of the original Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which was passed in 1978.

At that time, and in the early 1980s, I think there was still a maximum compensation of only up to \$1,000. I think it fairly quickly moved to \$2,000. I remember doing a multiple rape application for compensation for \$2,000. I thought to myself at the time how manifestly inadequate that was for the shocking experience of the woman in that case. Over the years, we have remedied that and we have updated it. Although it took a long time for the former government to eventually increase it from \$50,000 to \$100,000, they did do it. The former attorney introduced a scale of application, which has some significant limitations and deserves some reviewing.

In the meantime, this is an important aspect that we need to remedy. It has not previously been brought to our attention to act on. This government acted on this advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office. It is supported by our relatively newly appointed Commissioner for Victims' Rights, and I am pleased to have her support in that regard and advocacy generally in the support of victims.

I also express my appreciation for the member for Heysen's recognition of Mr Ray Whitrod, who was a pioneer in relation to the establishment of the Victim Support Service, a community-based board-led organisation, which has a history over decades of providing support.

Particular groups, such as those that provide support to victims of homicide within families, are active across the board in providing counselling and support services for the many victims subsequent to the royal commission by the late Mr Ted Mullighan QC into the sexual abuse and exploitation of children in institutional care. They have undertaken a number of roles over the years.

When the previous government advised that they were going to provide funding to the Victim Support Service to provide a legal service—that is, for legal representation and advice at courts—there was some comment that, whilst the service is a very important one for the provision of support of those who are going through court proceedings, I did not feel, and I still do not feel, that that is appropriately undertaken by the Victim Support Service. It needs to be undertaken by a legal service.

Members might be familiar with the recent announcement of that particular work being put out to tender. Last Monday or Tuesday, it was made public that the Legal Services Commission was the successful applicant to undertake that work in respect of court legal advice, so the service will continue but via a legal entity which is able to employ legal services and which will give a greater network of service through South Australia.

This does not in any way reflect on the work that the Victim Support Service is competently undertaking. In fact, I have been impressed by the level of work they have done in relation to counselling, so much so that I have publicly indicated my support that those victims who might now be going through an application process for extra redress under the national scheme for children and who are victims of institutional abuse and have been given a package of money for counselling and support services if they are successful—money for compensation up to \$150,000, plus counselling service—may wish to avail themselves of the Victim Support Service for that area of support.

Obviously, in many of our country regions, or areas where the VSS does not operate, it is also important that those applicants are given a chance to still have a service and may employ some other private provider for the purposes of accessing that locally, rather than having to come to

Adelaide. I thank members for their very considered contributions, and the support indicated by the opposition, and seek the swift passage of the bill.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:49):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL**

*Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 24.

**Dr CLOSE:** We are on clause 24, and I previously asked a number of questions about subclause (2). I would like to move two amendments (not combined, but one after the other) that I have to that clause. I move:

Amendment No 3 [Close-2]—

Page 41, line 36 [clause 24(2)(c)]—Before 'water' insert:

biodiversity sensitive and

I have done this at the request of a couple of organisations involved with the environment movement. These organisations are concerned that the legislation be forward facing. While the term 'biodiversity sensitive urban design' is not in common use, it is an expression that is beginning to be used.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I thank the deputy leader for her amendment. The government will support this amendment. I think this is a really good addition to the bill. One of the good things about this process is that we can use the committee stage of the debate to refine proposed legislation that is before the parliament.

As I have previously indicated to the house and to the deputy leader, we did not accept a number of amendments the last time around because of various internal processes—both party political and departmental—that I wanted to follow through. It is my intention to potentially return to some of those between the houses or address them in the upper house.

Equally, while I will oppose a number of amendments that are before us today, I want to indicate to the deputy leader that we may look at alternative wording or alternative placement within the legislation, in order to have the desired effect that the deputy leader might be intending. We will work through those amendments as we get to them.

As it stands, with the amendment that the deputy leader has proposed to clause 24, which is to insert the term 'biodiversity sensitive' before 'water sensitive urban design' to ensure that we are capturing water and biodiversity as a key priority of Green Adelaide, I think this fits with the spirit and direction we want for Green Adelaide. We believe this body can have a bold greening agenda for our capital city. We think it is a great direction in which to head, and we think this could be world leading.

As I am sure the deputy leader is aware, the term 'biodiversity sensitive urban design' has been advanced in Melbourne in particular. As we develop Green Adelaide, it is definitely my intention to look to other jurisdictions to see what good things are happening, whether that be in Australia or overseas. No doubt, Melbourne will be one of those places. With that, I accept the deputy leader's amendment.

Amendment carried.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 11 [Close-1]—

Page 41, line 38 [clause 24(2)(e)]—Delete 'and flora' and substitute:

, flora and ecosystem health

Clause 24(2)(e) in the bill presently reads 'fauna and flora in the urban environment'. My amendment would change that to 'fauna, flora and ecosystem health', recognising that fauna and flora in themselves do not necessarily constitute a healthy ecosystem.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The government will oppose this amendment. It is our view that promoting ecosystem health more broadly is part of delivering integrated landscape management, and the concept of integrated landscape management is at the very heart of the legislation that we are developing and is before the house today. The concept of integrated landscape management is reflected as a headline objective of the legislation that all boards, including Green Adelaide, will be required to consider and seek to further in their functions.

Amendment negated.

**Dr CLOSE:** I want to pick up one question on the clause about those seven priorities and ask the minister: should the board form a view that those priorities are no longer the right ones—they might seek an additional one or they might seek to replace one—is there a mechanism by which they are able to do that?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Of course, the board could prevail on the minister of the day to seek to amend the legislation, which would be the most direct way of doing it, I guess. Under clause 23 there is the opportunity for the minister to assign other functions to the board. Under this legislation, we class Green Adelaide as one of the regional boards; for the purposes of the legislation, it is one of the regional boards. Clause 23(i) provides 'such other functions assigned to the board by the Minister or by or under this or any other Act', so there would be the possibility of the Green Adelaide board speaking to the minister to enable that through clause 23(i).

However, as I said to the house before, it is the aim of this legislation and the priorities of Green Adelaide to comprehensively capture what occurs now and what is occurring with the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges NRM Board. We think we have been able to capture that. We have consulted broadly on these priorities and my view is that we attained through very solid and authentic engagement a broad agreement on these priorities notwithstanding my desire to have that biodiversity-sensitive urban design included at paragraph (c).

**Dr CLOSE:** The final question I have on this clause is whether there is a definition in the act of what a pest animal or a pest plant is?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Both animals and plants are defined in the preliminary part of the act, which includes the definitions. When it comes to defining pests, part 9—Control of animals and plants, expands the concept of pests. What we are looking at here is declared plants and animals that have been declared pests, which are included under part 9 of the bill and would be in clause 183.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 25 passed.

Clause 26.

**Dr CLOSE:** A question has been raised with me by the Landcare organisation about the nature of the election commitment relating to the grassroots grants program. Their strong impression was that this money would have a couple of features that it appears not to have as it is expressed in this legislation. One feature is that it be in addition to the funds already being assigned to natural resources management—so the funds that come through the levy. It would be an additional grant program available. Another feature is that it be statewide rather than a requirement for each individual board to administer their own.

A question that arises from their concern is the question of equity across regions. For example, a board that has a smaller fund because it has a lower levy base may not be able to provide as much of a grassroots program as another board that has a greater financial capacity to do so. I invite the minister to respond to the question about it being out of step with the election commitment and also the way in which this will operate in a way that it is equitable.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I have also picked up the same feedback, that there was an assumption or an understanding, particularly from the Landcare Association of South Australia—a great organisation that does so much to represent the grassroots focus that we want from this legislation. I would say that is a misunderstanding. At no point did the election commitment in my public statements say that this would be additional funding.

The spirit or the philosophy behind the creation of the grassroots grants fund was to ensure that a portion of the levy take in each region would be handed back to community groups to develop the capacity to expand the reach of the funds and to not only create community capacity but also stretch funding further. It is ideologically my point of view and that of this government that, if you empower community groups and organisations such as the Landcare Association, the Agricultural Bureau and friends groups, we will be in a far stronger position to stretch money further through partnerships.

We wanted to say that a portion of every levy take in each region will be handed back to the community through a structured grants process that would enable on-ground works to be taken out in partnership with community groups, having Landscape South Australia, or the landscape boards, as a key partner, as a grant funder. It is certainly my view that there was never an intention that these would be additional funds but, rather, a guarantee that there would be that giving back of money through grants.

We know that grants have come and gone through the NRM process. Some boards have been very committed to grants. Others have not been so forthcoming in providing grants to their communities. Grants programs are always very easy to cut when difficult financial times emerge, so we wanted to ensure that the confidence of having a consistent grants program was built into legislation.

The deputy leader also referred to the statewide pool. That was something that was considered. I would not say there was any commitment made. In the early days, I certainly discussed a statewide pool of funds. But, through our engagement and consultation process, it became very clear that communities wanted their boards to have autonomy over their grants, and that would create a level of fairness. Grants could be targeted to particular local issues and priorities, and that could be done by boards rather than by one central large pool of funding. It was definitely shaped through feedback from our very thorough and broad engagement stations across the state.

Communities said, 'Give us our own grants pool so that that can be administered by boards and so we can have confidence that that is then redistributed into our local communities.' Obviously, some boards have a smaller levy take. The AW board, the Kangaroo Island board and the Arid Lands board are the three which, because of population, have particularly low levy takes. That means that their grants will be lower. As a consequence of this legislation, the boards of those communities will have access to the statewide priorities fund, which is that redistribution of Adelaide's money, which is a much larger landscape scale grant scheme as well.

Clause passed.

Clauses 27 to 32 passed.

Clause 33.

**Dr CLOSE:** This is the section where we get into what will be the new staffing arrangements. Many questions have been raised with me by environment groups and also by the union about what this will mean. Can I start with the industrial conditions that these workers will be under? Is the EBA that they are currently signed up to going to remain in force, not only for the remainder of its term? Will they be the conditions under which the new EBA will occur or will there be a shift because they have moved into a different category?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I thank the deputy leader for her question. It is an important matter, and clearly one that she ought to raise on behalf of the people who raised it with her. It has been something that we have worked through carefully. The decentralisation of the boards will inevitably create staffing changes, perhaps a feeling of uncertainty among the workforce, and that has been something that, as minister, I have made very clear to the officials within my department that we must work through in a careful, sensitive and appropriate way, consulting heavily not only with the staff

affected but also with their representation through the union and in particular the Public Service Association.

Engagement has commenced with the Public Service Association and will continue during the change process and, as appropriate, union consultation will occur in accordance with applicable industrial instruments. Similarly, engagement will occur with other public sector unions as required if that is identified as being necessary. It is intended that any employees who transfer to a board as part of the Landscape SA reform will do so with predominantly the same or similar terms and conditions of their current employment, and this will be subject to further work as part of the transition planning.

Terms and conditions of employment will be the subject of significant consultation with affected employees and their unions. As the Green Adelaide board will be supported by DEW employees, it is worth saying on the record here that the terms and conditions that apply to those employees will not change at all. The change, if any, will occur to those who are moving out of the department structure with landscape boards. But, as I really emphasise, the aim is that terms and conditions of employment will be largely the same.

**Dr CLOSE:** Will terms and conditions, or the enterprise agreement under the way in which the legislation is written, potentially differ between boards?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Deputy leader, it is technically possible that the terms and conditions could be different between the landscape boards, but it would be largely my intention and that of the organisation to keep those as consistent as possible to really ensure mobility across the organisation. We would fully expect—as occurs at the moment—people to move between boards and between the departmental organisation and the boards. Efforts will be made to maintain that consistency, but technically they could be different between boards.

**Dr CLOSE:** And there will be boards with larger funds at their disposal than other boards?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes. In terms of just the salaries or the bucket of money they have, yes, definitely.

**Dr CLOSE:** And there is nothing in this piece of legislation that would require a particular level of work to be done at a particular payment?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The staff who are involved with boards continue to be public servants, so this legislation will not deal with their employment conditions. Other pieces of legislation will deal with that because they remain public sector employees.

**Dr CLOSE:** I think that there is some confusion between 'public sector' and 'public servant' that the minister might like to clarify. The do not remain public servants: they do remain in the public sector.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes, that is correct. Apologies, deputy leader. They remain public sector employees, not public servants.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Thank you, deputy leader. I will move clause 33 as printed. All those—

**Dr CLOSE:** Can I just ask a question because I have not previously been limited to the number. Is that clause—

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** I know, because that is my discretion. Indeed—

**Dr CLOSE:** Can I ask for clarity for the future?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Yes.

**Dr CLOSE:** Is it that under all of clause 33 there can only be three questions, or there could be under each of the subclauses?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** No, just under the clause. There are three per clause, per member. Sorry about that, deputy leader.

Clause passed.

Clauses 34 and 35 passed.

Clause 36.

**Dr CLOSE:** On clause 36, a question has been raised with me about how we maintain a firewall so that the funds held by the board are not able to be used by the department.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I guess your question goes to the very spirit of the legislation. One of the driving motivations for having it was to create a situation where there was not a feeling, particularly in regional communities, that their levy was being used by the department central to prop up the bottom line of the budget. That was one of the driving policy rationales for the creation of the Landscape South Australia Bill.

Under this legislation, each board will be required to have a separate account. We are working through the financial governance arrangements and what that looks like with the Department of Treasury and Finance. The assurance I can give you is that the account is required by legislation for each board but that the policy rationale for the decentralisation is to prevent exactly what you have suggested from occurring.

There will, of course, be opportunities and we do not want to reduce or cut off or prevent the opportunity from boards sharing resources with each other or, indeed, working with the department central to achieve outcomes along the way, as occurs at the moment, but we want to make sure that occurs in a sensible and cost-effective way. We will not be closing the door to those opportunities at all, but it will be governed by the board and by the board members.

Clause passed.

Clauses 37 to 41 passed.

Clause 42.

**Dr CLOSE:** My first question relates to the consultation that was undertaken in determining what the landscape strategy would cover and what kind of feedback the minister received on what environment groups and also landholders wanted to see in the state landscape strategy.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The requirement in the act for the state landscape strategy was one of our ways of simplifying in legislation the work of the boards in comparison with what occurs with the natural resources management boards as they stand. There seemed to be a criticism not only since I became the minister but during my 14 months or so as the shadow minister that there was a perception—again, particularly in regional communities—that NRM boards do a lot of planning, planning, planning and not a lot of doing. That was a substantial criticism.

This state landscape strategy is designed to be a simpler body of work that really focuses on creating a long-term vision for managing the statewide landscape and ensuring we have considerable community feedback shaping that as well. Engagement will be critical to the development process of the first state landscape strategy. I hope the process of developing it will occur soon after the legislation has passed. It will be a key part of the work of the new boards and the department to get that body of work underway.

The statewide planning for this will need to take regional priorities into account. Each board will have their own plan, and those priorities will need to be taken into account with regional plans, outlining how those priorities are expected to maintain, protect, improve or enhance the state of landscapes at a regional and local level. Engagement at all levels will be critical, with stakeholders, with other boards, but the key finding that we had from our community consultation and our engagement with stakeholders, conservation groups, the PPSA, etc., was to make sure that community feedback and authentic engagement are embedded in the development of this strategy.

There has been a lot of endorsement of the process that we went through to develop this legislation in terms of the engagement. I heard people on both sides of the house make positive comments about that. My intention would be to reflect that style of authentic engagement through the development of the state landscape strategy.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 12 [Close-1]—

Page 53, after line 41 [clause 42(3)]—Insert:

- (da) assess the state and condition of the natural resources of the State; and
- (db) identify existing and future risks of damage to, or degradation of, the natural resources of the State; and
- (dc) provide for monitoring and evaluating the state and condition of the natural resources of the State; and

Essentially, this is to restore the science work that was being done under the current act. I am seeking to have the landscape strategy require an assessment of the state and condition of the natural resources. I accept that that appears to a degree under subclause (4), but this makes it a more active process, assessing the state and condition. It also identifies risks, existing and future. It is difficult to have a good strategy if you do not know what the risks are. Thirdly, it provides for the monitoring and evaluation that are so essential in order to know not only whether those risks are coming to fruition but also that the activities that are occurring under the strategy are having their desired effect. I therefore move that amendment.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you, deputy leader. You have moved three new paragraphs. I would like to test your interest in my accepting paragraph (db) but not (da) or (dc). Of course, there are other places for us to work through that if required. It is my view that (da), 'assess the state and condition of the natural resources of the State', and (dc), 'provide for monitoring and evaluating the state and condition of the natural resources of the State', are included in the broader functions of the act. But it does make sense, in our view, to pursue your new paragraph (db), 'identify existing and future risks of damage to, or degradation of, the natural resources of the State'.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Is that acceptable to you?

**Dr CLOSE:** Am I able to ask a question about this without losing a question?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Yes, I will permit that.

**Dr CLOSE:** You are very generous, sir. I think we should probably vote either in favour of or against this amendment so that it does not get complicated if for no other reason than we can work it out in the Legislative Council. In considering how we go in the Legislative Council, my question really is: who does the assessing of the state and condition? Who provides for monitoring and evaluation under the general act? Who is actually going to do it, who is required to do it, who is held to account? If it does not sit in the state landscape strategy, which has clear accountability, how do I know that that is going to happen?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** If you look at clause 9 of the bill, the minister has a whole range of functions. Essentially, the instrument of the minister is the Department for Environment and Water in this case. It has a range of headline functions. They require the minister to provide that information, support and advice to boards, depending on which way you look at it. Boards have a corresponding requirement to include that information in their plans, which is also embedded in the legislation. So I am quite confident that the knowledge, understanding, science and factual foundation are issues that the boards will have to deal with by legislation.

**Dr CLOSE:** It is my inclination to proceed with moving my amendment, and we will look at how we can reassure ourselves between the houses before we see amendments upstairs.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** I understand that the minister would like to move an amendment to your amendment. For the benefit of the house, it is to insert new paragraph (db); is that correct?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes. There is every chance that we would oppose it and have to do exactly the same thing in the other house, so we might as well do it now.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** I am comfortable with that.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I move to amend the deputy leader's amendment:

Delete paragraphs (da) and (dc).

This leaves new paragraph (db).

Amendment to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried.

**Dr CLOSE:** I will not proceed with amendment 13, as it does not work without having had amendment 12 pass, but I will proceed with amendment 14, which is to add 'the best available climate science information' to the list of what the state landscape strategy must take into account. I move:

Amendment No 14 [Close-1]—

Page 54, after line 9 [clause 42(4)]—Insert:

(d) the best available climate science information.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The government will oppose this amendment because the bill already requires decision-making to be informed by the best available science, and that includes climate science. Under this legislation, the minister will need to consider the significance of climate change in our environment and in developing plans, as recognising the significance of climate change is an object of the bill.

I have been keen to ensure that this legislation is modernised to ensure that it captures the importance of building a resilient landscape in the face of a changing climate up-front in the bill as a key objective. Best available climate science is one form of scientific information. Other science, such as soil science and science relating to water, will be relevant to regional planning, so we do not believe we need to insert this clause here because it is embedded within the legislation at the objectives stage.

Amendment negated.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Do you have any more questions on this clause, deputy leader?

**Dr CLOSE:** I have a question that arises from the response to my proposed amendment. I have checked clause 9, which describes the things that the minister must do, and making sure that the best available science of any sort, including climate science, is not there. By what legislative instrument does the minister feel assured that the best available climate science would be embedded in a state landscape strategy?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you, deputy leader, for seeking clarification. I will clarify. The bill, under clause 7, objects and principles of the act, requires us to pay attention to the principles of ecologically sustainable development. I am just following what is a complex bill. Clause 7(3) provides:

(3) The following principles should be taken into account in connection with achieving ecologically sustainable development for the purposes of this Act:

...(d) decision-making should be informed by local knowledge and expertise, and traditional Aboriginal knowledge, together with the best available science, to achieve a functioning, resilient and productive landscape and avoiding, where practicable, serious or irreversible damage to the environment.

I apologise for hopping around the legislation but that is where the section on ESD and best available science is found.

Clause as amended passed.

Clause 43.

**Dr CLOSE:** The order of the amendments is dictated by the order of the bill, but in fact one makes absolutely no sense without the other, so I will gauge by the reaction to the first amendment whether the second one, which is the one that has consequence, is likely to be supported. I move:

Amendment No 15 [Close-1]—

Page 54, line 17 [clause 43(1)]—Delete 'The Minister' and substitute:

Subject to subsection (1a), the Minister

Amendment No 16 [Close-1]—

Page 54, after line 22 [clause 43]—Insert:



- (1a) The Minister must at least, in acting under subsection (1), consult with the bodies that are, in the opinion of the Minister, the peak bodies concerned with the environment and land use in the State.

I would like to explain the reason I have put these in. Every stakeholder who has spoken to me has been concerned that undertaking such consultation as the minister determines to be necessary is not enough comfort or protection for them. That is no reflection on the current incumbent. The concern is that at least the peak bodies ought to be required to be consulted; therefore, my proposition is that there be consultation with the bodies that are, in the opinion of the minister, who is still retaining some discretion, the peak bodies concerned with environment and land use in the state.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I thank the deputy leader for a very worthy contribution. We will oppose these amendments today, but we will certainly look at alternative wording with the shadow minister. We are working through this legislation and trying to strike the balance between not creating too much bureaucracy and red tape around consultation and, at the same time, valuing and seeing engagement and consultation and connection to community as being at the very heart of what we are all about with this decentralised natural resources management model.

Given the scope and status of the state landscape strategy, it is recognised that there will always be a need to consult with key stakeholders in establishing and reviewing the strategy. Because that is so inherent in what needs to happen, we did not want to be overly prescriptive as to how that occurred. However, these amendments are worthy of consideration between the houses, and we will certainly look to land an outcome that is acceptable to the sector and the shadow minister as a consequence of that.

Amendments negated; clause passed.

Clause 44 passed.

Clause 45.

**Dr CLOSE:** I have several amendments that relate to this clause. In fact, I think all my remaining amendments relate to this clause. My concerns and questions are twofold. One is around the lack of a frame in which the regional plan needs to sit, other than going right back to the objectives and the principles—so a more discrete picture of what the board is required to do in producing a regional landscape plan. The other is an insistence on how many priorities are to be pursued.

I understand the desire, and indeed the desire that has come from feedback the minister has received, that one does not want plans that are overly extensive, overly detailed, and that take all the effort of their board to prepare and there is no effort left, no room or time left for acting on what needs to happen on the land. Nonetheless, I am wary of a piece of legislation that restricts a board to five priorities at a time.

I am concerned that, in principle, it removes from the board the right, the ability, the capacity to identify more and that it risks making these plans overly dictated by a desire for neatness and simplicity, rather than being dictated by the needs of the community and the needs of the environment, that may express itself then in five, six, seven, or even three priorities. I have amendments to each of those and I invite the minister to give a general response for us to look at between houses.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** This really is again a very central part of the reform in trying to get a streamlined, straightforward, accessible piece of legislation that provides our landscape boards with enough discretion to deal with the challenges and opportunities environmentally that are unfolding within their region. It creates boundaries so that they really focus on getting the basics right, the foundational items in terms of environmental management, and communicating to their communities, their levy payers, that they are doing this effectively and doing it in a way that is efficient in terms of both human resources and financial resources, being the levy collected from the landowner.

Through a statewide consultation, that was something that was very apparent. Rightly or wrongly, people had a perception of money wasted. The perception was created as a result of the

idea that too much money went into bureaucracies within metropolitan Adelaide. That perception can be broken through a simpler planning framework.

Requiring through legislation the concentration of five items is really getting boards away from trying to wrestle with a huge, long list of legislative requirements and getting them to sit down with their communities and engage with their communities and use the expertise that will be available on the boards, and also among the staff who will serve the boards, and use a combination of that expertise, that knowledge and understanding, to come up with a high-level, five-tier regional landscape plan that sets out five priorities for managing the regions' landscapes.

However, it is important to say that this does not preclude boards from doing other things. While we are saying, 'Identify your five key areas and put resources and effort towards them and communicate them to your community, to the people who voted you on this board or the people who pay the levy for the board. Communicate those effectively and tackle those issues,' equally, nothing precludes the board from doing lots of other things as well. There will be other legislative requirements which fall under the legislation, which is part of business as usual, day-to-day business and functions of these boards, but which do not necessarily fall into that headline five-priority five-year plan.

We are not going to accept any of these amendments because we do believe that it adds a section of complexity to what is one of the central tenets of this legislation, which is to have a simplified planning framework.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Deputy leader, any further questions?

**Dr CLOSE:** No. I will now move my amendments and simply say that the central tenet of the legislation should be protecting, conserving and restoring landscape rather than being simple. Given that the minister indicated that he will not be supporting any of them, I am happy to move them all together.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There is one amendment that I want to accept and one that I want to highlight to the deputy leader that I would be very willing to take a look at between the houses in terms of alternative wording.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Minister, before you go on, which one are you prepared to further consider?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Amendment No. 20, which inserts the word 'value'. Amendment No. 21 is one I would like to work on. Can we oppose the first three?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Perhaps the deputy leader would move her amendments Nos. 17 to 19.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 17 [Close-1]—

Page 55, after line 2 [clause 45(1)]—Insert:

- (aa) include information about the issues surrounding the management of natural resources and the state of landscapes at the regional and local level, including information as to methods for protecting, improving and enhancing the quality or value of natural resources within the relevant region, and the health of those aspects of the environment that depend on those natural resources; and

Amendment No 18 [Close-1]—

Page 55, line 7 [clause 45(1)(a)(ii)]—Delete 'its 5' and substitute 'at least 5'

Amendment No 19 [Close-1]—

Page 55, line 15 [clause 45(1)(c)]—After 'level' insert:

, with particular reference to the conservation, use and management of natural resources,

Amendments negatived.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 20 [Close-1]—

Page 55, line 16 [clause 45(1)(c)(i)]—Delete 'and quality' and substitute ', quality and value'

Amendment carried.

**Dr CLOSE:** I no longer wish to pursue amendment No. 21. We will have a discussion between the houses. Now that I reflect on it, I was going to ask some more questions about its absence between the act and the bill, so I will not proceed with it, but I move amendment No. 22:

Amendment No 22 [Close-1]—

Page 55, after line 28 [clause 45]—Insert:

(1a) A regional landscape plan must take into account the best available climate science information.

Amendment negated; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 46 to 50 passed.

Clause 51.

**Dr CLOSE:** I understand that water allocation plans effectively have not changed in this piece of legislation from the current act, but I had a query, when we talk about the key features of the plan, about the method by which scientific input is sought and expressed in the plans.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Because water is such a complex area, I have another water adviser here to provide additional support on these clauses. The Department for Environment and Water provides the scientific advice to the boards, and that would continue. That is the current situation with natural resources management boards across the state when it comes to water allocation plans, and that approach would continue under the proposed legislation that is before us.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There will always be conflicting scientific opinions and a responsible minister should respond to those communities.

Clause passed.

Clauses 52 to 63 passed.

Clause 64.

**Dr CLOSE:** We now move to the often vexed question of levies. The changes are not clear to me. I do not think there are necessarily significant changes in the manner by which the levies are raised. But given our earlier discussion about the changes in the boundaries, I have some consequent questions, then I also have a question about the cap. One concern that has been raised with me is that in the changing of the boundaries there might be a net loss for a board; they will lose revenue and not gain it in another area. I invite the minister to say how any transition will be managed and how any long-term disadvantage will be managed.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you, deputy leader; you do raise a good point. There has been much discussion about this. While raising the levy is very important to enable boards to undertake environmental works on-ground, it is also important that levies do not have an undue cost of living impact on South Australian landowners and South Australian households.

With that in mind, we have tried to strike that balance. There will only be significant change occurring where boards are impacted by the abolition of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management Board, the creation of Green Adelaide, the creation of the new Hills and Fleurieu board, and then the area to the north of Adelaide which will change as a consequence of that as well. So you are right to identify that there will be that knock-on effect because different regions currently calculate their levies in different ways and use different methodologies to do that.

Any impact of the reforms of land levies will be mitigated through a three-year transition scheme approved and gazetted by the minister. This aims to ensure that people will not pay higher land levies as a result of finding themselves in a different region that calculates its boundaries using a different methodology. That was very important to deal with that cost of living aspect. The Local

Government Association will be consulted and any impacted arrangements for land levies collected during the transitional period. These arrangements are provided for in clause 94 of schedule 5 of the bill which enables the minister to put in place a transitional scheme for financial years 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23.

**Dr CLOSE:** A second question: could there be a net loss to NRM levy revenue altogether? Because there are different calculations, could it be that overall the sum that is raised becomes smaller because of the change of the boundaries? Has there been any work done to model that in considering the way that the boundaries will change?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** That is the case, deputy leader. That could certainly occur in a couple of the regions if you exclude Hills and Fleurieu because that is a new creation, essentially. Obviously, Green Adelaide has less money because it is a new entity with different boundaries. But you could have a situation where the SA Murray-Darling Basin board has a lower overall quantum of money because it no longer has particularly the regional settlement of Mount Barker, and the Northern and Yorke board could have a smaller levy take as well.

We have done modelling with that. We certainly believe that the impacts of that reduced levy-take in those regions will not be as substantial as to prevent them from carrying out their functions and we are balancing the cost of living versus raising enough money to undertake the implementation of this piece of legislation.

It should be also mentioned that, because of the creation of the statewide priority fund that we are using to distribute some of Adelaide's levy, there would be an opportunity through the creation of that for regional boards to gain large, centrally provided grants using the Green Adelaide levy-take to undertake very large works. As a consequence, that opportunity is likely to offset the lesser levy-take in those couple of regions. We cannot guarantee what projects will get up, of course, but it is likely to offset that.

**Dr CLOSE:** In terms of the cap, the bill foresees some methods by which that could be changed in exceptional circumstances. Is there a mechanism for the community to ask for that or can it only occur through discussion between the board and the minister?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There is no specific mechanism within the legislation to trigger the community seeking for the CPI cap to be buried; however, the boards can certainly do that by putting together a case and coming to the minister. I would hope that boards would have a connection with the community so that if there was a particular issue that the community thought needed to be dealt with, that would be fed through to the boards. Our plan is that they will be closer to community with, obviously, community voice on them as a consequence of the elected members on those boards.

Of course, any proposal, whether it is initiated in the community and taken to the board or initiated by the board themselves, will need to still address the exceptional circumstances test. Exceptional situations where benefits outweigh the costs will also constitute exceptional circumstances, providing flexibility to deal with unforeseen eventualities within communities or regions.

**Dr CLOSE:** I understand the concept of exceptional circumstances, but we live in exceptional times with climate change and the biodiversity crisis. Would either of those trigger a minister under this act to be able to lift the money that is required for a board?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The legislation requires that exceptional circumstances would need to be demonstrated through consultation with communities and then brought to the minister. They could be used to address infrastructure issues or natural or environmental disasters, which of course we know are increasing in the face of a changing climate. That would fall under the reference that the deputy leader has made. Or it could be some other major event with an adverse impact on a significant part of the community.

I would see the invasion of a pest species or a particular plant as falling under that category as well, leading back to that test that exceptional situations where the benefits outweigh the costs will also constitute exceptional circumstances. What the deputy leader is after—the challenges to biodiversity, the increasing storm events, the natural disasters that we are grappling with at an

environmental level—would certainly be captured in this area. That is really one of the central reasons why we built this into the legislation.

Clause passed.

*Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30.*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I rise to give a personal explanation.

**The CHAIR:** Minister, we are in committee at the moment, so you will have to find a time to do that when we come out of committee, which may or may not be tonight. The Clerk says that you can do it towards the end of the evening, so keep that in mind, minister.

Clause 65 passed.

Clause 66.

**Dr CLOSE:** The clause states that funds may be expended in subsequent years. If several NRM boards carry over money, or if one NRM board carries over money to a high degree, does that contribute to the budget bottom line? Does it appear within the budget papers as money that the state holds?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I am advised that nothing has changed with regard to this part of the legislation, so it would appear in the budget for the following year. However, where funding has accumulated, a carryover of expenditure authority must be sought through standard Department of Treasury and Finance processes to ensure that board expenditure in subsequent financial years does not exceed cabinet approved budget targets.

Clause passed.

Clauses 67 and 68 passed.

Clause 69.

**Dr CLOSE:** I think this is the first of several questions that will sound identical. Are there any changes between the existing act and this bill in relation to the activity in this clause?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There are three changes to the situation here. The first is that the bill introduces the concept of the CPI cap on land levies outside council areas in the same way as we have the CPI cap in other areas. The second change is that the levy will be declared by the board and published in the *Government Gazette*. Previously, it was declared by the minister and declared in the *Government Gazette*.

Then there is a new clause—and this clause partially replaces section 97 of the NRM Act—which has been separated into two headings, creating two options for the basis on which the land levy is charged, which will no longer be available as they have never been used and it is seen as an unnecessary component of the NRM Act.

I believe that the department actually suggested this be removed. These are the location of and the purpose for which rateable land is used and the area of land. Under the previous act that was never used for the calculation of the levies in out-of-council areas.

Clause passed.

Clauses 70 to 72 passed.

Clause 73.

**Dr CLOSE:** What changes, if any, are there in effect between this bill and the current act?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I am advised that this clause is exactly the same as the equivalent clause in the Natural Resources Management Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 74 to 85 passed.

Clause 86.

**Dr CLOSE:** What changes, if any, are there between the act and this clause?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There are no changes to this either. It simply replicates the provision in section 115 of the NRM Act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 87 to 90 passed.

Clause 91.

**Dr CLOSE:** When it comes to the landscape priorities fund, I am interested in understanding what public consultation might be undertaken on the expenditure of the fund, what scientific input will be required and why the minister has chosen not to have a board or any kind of external body oversee its expenditure.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I thank the deputy leader for her question. The landscape priorities fund has one of the greatest pieces of potential within the new legislation. It is a solid piece of policy reform that can really stretch the landscape-scale transformation that can be achieved as a consequence of applying some of Adelaide's levy take to the broader state landscape. The fund will be applied to projects that have a relationship with the state landscape strategy.

In debate in committee earlier, the deputy leader and I discussed the potential amendment that would insert consultation or engagement with peak bodies, something that I am more than happy to look at between the houses. The bill requires consultation in developing the statewide strategy, which would then be used to guide investment from the fund. I would be quite confident that the communities' desires would be mirrored through the statewide strategy, which will involve community consultation on the use, direction and targeting of the landscape priorities fund. That is the consultation side of it—it has that link.

In terms of scientific input, I would bring the deputy leader back to the objects and principles of the bill, under clause 7, and the concept around ecologically sustainable development, which forms the key part of the objects of the bill. That concept would require scientific input to be referenced or paid due attention to through the process of administering the fund. You asked a last question—

**Dr CLOSE:** About the board.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —about the role of a board or a selection. I have never foreseen this being used as a fund to undertake particular projects at the will or the discretion of the minister. I think there would be a departmental selection body involved to assess projects, which I would foresee being competitively tendered or put to this fund for funding. Certainly, my intention would be that the department would establish a selection panel or a committee with representatives from, potentially, Green Adelaide, other landscape boards across the state or other peak bodies. I think there would have to be some sort of selection panel in place.

Clause passed.

Clauses 92 to 99 passed.

Clause 100.

**Dr CLOSE:** Are there any changes in the expression of this section of the bill to the effect in the current act?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We have moved into the water section of the act: clause 100—Water affecting activities control policies. This is a new provision. This clause specifies the matters that a policy may contain or address in relation to water-affecting activities. Currently, rules about water-affecting activities for water resources are set out in 10-year regional NRM plans, water allocation plans or, on occasion, three-year business plans.

To promote consistent approaches to establishing rules by boards, enable simplification of regional landscape plans and provide greater consistency and clarity for customers on where rules on water-affecting activities are, this clause provides for rules for water-affecting activities, such as building a dam or drilling a bore, to be set out in either a water-affecting activities control policy or a water allocation plan.

A policy should not overlap the provisions of a water allocation plan in relation to any prescribed watercourse. Requirements for preparation and amendment of policies are set out in schedule 2 of the bill. Mandatory consultation will be required in accordance with guidelines prepared by the minister and any requirements prescribed by regulations.

A policy may be prepared by a regional landscape board, or the chief executive of the Department for Environment and Water in the case of Green Adelaide. Transitional provisions will ensure operational viability of current plans as boards effect these streamlined processes. This clause was formulated upon receiving feedback and also expertise, knowledge and understanding put forward through consultation within the Department for Environment and Water.

**Dr CLOSE:** I appreciate that the minister said the changes are as a result of feedback, but can he further elaborate on why he has chosen to change this part of the water area within the act, whereas he has left all, or nearly all, of the other elements relating to water alone?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The deputy leader is right to identify that we largely left the water components of the Natural Resources Management Act in place without significant change or amendment, apart from occasional modification of language and issues around potentially dated components; however, the previous legislation had quite a convoluted prescriptive approach to this, which was seen as potentially bureaucratic. As I said, this was suggested by the water experts within the department, so the creation of clause 100 simplifies the approach. It modernises it and aims to have a less bureaucratic approach to dealing with water-affecting activities than was previously in the NRM Act.

**Dr CLOSE:** Is it possible that water-affecting activities will now be permitted that are not currently permitted under the existing act?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I am advised that is not the case. The controls that are in place and the regulating activities remain the same. It is the process side of things that has been modernised in this act.

Clause passed.

Clauses 101 to 104 passed.

Clause 105.

**Dr CLOSE:** I am not sure whether I am able to ask a question over multiple clauses, but it will save time if you can give an answer that covers clauses 105 to 109 as to whether there are any effective changes between the current act and the bill.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There have been a couple of terminology updates, but that is just for consistency, in terms of language, which would not affect the conduct or execution of the bill. The main change is the change to penalties. We lifted the penalties by using the CPI from the period when the NRM Act had been created to the present day. The maximum penalties that may be imposed by the court have increased. That is quite a substantial increase on paper but that is because it was felt, and I would strongly agree with this, that the passage of time had seen the punitive implications of the penalties in these sections diminish.

Clause passed.

Clauses 106 to 182 passed.

Clause 183.

**Dr CLOSE:** We turn to the question of pest plants and animals, which the minister has been at pains to say are one of the back to basics that should be central to this act and central to natural resources management. I do not want to paraphrase the minister's close of the second reading inaccurately, but my understanding of what was said was that there was a great deal of concern on the minister's behalf about pest plants and animals that affect not only productivity and farmers and producers in the bush but also our ecosystems that might not have an impact on primary production but do have an affect on ecosystems, or have an impact on both but not the same impact necessarily.

My initial question is: what in part 9, clause 183 to start with, can identify that as a priority; the question of the impact of pests or overabundant species on ecosystems as opposed to on productive land?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The deputy leader is welcome to paraphrase my contribution earlier to the house in that if I was not clear about that, and hopefully I was, her interpretation of it is certainly accurate in that it is not just the economic impact of overabundant species or pest plants and animals, which clearly do have an economic impact, but it is their impact on ecosystems more broadly and the health of biodiversity or the occurrence, the existence, of a healthy dynamic biodiversity which will inevitably also be impacted.

In many cases, probably before the economic landscape is impacted, the biodiversity will falter and be impacted by the presence of pests. For me, that is a very important part of this legislation. I have talked about it as being quite fundamental in building the resilience of the landscape, and one of the best ways to do that is to limit the incursion of pest plants and animals. I know that is even more relevant in the face of a changing climate.

The way the legislation deals with the control of pest plants and animals is woven throughout the legislation from the objects and principles right through to part 9, which is the division that specifically looks at the declaration of pest plants and animals. I think we need to look to answer the deputy leader's question, and then, to hopefully give the deputy leader comfort, we need to look right through the bill at those principles, those objects, and then at the way the bill strengthens existing regulatory arrangements for managing pest plants and animals.

It does that in five ways. Firstly, a new type of order is being introduced in response to the feedback we have received that there needs to be a simpler and faster process for dealing with landholders who are failing to take action to destroy or control declared pests and animals, and the legislation does that. Secondly, a more structured approach is required for granting exemptions from certain pest plant and animal control offences, which is introduced through this legislation. Penalties will apply for failing to comply with those exemption conditions. Thirdly, the bill introduces a new expiation fee for possessing category 2 animals, noting that, to date, very few animals have been declared in this category. This will provide an alternative to prosecution for people possessing these animals, and that still holds them to account.

Fourthly, penalties for pest plant and animal control offences, which have not been increased since 2004, as we have dealt with in the previous response, have now been increased by up to 40 per cent, which equates to spreading CPI out over that same period. Finally, removing the distinction between state and regional authorised officers will increase compliance capacity and hence responsiveness on the ground. Regional authorised officers will no longer need to be cross-authorised by multiple boards to be able to deal with cross-boundary pest plant and animal control issues. We are trying to build in all these strengths to deal with pest plant and animal control. It is woven through the whole legislation and is obviously a central role of boards.

However, I think it comes down to programmatic rollout in terms of whether it is an economic project, a biodiversity project or both. I know the current boards have some really good examples of projects that develop multiple outcomes. The deputy leader may be aware of Rewilding Yorke and Wild Eyre, two separate projects that combine biodiversity and enhancement with economic outcomes. They are two projects that really inspire me around this legislation. The modernisation of this legislation is based on my desire to see projects like Rewilding Yorke and Wild Eyre, landscape-scale projects that enhance the economic output and sustainability of our regions but overlay that with the sustainability of biodiversity as well and demonstrate that we can do this hand in hand and in a way that potentially is world leading.

That is the sort of project that I think this legislation enables us to get a handle on, and it gives us the tools. Whether it is the landscape priorities fund or right down to the more agile compliance requirements, I think we have got it in the balance. Of course, I am happy to hear any suggestions from the deputy leader between the houses or in the upper house on that.

**Dr CLOSE:** It is interesting to me that I was contacted by a couple of environment groups in the last couple of days picking up on what was said in the second reading closing speech and looking at the act, so it is not just coming from me. It is possibly partly an unfortunate consequence



of the minister not being able to consider some of the amendments I have proposed, which the minister has indicated he may well support between the houses or in the Legislative Council, which seek to make sure that biodiversity, ecosystems and habitat restoration are restored into this bill as they exist in the current act.

One of the questions I was asked to ask today as a result of that interaction over the question of whether pest plants and animal control is essentially targeted at agriculture and primary production rather than at natural resources and ecosystem support and protection, was: how much is currently being spent—and you may not be able to answer this here today—on those pests that are causing an impact on ecosystems or on native fauna and flora, but not yet necessarily making a difference to primary production? Having obtained that figure, does the minister expect that under this act there would be no diminution in that effort?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The deputy leader makes an interesting point and one that I would be happy to explore. Obviously, I do not have the breakdown of how that works. I imagine it would be quite hard to unpick in some circumstances because multiple pests traverse multiple landscapes and are dealt with in different contexts. We will certainly take a high-level look at that within the realms of the resources that we have to do that and try to get a better understanding.

I hope there would not be a reduction. It would be completely against my aims for this legislation to see a rolling back of reduction strategies or programs for pest species that impact biodiversity as opposed to impacting an agricultural landscape, primary production, etc. I will undertake to look at that and see if it can be dealt with by way of amendment and, as previously mentioned to the deputy leader, there are a number of her previous amendments that I was not able to consider several weeks ago, prior to the debate, that I will be looking at, and I can confirm there are some that we will, no doubt, be accepting.

**Dr CLOSE:** Are there, in fact, any changes between the bill and the current act, as it relates to the control of animals and plants?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** In my earlier longwinded answer to the deputy leader's first question on this clause, I went through five key areas in regard to pest plant and animal control that we had taken a focus on reforming and those are the five main changes. I am advised there is one offence in the previous act not replicated in this act because it had never been used and overlapped with another offence.

Clause passed.

Clauses 184 to 189 passed.

Clause 190.

**Dr CLOSE:** This may have already been answered in that previous answer, but just to check: when it comes to the owner of the land being required to take action to destroy or control animals or plants, has there been any change between the bill and the current act?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I have largely covered this in my earlier answer. I should note that clause 190 operates alongside clause 191. Clause 191 is the new action orders, which I outlined as one of those five methods of controlling pest plants and animals, which we put in there to strengthen, but this section is largely the same as what was previously there, notwithstanding it has been modernised with the items that I mentioned in my previous long answer, if that answers the deputy leader's question.

Clause passed.

Clauses 191 to 201 passed.

Clause 202.

**Dr CLOSE:** Are there any changes in this section of the bill in comparison to the current act?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** There have been a couple of changes, but they are really for administrative ease and the modernisation of the act. There are no substantial changes. The main

change, which was also mentioned in the previous longer answer around pest plants and animals, was in relation to authorised officers. Currently, only state authorised officers can exercise powers with respect to residential premises. Going forward, this power will be exercised by any authorised officer unless limited by an instrument of appointment which could be put in place around their qualifications, etc. The power is exercisable only under a warrant or if there is reasonable belief that high-risk pest plants or animals are present on the premises.

One reason for making this reform was that in communities it can be difficult to get a state authorised officer into a small community where there might only be a very small workforce—somewhere like Kangaroo Island or another remote community—and it is just giving that broader discretion within the workforce to undertake compliance. It was really seen, again through departmental and workforce planning feedback, that this was something that ought to be modernised within the legislation to bring the legislation up to useable standards, reflecting on what was not necessarily working in a practical way with the existing NRM Act.

**Dr CLOSE:** If I can just clarify, that means that there might be a broader range of people who could become authorised officers for certain activities; is that correct?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes, that is absolutely correct.

Clause passed.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I move to the next clause, I would like to welcome to parliament this evening the Kadina Apex Club, who have been guests of the member for Narungga. I hope you enjoyed your dinner in the Speaker's dining room. What you are watching is the committee stage of the Landscape South Australia Bill 2019.

**The Hon. D.J. Speirs:** Even better than dinner.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Even better than dinner, the minister says. You may or may not agree with that. Welcome; I hope you enjoy your stay.

#### *Bills*

#### **LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL**

#### *Committee Stage*

Debate resumed.

Clauses 203 to 212 passed.

Clause 213.

**Dr CLOSE:** This clause refers to the orders that can be made by the ERD Court relating to natural resources management. What changes, if any, have been made to the manner in which the orders can be made or acted upon in the current act?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** This clause sets out the orders that the ERD Court can make and the requirements and procedures in relation to such orders. It replicates section 201 of the Natural Resources Management Act, with only minor updates to terminology as part of the modernisation of the act.

Clause passed.

Clause 214.

**Dr CLOSE:** There is a change that I observed here relating to the right of appeal, and I am talking about subclause (1)(c). The new version is 'a person', whereas previously it was 'an owner of the land'. In answering the question about the reason for that change, it would be useful to explain if there were a broader change that has led to the use of the words 'a person'. I note that is of particular interest to members of the Legislative Council—not necessarily in my party, but also in my

party—who are interested in how the rights of appeal work, so if you could explain reasonably fully that would be very helpful in consideration between the houses.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you for picking up on that, deputy leader. I am advised that this is a change in terminology through drafting and that the clause seeks to set out rights of appeal to the Environment, Resources and Development Court and the time for making an application. There is no reduction in appeal rights under the bill relative to what we have in the Natural Resources Management Act, apart from those terminology matters. If the deputy leader has advice that it does have a legal impact that we are not aware of, we are happy to look at it between the houses.

**Dr CLOSE:** Just to clarify, there is no reduction and there is no extension of rights to third parties who are currently not able to make appeals.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** No, it is as per the current legislation. It replicates section 201 of the Natural Resources Management Act.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (215 to 246) passed.

Schedules 1 to 5 passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (20:16):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Personal Explanation*

**VEGETABLE INDUSTRY**

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (20:17):** I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I would like to add to my answer to a question without notice this afternoon from the member for Wright. I took the member's question to relate to the 2019 AUSVEG SA awards about which I had just answered a question and during which I confirmed my office did not pay for alcohol.

I would like to update the house that I have now been advised that in the 14 months I have been minister alcohol has been purchased by my office on two occasions: a primary industries stakeholder event in Old Parliament House on 4 July 2018 at a cost of \$191, and the second was \$360 worth of wine, which was purchased with the purpose of forming a promotional display showcasing South Australian wine regions. The alcohol was not for consumption.

*Matter of Privilege*

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The SPEAKER (20:18):** I rise on the matter of privilege that was raised this morning by the member for Badcoe regarding outsourcing of foster carer services. I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege raised by the member for Badcoe in the house earlier today. As I have done before, before addressing the matter I wish to outline the significance of privilege as it does relate to the house and its members.

I remind members that privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by the vote of the house on a substantive motion. As we have heard before, McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*

makes the test for whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege by defining it as a matter that can 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the House in the discharge of its duties'.

Generally speaking, any act or omission which obstructs or impedes the house in the performance of its functions, or which obstructs or impedes any member or officer of such house in the discharge of his or her duty, or which has a tendency, directly or indirectly, to produce such a result, may be treated as a contempt and therefore be considered a matter of privilege even though there is no precedent of the offence.

I refer to the matter raised by the member for Badcoe in relation to an answer given by the Minister for Child Protection to a question in the house on 16 May. More specifically, the member for Badcoe asked the following question of the Minister for Child Protection:

Is the minister outsourcing the assessment of foster or kinship carers to a Victorian company, Assessments Australia, or any other private or non-government organisations?

The Minister for Child Protection, in responding to the question, answered, 'No.' The member for Badcoe alleges that the Minister for Child Protection has misled the house as she acknowledges that for some time the assessment of foster carers has been done by external agencies, including not-for-profit groups that recruit foster carers.

Further, the member for Badcoe contends that the Victorian-based company Assessment Australia is and has been completing kinship care assessments for the department, referring to the Department for Child Protection. The member for Badcoe then advises the house by way of a rhetorical question, 'Why else would their website [Assessment Australia] have forms with the Department for Child Protection logos on them for department workers to refer kinship carers to Assessment Australia for assessment?'

Since this matter of privilege was raised, I advise the house that I have had the opportunity to read the Minister for Child Protection's personal explanations that were made in the house earlier today. In her personal explanation, the minister asserts her answer to a question on 16 May to be accurate because these care assessments were outsourced a number of years ago. The minister further states, 'Neither I nor the government have taken any steps to change this arrangement.'

If I was considering the matter prior to the minister's personal explanation, I would be of the view that prima facie the matters raised by the member for Badcoe may have touched on privilege and should therefore be accorded precedence for a motion which would enable the house to determine if there had been a breach of privilege. However, having had the benefit of examining the minister's personal explanation, I am of the opinion that any potential misleading of the house, as alluded to by the member for Badcoe, by the minister's answer has been corrected and therefore I do not propose to give precedence to the matter as a matter of privilege. However, this decision does not prevent the member for Badcoe or any other member from proceeding with a motion on the specific matter by giving notice in the usual way.

#### *Bills*

### **CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ASSAULTS ON PRESCRIBED EMERGENCY WORKERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 May 2019).

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (20:22):** I rise to make some brief remarks to support this bill enjoying a speedy passage through the house. This is a bill that all of us in this house should wholeheartedly endorse, promoting as it does better recognition for and more thorough penalisation of those who would contravene the rights of, our emergency workers in this state.

The bill would seek in a practical way to protect the interests of prescribed emergency workers by, to some extent, increasing the penalties that apply by rendering certain offences to be aggravated offences and in part by introducing new offences into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. I will take a moment to spell out the categories of workers who are covered by the bill because

it is important, in my view, that we recognise that there are people engaged in emergency work across a wide range of fields in this state. They are carrying out their work in both paid and voluntary capacities and they do so throughout the state both in city and rural areas.

Prescribed emergency workers are defined to include, firstly, police officers; secondly, prison officers; thirdly, employees in a training centre, that is, a training centre within the meaning of the Youth Justice Administration Act 2016; fourthly, members of the SA Ambulance Service; fifthly, a member of the SA MFS, the SA CFS and SA SES; and, sixthly, law enforcement officers and also those persons engaged in any occupation or employment that may be prescribed by regulation are otherwise to be included in the definition.

As I have indicated, those workers come from a whole variety of areas across the state and they work in both paid and voluntary capacities. The intent in this regard is that the category of person who is covered as a prescribed emergency worker is inclusive and so there is a capacity for that range of prescribed occupations to be expanded as may be appropriate by regulation over time.

I want to emphasise in these remarks that the bill is setting out to protect as wide a range of those engaged in this important category of work as is possible. That is for the reason that we see, through statistical analyses throughout Australia and indeed internationally over a sustained period of time, that those workers who are engaged in this range of emergency work are vulnerable to assault and being on the receiving end of similar offending in a way that far exceeds those working in other fields and indeed those members of the general public.

The statistics abound. We see published statistics indicating that there may be, for example, in relation to paramedics, a very high annual incidence of assault each year. There have been comparative treatments of the experience of those working in the UK in the NHS environment, which compare in similarly unfavourable terms with the experience of paramedics in Australia. This is a matter that has become somewhat of a uniting factor for those engaged in these fields of work throughout the world. It is something that I think we have come to hear from paramedics, police officers, prison officers and others over many years now, that this is a blight on and a constant risk in their day-to-day work.

This bill sets out to acknowledge that people working in this range of employment ought to be the subject of a special category, and it is recognised in two ways by this bill. The first is that the aggravating circumstances of offending will now be broadened to include an offence that is an offence against a victim who was engaged in one of the prescribed occupations that I have indicated earlier, and particularly in circumstances where the offender committed the offence knowing that the victim was acting in the course of their official duties at the time. So there is an aggravating element that is now introduced, and we see that in clauses 4, 5 and 6.

Secondly, we see in clause 7 of the bill the introduction of new offences that are specifically directed to the use of human biological material against emergency workers. This is particularly vile behaviour, of course, and concerning conduct that emergency workers find themselves uniquely in the path of in the course of their duties. The new offence provision, which will be introduced by way of the insertion of new section 20A, will introduce an offence constituted by a person committing a prohibited act involving human biological material against a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of their duties.

'Human biological material' is defined to include, unsurprisingly, blood, saliva, semen, faeces or urine. A prohibited act involving that material is constituted by the intentional causing of human biological material to come into contact with the victim or, alternatively, by the threatening of such conduct, that is, the threatening to bring human biological material into contact with a victim. This is an expansion of the scope of offending that may bring about sanction. They are very serious penalties that may be incurred by people who engage in this sort of conduct against emergency workers.

The penalty provision provides, in the case of actual harm being caused, for imprisonment of five years and, in any other case, imprisonment for four years. 'Harm' is defined to include both physical and mental harm. An important part of this new offence provision, unsurprisingly, is the element of knowledge. It will be a defence for the defendant to prove that they did not know and could not have reasonably been expected to know that their victim was a prescribed emergency worker.

Of course, we are talking about those workers who are often engaged in work around the clock at odd hours. These are people who almost invariably are conducting their official duties in uniform. The circumstances in which they are at risk of being the victim of an offence of this kind are very often, it might be expected, in circumstances where their duty, their responsibility and the nature of their work are very obviously portrayed. One can think of examples of how that is plainly obvious.

The nature of the bringing of biological material into contact with a victim, again unsurprisingly, contemplates involving spitting, throwing material, deliberately applying it to a person and conduct of that kind. That is set out in new section 20AA(4). I adverted at the commencement of my remarks to the extension of additional penalty provisions in relation to assaults and unlawful threats. Importantly, new section 20AB of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act will provide for an alternative verdict in the event that an offence contrary to section 20A not being proved. It will be open to find that an offence may be proved against section 20 as an alternative—that is, the section dealing with assaults.

As a result of these amendments, there is a necessary amendment to the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007 so as to include an offence against new section 20AA for the purposes of defining a 'prescribed serious offence'. That is so as to ensure that the relevant forensic procedures can occur in the circumstances so as to prove the offence.

Secondly, it is important to note that the result of the amendments and the introduction of the new aggravated offences, as well as the new offence that is the subject of section 20AA, is that the current offence of assault police that is provided for in the Summary Offences Act will no longer be necessary. This will no longer be a summary offence.

As I set out at the outset, police, being the first category named as one of those prescribed emergency worker categories, are covered by the definition, covered by the new offences and covered by the new aggravated offences. As a result, the currently prescribed offence of assault police that is the subject of section 6(1) of the Summary Offences Act will be overtaken by the offences that are the subject of this bill.

Such assaults will now, and properly in my view, be brought in within those serious offences that are the subject of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. As a result, section 6(1) is deleted and that is the subject of part 3 of the bill. With those remarks and again emphasising the extraordinary work that our emergency workers do for us in this state, I thank them and I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.

At 20:43 the house adjourned until Wednesday 5 June 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

**645 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (27 February 2019). Can the Treasurer advise what consultancies and/or contractor arrangements have been engaged by the Department of Treasury and Finance since 30 June 2018?

- (a) What is the purpose of each consultancy and/ or contractor arrangement?
- (b) What is the estimated cost of each consultancy and/or contractor arrangement?

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

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013 – Annual Reporting Requirements, information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost of work undertaken and nature of work undertaken, was detailed in the Department of Treasury and Finance 2017-18 annual report.

As detailed in the Treasurer's ministerial statement on 16 October 2018, the government is delivering on its election commitment for greater transparency. The 2017-18 annual reports will be a transition year as there are some pre-existing agreements with confidentiality obligations that the government is unable to provide in this reporting period.

The Department of Treasury and Finance 2018-19 annual report will include consultant and contractor information as required by the DPC Circular PC013. In addition information on the engagement of consultants and contracts is published on the South Australian government's Tenders and Contracts website as required by DPC Circular PC027 – Disclosure of Government Contracts.

**THOMAS FOODS INTERNATIONAL**

**734 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (14 May 2019). What support has the Marshall Liberal government provided to Thomas Foods International following the fire of January 2018?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** My department has not been approached as described.

**THOMAS FOODS INTERNATIONAL**

**735 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (14 May 2019). Has Thomas Foods International approached the government seeking government grants to support innovation through robotics?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** The Marshall Liberal government has continued to provide post-fire support to Thomas Foods International through the Thomas Foods Fire Coordination Taskforce which operates on an as-needs basis. The government has been working with Thomas Foods International as it assesses its options to restore the processing capability lost in the fire at its Murray Bridge site in January 2018.

**THOMAS FOODS INTERNATIONAL**

**736 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (14 May 2019). What commitment has the government received from Thomas Foods International regarding the retention of local jobs as a condition of the grant?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** My department has not been approached as described.

**THOMAS FOODS INTERNATIONAL**

**737 Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (14 May 2019). Will the Minister guarantee that no South Australian jobs will be lost because of the government grant?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):** My department has not been approached as described.

**FOSTER CARERS**

**738 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many fully approved foster carers were there in the child protection system at 1 March 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 March 2019, there were 2,094 registered primary and secondary foster carers in the SA child protection system.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household.

A foster carer can choose to facilitate one or more placement types such as long-term, short-term, emergency, respite and specialist placements.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**739 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many fully approved foster carers were there in the child protection system at 1 March 2018?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 March 2018, there were 2,012 registered primary and secondary foster carers in the SA child protection system.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household.

A foster carer can choose to facilitate one or more placement types such as long-term, short-term, emergency, respite and specialist placements.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**740 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many approved foster carers are there in the child protection system at 1 March 2019 who are not currently caring for an allocated foster child?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 March 2019, there were 651 registered primary and secondary foster carers in the SA child protection system who were not currently caring for a child or young person.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household.

Foster carers can choose to facilitate one or more placement types such as long-term, short-term, emergency, respite and specialist placements. Foster carers may have particular requirements of allowing children into their care, such as the age range of the child being placed.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**741 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many foster carers are awaiting full approval or are currently unable to accept a child into their care as at 1 March 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 March 2019, there were 16 foster carers awaiting full approval of their applications within the SA child protection system.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**742 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many foster carers are suspended from caring at 1 March 2019? What are the reasons for these suspensions?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection does not 'suspend' foster carers from caring. At times, the department applies a condition of 'no new placements' against carers within the SA child protection system.

There are multiple reasons for which the department may apply the condition of 'no new placements' against a carer/s. These reasons include, but are not limited to:

- the carer may have an expired screening clearance
- the carer may request a break from a child or young person being placed in their care
- the household may relocate to an alternative jurisdiction
- there is a change in the personal circumstance for the foster family which impedes their ability to accept the placement of a child or young person.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**743 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many new foster carers have been recruited into the child protection system since 1 April 2018?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 April 2019, there have been 227 new primary and secondary foster carers entering into the child protection system since 1 April 2018.



A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**744 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many new households have been recruited into the child protection system since 1 April 2018 (As distinct from carers, as multiple carers may be approved for one household)?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 April 2019, there have been 136 new registered households entering into the child protection system since 1 April 2018.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**745 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many new foster carers have been recruited above attrition since 1 April 2018?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 April 2019, there have been 93 new registered primary and secondary foster cares entering the SA child protection system above attrition, since 1 April 2018.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**746 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many new foster carers have been recruited since 1 April 2018 from Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander backgrounds?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 April 2019, there have been six registered primary and secondary foster carers who have been recruited into the SA child protection system who have identified as Aboriginal and/or Torres Strait Islander since 1 April 2018.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**747 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many new foster carers have been recruited since 1 April 2018 who are approved as able to care for children with special needs?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 April 2019, there have been 53 registered primary and secondary foster carers recruited into the SA child protection system since 1 April 2018, who are able to care for children and young people who require a specialist placement.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**748 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). Of the new foster carers who have been recruited since 1 April 2018, how many have since left the child protection system? And how many never had a child placed in their care? How many had one child placed in their care? How many had more than one child placed in their care, either simultaneously or consecutively?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 April 2019, there have been three registered primary and secondary foster carers (two households) who have entered the SA child protection system and subsequently left, since 1 April 2018. One of the two households has transitioned to kinship care and the other exited the South Australia child protection system due to a relocation of carers interstate.

All of the registered primary and secondary foster carers had more than one placement either consecutively or simultaneously of short-term, emergency and respite placement types.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or

young person within one household. Foster carers can choose to facilitate one or more placement types such as long-term, short-term, emergency, respite and specialist placements.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**749 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). Has the entry of new foster carers into the child protection system met the demand of rising numbers of children in the child protection system since 1 April 2018? If not, what is the gap in supply of foster carers and demand of children in care? If so, what is the surplus?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) is working to increase the number of children and young people placed within family-based care placement options. This is not solely limited to the placement of children or young people in foster carer placements.

While the rate at which children are entering the care system is growing, DCP continues to increase the proportion placed in family based care, which reached 85.7 per cent as at 30 April 2019. The placement of a child or young person is a process of negotiation between meeting the needs of the child and the capacity of the placement options available. Considerations of ensuring the child or young person has a connection to culture and their community can also affect this process.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**750 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What was the target for recruitment of new foster carers in the 2018-19 financial year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The government is committed to ensuring South Australia comes into line with the national average for the family-based care placement rate. A target to recruit a minimum of 50 foster carers has been set for 2018-19.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**751 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What is the target for recruitment of new foster carers in the 2019-20 financial year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The government is committed to ensuring South Australia comes into line with the national average for the family-based care placement rate.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**752 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What is the target for recruitment of new foster carers in the 2020-21 financial year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The government is committed to ensuring South Australia comes into line with the national average for the family-based care placement rate.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**753 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What is the target for recruitment of new foster carers in the 2021-22 financial year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The government is committed to ensuring South Australia comes into line with the national average for the family-based care placement rate.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**754 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). On what basis are targets for the recruitment of foster carers set?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The proportion of children in family-based care as a percentage of all out-of-home care in South Australia has increased from 83.1 per cent at 30 June 2017 to 85.7 per cent, as reported at 30 April 2019. The government is committed to ensuring South Australia comes into line with the national average family based care placement rate, which sits at approximately 93 per cent.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**755 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What measures are in place to ensure targets for the recruitment of foster carers are met?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

Non-government providers are funded to recruit, assess, train and support carers. Each agency is funded to provide an identified number of placements and is monitored through contractual arrangements.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**756 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How much funding is allocated to the recruitment of foster carers to be conducted by the Department for Child Protection?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection does not recruit foster carers. These services are provided by non-government organisations (NGOs). The funding provided to the NGOs is included within their overall payment.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**757 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How much funding has been provided to non-government organisations for the recruitment of foster carers for the years 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22? Which organisations have been allocated that funding? And how much is allocated to each organisation?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The total funding in 2018-19 to NGOs was \$30.766 million, which was for the provision of recruitment, support and respite for foster carers. Funding beyond 2018-19 is subject to the 2019-20 budget process. NGO individual contract values are commercial in confidence.

The NGOs used in 2018-19 are:

- Aboriginal Family Support Services Ltd
- Anglican Community Care Incorporated
- Anglicare SA Ltd
- Centacare Catholic Country SA Ltd
- Life Without Barriers
- Lutheran Church of Aust (SA and NT District)
- Uniting Country SA Incorporated
- Anglicare SA Ltd
- Catholic Church Endowment Society Inc
- Key Assets the Children's Service Provider (Aust) Ltd
- Uniting Communities Incorporated

#### FOSTER CARERS

**758 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many children were deemed suitable for foster care as at 1 April 2018, but were not in a foster care placement?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

During 2017-18, the Department for Child Protection undertook an audit of children in non family-based care to provide an understanding of placement need at a point in time, and to more broadly guide reform of the South Australian out of home care system. The audit was undertaken in four stages.

The findings showed that approximately:

- 53 per cent of children were appropriately placed in residential care based on their point in time need.
- 47 per cent of children audited, based on their point in time assessed need, could potentially have been placed in family-based care.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**759 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many children were deemed suitable for foster care as at 1 March 2019, but were not in a foster care placement?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

During 2017-18, the Department for Child Protection undertook an audit of children in non family-based care to provide an understanding of placement need at a point in time, and to more broadly guide reform of the South Australian out of home care system. The audit was undertaken in four stages.

The findings showed that approximately:

- 53 per cent of children were appropriately placed in residential care based on their point in time need.
- 47 per cent of children audited, based on their point in time assessed need, could potentially have been placed in family-based care.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**760 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many applications were received from prospective foster carers by DCP and non-government agencies since 1 April 2018? How many of those applicants have been approved by DCP or non-government agencies since 1 April 2018?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection (DCP) can only comment on the number of applications which have been received and screened from the NGO sector, and are to proceed for a full assessment by the Carer Assessment and Referral Unit (CARU).

DCP has received from the NGO sector a total of 158 applications for full assessment since 1 April 2018. Of these applications, 146 have been approved.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**761 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many new foster carers have been recruited since 1 April 2018 in rural and regional South Australia?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 April 2019, there have been 90 new registered primary and secondary foster carers recruited into the SA child protection system from rural and regional areas since 1 April 2018.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household. Foster carers can choose to facilitate one or more placement types such as long-term, short-term, emergency, respite and specialist placements.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**762 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many fully approved foster carers, based in rural and regional South Australia, were there in the child protection system at 1 March 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 March 2019, there were 876 registered primary and secondary foster carers based in rural and regional areas in the SA child protection system.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household. A foster carer can choose to facilitate one or more placement types such as long-term, short-term, emergency, respite and specialist placements.

#### FOSTER CARERS

**763 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many fully approved foster carers, based in rural and regional South Australia, were there in the child protection system at 1 March 2018?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 1 March 2018, there were 838 registered primary and secondary foster carers based in rural and regional areas in the SA child protection system.

A household with which a child or young person can be placed is distinct from the number of registered primary and secondary foster carers, as both the registered primary and secondary foster carer can care for a child or young person within one household. A foster carer can choose to facilitate one or more placement types such as long-term, short-term, emergency, respite and specialist placements.

#### FAMILY-BASED CARERS

**764 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many family-based carers have registered to access carer payments for young people up to the age of 21 since 1 January 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

There have been 18 applications received for carer payments for eligible young people up to the age of 21 since 1 January 2019, as part of the stability in family-based care program.

#### FAMILY-BASED CARERS

**765 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many family-based carers have registered to access carer payments and are awaiting approval as at 30 March 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Stability in Family-Based Care Program currently has five applications for family-based carers who have registered to access carer payments post 18 years of age for the young person who is in their care, and which are awaiting approval as at 30 March 2019.

Four of these five applications have been fully assessed and are awaiting the young people's 18<sup>th</sup> birthdays, while the fifth was being assessed as at 30 March 2019.

#### **FAMILY-BASED CARERS**

**766 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What is the average turnaround time between a family-based carer registering to access carer payments and when carer payments are approved as at 30 March 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

Applications for the Stability in Family-Based Placement Program are prioritised according to how close a young person is to turning 18. This ensures all applications are processed in a timely manner, ensuring the young person maintains a sense of continuity and stability within their currently family-based placement.

#### **FAMILY-BASED CARERS**

**767 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many family-based carers have had their application to receive carer payments for young people up to the age of 21 approved since 1 January 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

There have been 10 family based carers who have been approved to receive carer payments for young people up to the age of 21 since 1 January 2019, as part of the Stability in Family-Based Care program.

#### **FAMILY-BASED CARERS**

**768 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many family-based carers have had their application to receive carer payments for young people up to the age of 21 rejected since 1 January 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

In the Stability in Family-Based Care Program, 5 applications have not met the eligibility criteria for the program since 1 January 2019.

#### **FAMILY-BASED CARERS**

**769 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many young people, who reside with family-based carers who are receiving carer payments, are due to 'age-out' of the child protection system by 31 December, 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 24 May 2019, there are 92 young people recorded in the system who are residing in a family-based placement type and who are due to turn 18 years of age between the period of 1 January 2019 and 31 December 2019. Carers of eligible children can commence the application process for payment under the Stability in Family-Based Care Program when the young person in their care turns 17.5 years old.

#### **FAMILY-BASED CARERS**

**770 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many young people, who reside with family-based carers who are receiving carer payments, are due to 'age-out' of the child protection system by 31 December, 2020?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

As at 24 May 2019, there are 128 young people recorded as residing in a family-based placement type and who are due to turn 18 years of age between the period of 1 January 2020 and 31 December 2020. Carers of eligible children can commence the application process for payment under the Stability in Family-Based Care Program when the young person in their care turns 17.5 years old.

#### **FAMILY-BASED CARERS**

**771 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many family based carers are forecast to receive carer payments, for young people aged 18-21, in 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection has multiple programs to better support young people in out of home care who are about to turn 18 years of age.

The Stability in Family-Based Care Program is currently forecast for 56 young people in out of home care who are residing in family based placements within the 2019-20 financial year. Budget forecasts for the Stability in Family-Based Care Program are subject to the 2019-20 budget process. All applicants eligible for the Stability in Family-Based Care Program will be supported.

**CARER PAYMENTS**

**772 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What funding has been allocated for carer payments for young people up to the age of 21 in 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21, 2021-22?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The funding allocated for care payments for 2018-19 is \$57.179 million. Funding beyond 2018-19 is subject to the 2019-20 budget process.

**FAMILY-BASED CARE PROGRAM**

**773 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What funding has been allocated to the Stability in Family-Based Care program in 2018-19, 2019-2020, 20-21, 2021-22?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The funding allocated to the Stability in Family-Based Care program is in the 2018-19 Budget Papers.

**FAMILY-BASED CARE PROGRAM**

**774 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What targets or key performance indicators have been set for the Stability in Family-Based Care Program? How are these targets or key performance indicators assessed and measured?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The department identifies young people in family based care who will be turning 18 years old. All applicants assessed as eligible for the Stability in Family Based Care Program will be supported.

**FAMILY-BASED CARERS**

**775 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How are the outcomes for young people aged between 18-21 and residing with family-based carers measured and monitored?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Department for Child Protection will measure and monitor the outcomes for young people in the Stability in Family-Based Care Program as part of the program's regular data and qualitative analysis based on surveys and exit interviews. Continuous monitoring of outcomes will focus on the following areas:

- Source of referral
- Reach, uptake and impact of program
- Program satisfaction

In addition, the CREATE Foundation has offered to consult with young people in 2019 about the program.

**STATE CARE CASES**

**776 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many child protection or children in state care cases have been referred to the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People since 18 October 2018?

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

None. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People does not have powers to investigate individual child protection or children in state care cases.

**STATE CARE CASES**

**777 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many child protection or children in state care cases have been referred and completed by the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People as of 30 April 2019?

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

None. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People does not have powers to investigate individual child protection or children in state care cases.

**STATE CARE CASES**

**778 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many child protection or children in state care cases have been referred to the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People and remain ongoing as of 30 April 2019?

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

None. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People does not have powers to investigate individual child protection or children in state care cases.

**STATE CARE CASES**

**779 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many child protection or children in state care cases have been investigated by the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People since 18 October 2018?

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

None. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People does not have powers to investigate individual child protection or children in state care cases.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**780 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many cases, involving children in state care, has the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People made recommendations on since 18 October 2018?

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

None. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People does not have powers to investigate individual child protection or children in state care cases.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**781 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What policies have been developed by the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People that relate to child protection matters or children in state care since 18 October 2018?

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

The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People (the Commissioner) does not lead the development of child protection policy in South Australia.

The role of the commissioner is to monitor, advise and advocate on systemic and individual issues and to promote operations, policies and procedures by state authorities that improve the safety, health and wellbeing of the Aboriginal children and young people of South Australia.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**782 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What recommendations have been made by the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People related to child protection matters or children in state care since 18 October 2018?

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

None. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People commenced in the role 3 December 2018.

Since her recent appointment, the inaugural commissioner has established her office, undertaken an intensive engagement program with government and Aboriginal community stakeholders about the role.

The commissioner is a member of the SA Family Matters forum, meets regularly with the Department for Child Protection leadership and is an appointed member of the Department for Education's Aboriginal Experts Advisory Panel and the Housing and Homelessness Taskforce. In addition, she is a member of, and attends the national forum of Australia—New Zealand Children Commissioners and Guardians whom meet twice a year.

**STATE CARE CASES**

**783 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many child protection or children in state care cases is the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People monitoring as at 30 April 2019?

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

None. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People does not have powers to investigate individual child protection or children in state care cases.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**784 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What actions have the Department for Child Protection taken in responding to any recommendations made by the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People since 18 October 2018?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

Senior executives of the Department for Child Protection (DCP) have regular meetings with the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People to discuss areas of mutual priority and systemic issues. DCP action taken as a result of these discussions is on an issue-by-issue basis and is progressed in accordance with the department's program of continuous improvement.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**785 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). How many times has the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People met or corresponded with the Minister for Child Protection about child protection or children in state care matters that have been referred to the commissioner?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People commenced in the role on 3 December 2018.

Since 3 December 2018 the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People has met with the Minister for Child Protection a number of times, in their official capacities as commissioner and minister and at many functions they have attended.

Since 3 December 2018 the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People has not corresponded with the Minister for Child Protection about child protection or children in state care matters. The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People does not have the powers to investigate individual child protection or children in state care cases.

**RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS**

**795 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How many residential property transactions were liable for conveyance duty in 2017-18 with assessable property values of:

1. \$0 to \$200,000;
2. \$200,001 to \$300,000;
3. \$300,001 to \$400,000;
4. \$400,001 to \$500,000;
5. \$500,000 to \$600,000;
6. \$600,001 to \$700,000;
7. \$700,001 to \$800,000;
8. \$800,001 to \$900,000;
9. \$900,001 to \$1,000,000;
10. \$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000;
11. \$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000;
12. \$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000;
13. \$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000;
14. \$1,400,000 to \$1,500,000;
15. \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000;
16. \$2,000,001 to \$2,500,000;
17. \$2,500,001 to \$3,000,000;
18. \$3,000,001+?

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

Property value	Number of residential transactions – 2017-18
\$0 to \$200,000	7,780
\$200,001 to \$300,000	7,360
\$300,001 to \$400,000	8,180
\$400,001 to \$500,000	6,170
\$500,001 to \$600,000	3,870
\$600,001 to \$700,000	2,450
\$700,001 to \$800,000	1,390
\$800,001 to \$900,000	900
\$900,001 to \$1,000,000	460
\$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000	270
\$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000	240
\$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000	180
\$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000	130
\$1,400,001 to \$1,500,000	100
\$1,500,001 to \$2,000,000	250
\$2,000,001 to \$2,500,000	90



Property value	Number of residential transactions – 2017-18
\$2,500,001 to \$3,000,000	40
\$3,000,001 +	70
TOTAL	39,900

Note: This is system generated information. There may be inaccuracies in the type of property listed, especially where the same duty rates apply (e.g. residential and primary production).

Rounded to nearest 10 transactions.

Total may not add due to rounding.

#### RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

**796 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). What is the conveyance duty raised for residential property transactions in 2017-18 for property values of:

1. \$0 to \$200,000;
2. \$200,001 to \$300,000;
3. \$300,001 to \$400,000;
4. \$400,001 to \$500,000;
5. \$500,000 to \$600,000;
6. \$600,001 to \$700,000;
7. \$700,001 to \$800,000;
8. \$800,001 to \$900,000;
9. \$900,001 to \$1,000,000;
10. \$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000
11. \$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000
12. \$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000
13. \$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000
14. \$1,400,000 to \$1,500,000
15. \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000
16. \$2,000,001 to \$2,500,000
17. \$2,500,001 to \$3,000,000
18. \$3,000,001+?

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

Property value	Residential Duty 2017-18 (\$m)
\$0 to \$200,000	31.1
\$200,001 to \$300,000	67.9
\$300,001 to \$400,000	111.1
\$400,001 to \$500,000	112.8
\$500,001 to \$600,000	90.8
\$600,001 to \$700,000	70.7
\$700,001 to \$800,000	48.3
\$800,001 to \$900,000	36.4
\$900,001 to \$1,000,000	21.1
\$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000	13.8
\$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000	13.5
\$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000	10.9
\$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000	9.0
\$1,400,001 to \$1,500,000	7.5
\$1,500,001 to \$2,000,000	21.3
\$2,000,001 to \$2,500,000	10.4
\$2,500,001 to \$3,000,000	5.5
\$3,000,001 +	20.2
TOTAL	702.2

Note: This is system generated information. There may be inaccuracies in the type of property listed, especially where the same duty rates apply (e.g. residential and primary production).

#### RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

**797 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How many residential property transactions were liable for conveyance duty from 1 July 2018 to 31 December 2018 with assessable property values of:

1. \$0 to \$200,000;
2. \$200,001 to \$300,000;
3. \$300,001 to \$400,000;
4. \$400,001 to \$500,000;
5. \$500,000 to \$600,000;
6. \$600,001 to \$700,000;
7. \$700,001 to \$800,000;
8. \$800,001 to \$900,000;
9. \$900,001 to \$1,000,000;
10. \$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000
11. \$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000
12. \$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000
13. \$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000
14. \$1,400,000 to \$1,500,000
15. \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000
16. \$2,000,001 to \$2,500,000
17. \$2,500,001 to \$3,000,000
18. \$3,000,001+?

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

Property value	Number of residential transactions—6 months to 31 December 2018
\$0 to \$200,000	3,740
\$200,001 to \$300,000	3,410
\$300,001 to \$400,000	3,950
\$400,001 to \$500,000	2,950
\$500,001 to \$600,000	1,980
\$600,001 to \$700,000	1,120
\$700,001 to \$800,000	700
\$800,001 to \$900,000	390
\$900,001 to \$1,000,000	260
\$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000	140
\$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000	120
\$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000	100
\$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000	70
\$1,400,001 to \$1,500,000	60
\$1,500,001 to \$2,000,000	140
\$2,000,001 to \$2,500,000	40
\$2,500,001 to \$3,000,000	30
\$3,000,001 +	30
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>19,230</b>

Note: This is system generated information. There may be inaccuracies in the type of property listed, especially where the same duty rates apply (e.g. residential and primary production).

Totals rounded to the nearest 10 transactions.

Total may not add due to rounding.

#### RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

**798 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). What is the conveyance duty raised for residential property transaction from 1 July 2018 to 31 December 2018 with assessable property values of:

1. \$0 to \$200,000;
2. \$200,001 to \$300,000;
3. \$300,001 to \$400,000;
4. \$400,001 to \$500,000;
5. \$500,000 to \$600,000;
6. \$600,001 to \$700,000;
7. \$700,001 to \$800,000;
8. \$800,001 to \$900,000;
9. \$900,001 to \$1,000,000;
10. \$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000;
11. \$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000;
12. \$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000;
13. \$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000;
14. \$1,400,000 to \$1,500,000;
15. \$1,500,000 to \$2,000,000;
16. \$2,000,001 to \$2,500,000;
17. \$2,500,001 to \$3,000,000;
18. \$3,000,001+?

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

Property value	Residential duty 6 months to 31 December 2018 (\$m)
\$0 to \$200,000	14.4
\$200,001 to \$300,000	31.6
\$300,001 to \$400,000	54.3
\$400,001 to \$500,000	55.2
\$500,001 to \$600,000	47.7
\$600,001 to \$700,000	33.4
\$700,001 to \$800,000	24.6
\$800,001 to \$900,000	16.1
\$900,001 to \$1,000,000	12.0
\$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000	7.6
\$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000	6.9
\$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000	6.3
\$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000	4.6
\$1,400,001 to \$1,500,000	4.2
\$1,500,001 to \$2,000,000	12.5
\$2,000,001 to \$2,500,000	4.7
\$2,500,001 to \$3,000,000	3.6
\$3,000,001 +	6.2
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>345.9</b>

Note: This is system generated information. There may be inaccuracies in the type of property listed, especially where the same duty rates apply (e.g. residential and primary production).

Total may not add due to rounding.

#### RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

**799 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How many first-home buyer residential property transactions occurred in South Australia in each month of 2017-18?

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

The government does not collect data on the number of first-home buyer residential property transactions. Data on the number of First Home Owner Grants paid by month and financial year is available on the RevenueSA website: <https://www.revenuesa.sa.gov.au/services-and-information/statistics>.

The First Home Owner Grant is available for eligible first home buyers purchasing or constructing a new residential property with a market value of up to \$575,000.

#### RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

**800 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How many first-home buyer residential property transactions occurred in each month of 2017-18 that were:

1. Existing properties?
2. New builds?

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

The government does not collect data on the number of first-home buyer residential property transactions. Data on the number of First Home Owner Grants paid by month and financial year is available on the RevenueSA website: <https://www.revenuesa.sa.gov.au/services-and-information/statistics>.

The First Home Owner Grant is available for eligible first-home buyers purchasing or constructing a new residential property with a market value of up to \$575,000.

#### RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

**801 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How many first-home buyer residential property transactions occurred in South Australia in 2017-18 with property values of:

1. \$0 to \$200,000
2. \$200,001 to \$300,000;
3. \$300,001 to \$400,000;
4. \$400,001 to \$500,000;
5. \$500,000 to \$600,000;
6. \$600,001 to \$700,000;
7. \$700,001 to \$800,000;
8. \$800,001 to \$900,000;
9. \$900,001 to \$1,000,000;
10. \$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000;
11. \$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000;
12. \$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000;
13. \$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000;
14. \$1,400,001 to \$1,500,000;
15. \$1,500,001 and above?

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

The government does not collect data on the number of first-home buyer residential property transactions. Data on the number of First Home Owner Grants paid by month and financial year is available on the RevenueSA website: <https://www.revenuesa.sa.gov.au/services-and-information/statistics>.

The First Home Owner Grant is available for eligible first-home buyers purchasing or constructing a new residential property with a market value of up to \$575,000.

#### RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TRANSACTIONS

**802 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). In 2017-18, how much conveyance duty was collected for first-home buyer residential property transactions with property values of

1. \$0 to \$200,000
2. \$200,001 to \$300,000;
3. \$300,001 to \$400,000;
4. \$400,001 to \$500,000;

5. \$500,000 to \$600,000;
6. \$600,001 to \$700,000;
7. \$700,001 to \$800,000;
8. \$800,001 to \$900,000;
9. \$900,001 to \$1,000,000;
10. \$1,000,001 to \$1,100,000;
11. \$1,100,001 to \$1,200,000;
12. \$1,200,001 to \$1,300,000;
13. \$1,300,001 to \$1,400,000;
14. \$1,400,000 to \$1,500,000;
15. \$1,500,001 and above?

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

The government does not collect data on the number of first-home buyer residential property transactions. Data on the number of First Home Owner Grants paid by month and financial year is available on the RevenueSA website: <https://www.revenuesa.sa.gov.au/services-and-information/statistics>.

The First Home Owner Grant is available for eligible first-home buyers purchasing or constructing a new residential property with a market value of up to \$575,000.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION**

**818 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). Can the Minister table an itemised list of the current recipients of any funds from the Regional Consumer Marketing Fund' under the South Australian Tourism Commission?

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

The regions are:

- Adelaide Hills Tourism
- Tourism Barossa
- Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North (Clare Valley)
- Destination Riverland
- Regional Development Australia Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula
- Tourism Marketing Committee Flinders Ranges and Outback South Australia
- Tourism Kangaroo Island
- Limestone Coast Local Government Association
- Regional Development Australia, Murraylands and Riverland (Murray, River, Lakes & Coorong)
- Yorke Peninsula Tourism
- Fleurieu Peninsula Tourism.

#### **SKILLING SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**820 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). How many new apprenticeships and traineeships have been created through the Skilling South Australia program since the program started?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** The state government is on track to meet targets under the National Partnership Agreement on the Skilling South Australia program. Due to data lags i.e. lags in commencement activity reporting, an announcement in conjunction with the commonwealth, providing full details on the numbers and funding will be made in the near future.

#### **APPRENTICESHIPS**

**821 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). What is the current apprenticeship non-completion rate in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** According to the latest figures released by National Centre for Vocational Education Research (NCVER) in 2018, the non-completion rate for apprentices and trainees in South Australia who commenced their training contract in 2013 (under the former Labor

government), was 33.0 per cent. This was the lowest rate of all the states and territories and 9.0 percentage points below the national rate.

The Marshall Liberal government is working directly with industry to improve completion rates and ensure real job outcomes for more South Australians.

#### SKILLING SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**822 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). How many new apprenticeships and traineeships are expected to be created through Skilling South Australia by

- (a) 1 July 2019?
- (b) 1 July 2020?
- (c) 1 July 2021?
- (d) 1 July 2022?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** The state government is on track to meet targets under the National Partnership Agreement on the Skilling South Australia program. Due to data lags i.e. lags in commencement activity reporting, an announcement in conjunction with the commonwealth, providing full details on the numbers and funding will be made in the near future.

Projected numbers over the forward years will be in line with full reporting.

#### SKILLING SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**823 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). How much of the \$202.6 million committed to Skilling South Australia over the next four years is forecast to be spent in each of the 2018-19, 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 financial years?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** The state government is on track to meet targets under the National Partnership Agreement on the Skilling South Australia program. Due to data lags i.e. lags in commencement activity reporting, an announcement in conjunction with the commonwealth, providing full details on the numbers and funding will be made in the near future.

Projected numbers over the forward years will be in line with full reporting.

#### APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

**824 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). The Marshall Liberal government states it will create 20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships over the next four years. Is this 20,800 completions or 20,800 commencements of new apprenticeships and traineeships?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** The Marshall Liberal government's Skilling South Australia commitment is to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeship and traineeship commencements. In pursuing this target, the Department for Innovation and Skills is working directly with industry and businesses to ensure completions and ongoing job outcomes.

#### INNOVATION AND SKILLS DEPARTMENT

**825 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). How much has the Department for Innovation and Skills budgeted to cover the cost of the department name change from 'Department of Industry and Skills' to 'Department for Innovation and Skills'?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** I have been advised:

No specific budget has been allocated to support the department's name change. I have been advised that costs incurred have been minimal and will be managed in the department's overall 2018-19 budget.

#### INNOVATION AND SKILLS DEPARTMENT

**826 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). How much has minister Pisoni's office budgeted for the cost of the department's name change from 'Department of Industry and Skills' to 'Department for Innovation and Skills'?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills):** Refer to freedom of information document released on 6 May 2019. It was fortuitous that the first run of business cards was almost exhausted, meaning the associated printing costs of new cards was scheduled to occur anyway.

#### ELECTIVE SURGERY

**827 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). How many elective surgery operations on public health patients were performed in public hospitals for each of the following months:

- (a) November 2017?
- (b) December 2017?

- (c) January 2018?
- (d) February 2018?
- (e) March 2018?
- (f) April 2018?
- (g) May 2018?
- (h) June 2018?
- (i) July 2018?
- (j) August 2018?
- (k) September 2018?
- (l) October 2018?
- (m) November 2018?
- (n) December 2018?
- (o) January 2019?
- (p) February 2019?
- (q) March 2019?
- (r) April 2019?

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

Admissions from elective surgery waiting lists, including elective surgery categories, are provided annually by the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare.

#### INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

**832 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). As at Friday 26 April how many flu vaccines were in storage?

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

The member is referred to public statements by the minister and health sector management.

#### INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

**833 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). On what dates were updates or briefings (written or verbal) provided to the minister on flu vaccinations?

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

The minister speaks frequently with the Chief Medical Officer, clinicians and management responsible for influenza vaccinations.

#### INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

**834 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). During 2019 how many orders from GPs for flu vaccine were not fulfilled with the full number of vaccines requested?

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

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

#### INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS

**836 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). On what date in 2019 was the first order provided to a GP with less vaccines than was ordered?

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

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

**INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS**

**837 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). On what date in 2019 was the last order provided to a GP with less vaccines than was ordered?

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

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

**INFLUENZA VACCINATIONS**

**838 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). What are the postcodes of GP practices where during 2019 less flu doses were provided than were ordered?

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

The member is referred to the public weekly updates provided by the Communicable Diseases Control Branch of the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

**NATIONAL TRAINING CENTRE HIGH PERFORMANCE PROGRAMS**

**844 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (4 June 2019). What portion of the \$90,000 granted to Football Federation South Australia in 2018-19 for their National Training Centre High Performance Programs through the Sport and Recreation Development and Inclusion Program was allocated specifically to their female football programs?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I am advised by the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing:

The grant funding to the Football Federation of South Australia National Training Centre contributes to the delivery of two full-time development programs, one for girls and one for boys. Football Federation Australia and the Football Federation of South Australia contribute the remaining three-quarters of the project costs for this program.

The financial reporting for this grant does not distinguish expenses between the girls and boys programs, it is reported by expenditure items across the two programs. It is evident that two head coaches are employed to deliver the two programs.

In 2018-19, 14 female athletes achieved National Squad or W League selection, including two athletes as members of the Matildas and two more players in the Young Matildas squad.

**ELECTIVE SURGERY**

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (27 February 2019).

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

The SA Health Extreme Heat Strategy was published in its current form under the former Labor government in 2016. In circumstances when the State Emergency Service issues an extreme heatwave warning SA Health's response is in line with that strategy.

**FINANCIAL WELLBEING PROGRAM, PORT PIRIE**

In reply to **the Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (2 May 2019).

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection):** I have been advised:

There are currently 3.0 FTE financial counsellors working from DCP's Port Pirie office.

As per the department's HR transition principles, all staff affected by the restructuring of the department's financial wellbeing services will be supported to transition to other roles within the department, or the wider public sector. The department's human resources team is currently working with affected staff to establish future career pathways, as well as training and support required to transition into new roles. The department is committed to finding positions within the department in which to place all affected staff, where a reasonable match in terms of skills and/or training is identified.