

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 31 July 2019

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

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

### *Bills*

#### **EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES BILL**

##### *Conference*

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (10:31):** I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

#### **COMMISSION OF INQUIRY (LAND ACCESS IN THE MINING INDUSTRY) BILL**

##### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (10:32):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to provide for a commission of inquiry into land access regimes under the Mining Act 1971 and the Opal Mining Act 1995, the operation of the Department for Energy and Mining in relation to such land access regimes, and for other purposes. Read a first time.

##### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (10:33):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The bill that I present to this house calls for an independent commission into land access and approvals for the mining sector to be able to obtain access to agricultural land and work collaboratively with both sectors that have been affected. Previous bills have been through the Parliament of South Australia, but no bill has been able to satisfy all parties. Therefore, I feel it necessary to have this commission of inquiry.

There are people who may say that we as legislators get it right every time we bring any legislation into both houses of parliament, but we must be realistic and look at and review our consultation and how we do it, especially with the general public. I believe that we can always improve on what we do.

The bill proposes that the inquiry be held away from politics and also that the commissioner be an independent person. My bill requests that the commissioner be a retired justice of the Supreme Court or Federal Court and that this person is appointed by the Attorney-General. This person should not be a retired political person but someone well and truly away from politics.

It appears that for far too long mining legislation may not have looked at all opportunities. For this reason, I have placed in the bill the opportunity to look into the practices of not only interstate but also overseas jurisdictions and how they have been able to achieve best practice and balance the rights of landowners and those who may seek access to land to explore for or extract mineral resources.

I also envisage that the commissioner will inquire into administrative and legislative options that may be a model of best practice for not only South Australia but also other jurisdictions. The bill also requires that the operations of the Department for Energy and Mining be looked at for the best model for all to be able to operate within.

In the past few days, I have had numerous—and I mean numerous—calls from across all regional South Australia regarding the current situation, supporting this independent commission of

inquiry. People ringing me on my Parliament House telephone this morning from across the South-East and also in other areas across South Australia suggested that this inquiry should go further and include other acts, such as the Land Acquisition Act 1969. There may be other acts that the commission may elect to investigate, along with any other legislation that may be identified.

As in general life, we are advised and guided by others. In our journeys we come into contact with people who may have different ideas or views, and sometimes we need to stand back and re-valuate what we do and how we do things. What we do in this place is no different from what we do in our general life.

It has been mentioned at times that the department could be seen as both the regulator and the promoter of any projects that may eventuate. Currently, it is my belief that a resource company obtains the licence first and then proceeds to undertake the required environmental processes. Perhaps there is another sector that may have best practices that are agreeable to all parties.

It is very rare for numerous stakeholders, including the South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy (SACOME), Grain Producers SA, the National Farmers' Federation, Primary Producers SA and Livestock SA to come together at a round table to contribute to the best opportunities for all their members. It was a resolution of all parties that an independent review be commissioned for the best opportunities and for the best practice of all concerned.

The independent inquiry would also be able to identify alternative models and jurisdictions with a view to suggest best practice ways to address the question of land access, aquifer protection, legislation and any other opportunities that may arise. This inquiry will also bring greater transparency and a better balance of all landowners and mining companies. It should be stated today that there are many projects that go through the current process and all may be in agreement; however, there are other occasions when the process may not have been so smooth and has cost many people a lot of frustration, money and time.

There have been times when the agricultural sector has been stressed due to the length of approval and development processes that have taken place. The education for all parties should be clearer and easier for all parties to understand the process. We are a great state and we need to be able to extract the best we can from all sectors and to put in place the best practices and methods to enable everyone to achieve the best outcomes for all involved and for all our other industries.

This bill will allay concerns from everyone in the mining industry. All this bill asks for is that an independent inquiry into land access be established for the mining industry and for the final report of the commission to be laid before each house of parliament within six days of receiving it. As mentioned earlier, I have received numerous calls from across the state regarding this bill and what progress there will be from here.

I present the bill today. The second reading will be deferred and an opportunity will be given for everyone in this house to look at it. As I have now presented the bill for all members to peruse and consider, I hope that the government will have the bill on the next sitting day of parliament after the six-week winter break. I look forward to getting bipartisan support for this bill to ensure best practices are put in place, which will benefit both sectors involved with regard to modernising mining approvals and other processes. I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL**

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (10:39):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill 2018 and it is with much pride that I do so. I had wondered, given the history of this matter, whether we would ever come to this day, but I am proud to say that we have. The outline of the proposed legislation, which has had scrutiny through its introduction and passage in the other place, has been a valuable addition.

May I outline first that the Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill seeks to progress reform to remove offences relating to prostitution and the keeping of brothels from our criminal law, both the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Summary Offences Act. Furthermore, the bill ensures that current and former sex workers cannot be discriminated against under the Equal Opportunity Act and that they are covered through return to work provisions. Finally, the bill brings offences relating to prostitution, brothel keeping and street soliciting under the spent convictions regime, allowing prescribed sex work offences to be spent convictions. I will turn to each of these key components shortly.

The bill I speak of today is nearly identical to the bill proposed by the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC, introduced into this parliament in 2015, and that of Steph Key, MP of the time, introduced in 2013. The 2015 bill was subsequently the subject of a select committee report published on 30 May 2017. Although it was passed without amendment by the Legislative Council on 5 July 2017, that bill did not ultimately pass the House of Assembly prior to the prorogation of parliament.

The bill before us today reflects the lengthy work of that committee and those members on it and takes into account amendments provided in the Legislative Council only weeks ago. I believe that these amendments work to strengthen the bill for our sex workers and brothel keepers but will also deal with some community concern around advertising and police powers.

We are joined on this day by an historic group of people in the chamber, many of whom have paved the way for the full decriminalisation model to be progressed in our parliament and the basis upon which we are able to debate this today. Specifically, I would like to thank attendees from Zonta, the YWCA, the Sex Industry Network, SHINE SA, the Working Women's Centre, Business and Professional Women, and the Health Services Union.

I would also like to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC, the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC, Duncan McFetridge, former member of this parliament, and my colleague the member for Reynell, who joins me today to second this bill. I also wish to thank the Hon. Steph Key and the Hon. Diana Laidlaw, who cannot join us today but who have been with us every step of the way in working towards a full decriminalisation model.

As a firm believer in this cause, I see decriminalisation as the only model that will comprehensively afford sex workers and women their fundamental rights and protections. By decriminalising sex work, we can provide the predominantly female and often highly vulnerable cohort the opportunity to be afforded basic health care, report instances of abuse to the police, seek work opportunities and contribute to society without the overarching stigma of their choice of work.

The sale of sex has existed since time immemorial and will continue to exist with or without the passage of this bill. However, the bill can improve the health and safety conditions of workers and reduce crime rates, which is the experience of other jurisdictions that have implemented decriminalisation. I refer particularly to New South Wales and New Zealand, which have decriminalised sex work in 1979 and 2003 respectively. This bill, at its heart, is about choice: the choice to work in whichever industry you like, the choice to disclose details of actions to the police without the fear of prosecution and the choice to cease working in the industry should you choose to do so.

I will now move to key components of this bill. Under the bill, at clauses 9 to 19 inclusive, the protections of part 5B of the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 are extended to a former or current sex worker, which is to be defined as a 'person who provides sexual services on a commercial basis', and their relatives or associates.

The amendments will have the effect of treating discrimination on the grounds of being or having been a sex worker in the same way that part 5B of the Equal Opportunity Act currently treats discrimination on the grounds of marital or domestic partnership status, the identity of a spouse or domestic partner, pregnancy, association with a child, caring responsibilities and religious appearance or dress. Generally speaking, it will be unlawful to discriminate against a former or current sex worker and their relatives or associates by treating them unfavourably in employment and education or in relation to land, goods, services and accommodation.

Under section 6 of the Equal Opportunity Act, a person—that is, the discriminator—treats another unfavourably on the basis of a particular attribute or circumstance if the discriminator treats that other person less favourably than in identical or similar circumstances in which the discriminator treats, or would treat, a person who does not have that attribute or is not affected by that circumstance. The equal opportunity commissioner has advised that the amendments simply add a new ground to the act. The commissioner has no concerns about this, noting that exemptions can be applied for.

Clause 20 of the bill allows for prescribed sex work offences to be spent convictions. Under this clause, convictions will be taken to be spent if they were an offence against keeping of a bawdy house, section 270(1)(b) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act; permitting premises to be frequented by prostitutes, section 21 of the Summary Offences Act; soliciting in a public place, section 25 of the Summary Offences Act; procurement for prostitution, section 25A of the Summary Offences Act; living on the earnings of prostitution, section 26 of the Summary Offences Act; the keeping and management of a brothel, part 6 of the Summary Offences Act; or a common law offence related to prostitution.

The Spent Convictions Act 2009 sets out the law on when a conviction is not disclosed on your criminal record. A spent conviction is a conviction that, subject to exceptions, cannot be disclosed on a police check and is not required to be disclosed in response to questions about criminal history. Some exceptions to this rule include certain categories of employment, character tests and screening applications. Unless applying for particular types of work, a person who has spent convictions does not have to disclose them to prospective employers, and employers cannot refuse to employ someone on the basis of spent convictions.

Regardless, spent convictions are disclosable in relation to working or volunteering with children, people with disability, vulnerable people or people in the aged-care sector. This includes working with children checks. In these circumstances, the screening unit operated by the Department of Human Services undertakes an examination and consideration as to whether a current or former sex worker poses a risk to children and thus whether a working with children check should be granted. This is done on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, people with sex work-related spent convictions are eligible to apply to a magistrate for an order that their spent conviction is not disclosable, even in relation to these exceptional types of work.

Clause 23 of the bill inserts police powers to enter and search premises used for commercial sex services if there is reasonable cause to suspect an offence has recently been, or is about to be, committed or to secure evidence of an offence. Under section 32 of the Summary Offences Act, currently police have the power to enter and search premises that are reasonably suspected to be brothels. Retaining a right of entry in certain circumstances is important when decriminalising sex work; however, it should not overreach the decision of parliament to decriminalise brothels and sex work.

As such, this clause ensures that there is adequate and appropriate police power to enter premises used for commercial sex services where there is reasonable cause to suspect that an offence has been recently committed or is about to be committed. This clause ensures a balance is met between entering premises in the investigation of a crime and simply entering premises with no reasonable cause. There must be a reasonable cause to suspect an offence is occurring.

The Commissioner of Police has noted their opposition to a bill that gives police no power to enter premises where crimes such as child exploitation, child trafficking or otherwise are occurring. South Australia Police are provided effective measures to protect sex workers from illegal exploitation, to prevent the involvement of minors and to prevent organised crime entering the industry, without a broad right of entry power affecting potentially much more of our community.

Clause 24 of the bill repeals offences relating to soliciting in a public place for the purposes of prostitution under section 25 of the Summary Offences Act, procuring a person for prostitution under section 25A, and living on the earnings of prostitution of another person under section 26. The retention of these offences in their current form displaces the criminalisation model and erodes the purpose of this reform.

Despite this, I have seen a strong interest from both sides of the parliament to see an amendment limiting where soliciting can occur. On the face of it, suggestions like the creation of declared precincts are utterly inappropriate as a solution to the supposed perils of soliciting, as I imagine we would simply see precincts encompass entire suburbs.

Looking at the New South Wales experience, the New South Wales Summary Offences Act provides that a person on a road shall not, near or within the view of a dwelling, school, church or hospital, solicit another person for the purpose of prostitution. This model covers both soliciting clients by prostitutes and soliciting prostitutes by clients. I consider that a model akin to this may be a worthy option to ensure broader community concerns are addressed and will be considering amendments to the same.

Finally, I turn to regulation and licensing. I do not believe that licensing structures have a place in any debate around the decriminalisation of sex work. This view is shared by current licensed jurisdictions like New Zealand, New South Wales and Queensland, which, I have been advised, are progressing towards full decriminalisation. South Australia has the opportunity to learn from the mistakes of other jurisdictions and progress with a fully decriminalised model, yet one which enshrines advertising restrictions, protections for vulnerable persons, exit assistance and police powers.

I am acutely aware that other models proposed by decriminalisation opponents are simply a mechanism to detract from true reform. Quite simply, sex workers oppose licensing models on the grounds that it compromises their safety for similar reasons to the existing laws and shows ignorance as to what the decriminalisation of sex work means.

The bill has been sent to the Law Society of South Australia for its comment and I look forward to sharing that response with this place and working with the society on any amendments that would add to the decriminalisation of sex work in South Australia. On that note, I encourage all members on both sides of politics to take an opportunity to meet with the Sex Industry Network and other advocates to learn about what decriminalisation truly means to someone on the front line.

I urge members to hear about the way sex workers interact with members of our disabled community who might not otherwise have opportunities, hear about the stigma and derogatory behaviour that occurs on the streets and listen to the educated, bright and conscientious women leading this charge for reform. There have been significant miscommunications and mistruths about what this bill will and will not allow.

In the coming weeks, I will be holding a comprehensive briefing with my colleague the member for Reynell, which I hope all members will attend. This is not a political issue. This is a basic question of fundamental rights and the rights for all to feel safe in the workplace. We need an open dialogue on this reform and I welcome all opinion and comment from my colleagues in this place and stakeholders in the wider community, but we must remain respectful during debate and outside commentary.

I end with this: our parliament is left with two options. We either persevere with the status quo, effectively ignoring sex workers as the victims of crime and perpetuation of the stigma around this industry, or we progress with decriminalisation and see a stronger protection for workers and women. I implore all my colleagues on both sides of the house to consider this carefully and support the decriminalisation of sex work.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (10:54):** I rise to second and speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill. In doing so, I acknowledge the Attorney-General and thank her for her co-sponsorship of the bill and for her determination to work together to progress reform. I acknowledge the Hon. Tammy Franks and say thank you to her for bringing the bill to the other place and for her deep commitment to achieve decriminalisation.

I heartily thank my friend the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos for her wise contribution and unfailing support, support steeped in an understanding born from her lifetime of work to support and empower workers, of the deep link between decriminalisation and the positive health and wellbeing of sex workers. I also thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for her leadership in progressing this decriminalisation of sex work, and I thank the many colleagues here and in the other place and those

brave women who have prosecuted this argument before, Steph Key in particular, for their voice, for their tenacity and indeed for their endurance.

I thank the incredible advocates and women's organisations here with us today, advocates and organisations that make all of us in this place feel stronger in our voices and in our actions and feel supported, which is a very special thing. To the YWCA, to the Working Women's Centre, Zonta, BPW, SHINE, Soroptimist International, the National Council of Women Australia, the South Australian Rainbow Advocacy Alliance, the women lawyers' group and the HSU, thank you for your deep conviction in advancing the interests of all women here in this state and beyond.

To SIN, thank you for being with us today and for your advocacy, advocacy that I hope more workers will feel even more confident to seek out and openly connect with following a successful passage of this bill. This bill being at this point is testament to your exemplary work. Most importantly, I acknowledge the workers who are here with us today, workers who have shown enduring leadership, courage and tireless, relentless advocacy for what they know is right.

I say to each of you that I know this fight has been a long one, filled with eternal hope and, to date, lined with disappointment as we have edged closer and closer towards decriminalisation. I say to you that I stand with you, I am here for you and, like all those I have just mentioned and members on both sides of this house, including the member for Bragg and the member for Cheltenham, who has been a strong advocate for change, I will keep fighting alongside you until this is won.

History tells us that change and progress always happen when people relentlessly raise their voices together for as long as it takes to achieve that progress. Just like Catherine Helen Spence and her remarkable cohort of activist women, whose work 125 years ago meant that women here in South Australia could finally vote, we will not stop. Friends, we will get there, and it is indeed high time that we do.

I had the opportunity to see some of the contributions in the upper house, to listen and to read the words of members. I was intrigued about the thread amongst those words about values, morality and what drives people to take a particular position. It was clear to me, as it so often is, that most people come to this place with a conviction born from experience, born from who and what has shaped them and born from their beliefs.

I am confident that most who have contributed to date did so because they felt strongly about what the right or moral thing to do was for their own conscience and also for the rights and wellbeing of those whom this legislation will affect. It is the case, however, that we can reach different conclusions about how this law will or will not impact those rights and those people's wellbeing.

I have talked with sex workers in this state for the past couple of decades, and I have heard them. I bring that deep listening to this place today, to this issue that we contemplate, and I also bring my own set of experiences that have shaped me, my own values, my own conscience and my moral compass. I put myself forward for election to this place because I passionately believe in fairness and equality, because I am driven to ensure that people are included and that they are able to live their lives with dignity and respect, free from stigma. I put myself forward because I care about every member of our local and broader community and believe that above all else they should be enabled to access their human rights, those core rights that mean they are treated with humanity.

To me, that humane treatment of people, that equality of access to fundamental human rights, is all about morality. It is from my own early experiences, that I developed my burning and relentless passion for fairness. It is from those experiences, and with the guidance of my very strong and often very loud mum, that I learned to speak up for myself when things were not fair and then to speak up for others. But it is through organising workers and other community members to have a strong voice on the issues that they care about, that drive them and that impact their lives that I learnt that the most important thing we do as leaders is not just to find our own voice on our own rights but always, always to empower the voice of others on their rights.

I am driven to do this with and for all, and for a range of reasons I have particularly worked with women to engender their leadership, their voice, their power, because women are still not equal in terms of how they are empowered to participate in community life, in work, in politics or in our economy. It remains that women are more likely to experience violence in their lifetime, and this

issue we contemplate today is absolutely about power. It is about empowering women and other people, of course, to advance their rights, to ensure they can access protection, support, advocacy and health services.

I know there has been much dialogue about how we empower women when we are talking about them engaging in transactions to provide sexual services. What we do know is that all people who are engaged in sex work in a criminalised environment are marginalised, deal with stigma and experience discrimination. This is so because of the fact that they do their work in a criminalised environment, and the manifestation of that discrimination is an inability to access workplace protections, outreach support, advocacy and health services, and it also has an impact on how they are able to negotiate with and report to police.

What has also shaped me from an early age is my faith. It continues to do so. My Christian Catholic faith is fundamentally entwined with my unshakeable and deeply held belief that it is incumbent on each of us to love people, to offer kindness to people, to include, to accept people and to do what we can to ensure their place in our community and to ensure that their voice is heard. It is not my place, nor the place of anyone else here, to carve roles for ourselves as judges and, by virtue of that tenet, as saviours, but it is absolutely our place to make sure that with love, kindness and determination we do what we can to ensure that all people have access to their fundamental human rights. That is the right and moral thing to do.

It is that desire to include people to make sure that their voice is empowered to access their rights, the dignity and the respect they need, that has meant that I have supported this decriminalisation cause for more than two decades. It is also, of course, my conversations with sex workers over those many years about what work is like without basic industrial rights, without access to health and safety protections, to safe reporting mechanisms, to safe access to advocacy groups and to health care without stigma that bring me to my very firm view that I share today—that every worker, every person, should be able to access the rights that we have created, the rights enshrined in laws that we progress over time as our community demands.

We as leaders must be here for all South Australians, and from those conversations, from everything that I have read and that I have heard criminalising this work through our existing law and making many workers—the majority of whom are women—unable to access the rights in other legislation that the majority of our community do access, mean that we are not here for these workers. In fact, through this parliament's multiple failures to pass this legislation, we have failed them and we have failed our community.

We know that our current law lets people down; we need to change it. Should we decriminalise sex work, workers will have the opportunity to access the rights and protections that are afforded through work health and safety legislation, through the Fair Work Act and potentially through other industrial instruments—basic safety nets that all workers should have the right to access. I know that some questions have been raised in the other place by the Hon. Rob Lucas about how this will work, and I answer some of those now.

Like other workers, to access, for instance, the provisions of the Return to Work Act, a worker will need to show that they are indeed a worker as opposed to an independent contractor, and they will need to demonstrate that their particular work injury has arisen as a consequence of employment. That is clearly stipulated in section 7 of the act, which sets out that compensability for a work injury requires a connection with employment and that the injury arose as a consequence of that employment. Section 9 identifies the evidentiary provisions required to establish compensability. There is, of course, longstanding case law on this issue.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Mr Speaker, can I suggest that you allow the member some additional time to finish her speech.

**The SPEAKER:** Is the member nearly done?

**Ms HILDYARD:** Just about three minutes, I think.

Leave granted.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Reynell, three minutes.

**Ms HILDYARD:** Additionally, the act in section 4 sets out what constitutes a contract of service. It can include a verbal or written contract, an award or understanding. In relation to any claim for compensation, evidence is required to establish the employment relationship. Again, there is much case law in relation to how that employment relationship is established. In terms of the Hon. Rob Lucas's questions about establishing average weekly earnings in relation to a claim, sections 5 and 9 of the regulations and section 5 of the act identify the key principles and concepts that must be considered in establishing the worker's average weekly earnings.

Having for many years represented workers on issues around independent contracting versus employment, I could not say that the system is perfect nor that it provides the best possible outcomes every single time. That is not a reason to exclude one particular group of workers from accessing rights enshrined in legislation that all other workers are afforded. It is also an issue that we can assess post the passing of this bill. Wherever there are industries where there is a prevalence of workers being inappropriately deemed as independent contractors, resulting in a lack of access to industrial rights, it is important that we look at the industry to see how we can address that particular situation, how we can ensure the right environment is in place for them as workers.

The bill, as the Attorney-General has pointed out, does rightly provide protection through the Equal Opportunity Act, protection that means workers will have an avenue for redress should they experience discrimination as a result of being or having been a sex worker. It also deals with the spent conviction issues. There are many other issues which we can of course also assess and for which I know there is a commitment to exploring the best possible outcomes. I can indicate to this house that following the introduction today we will be conducting a comprehensive briefing for all members. There is a commitment from both the Attorney and myself to working through the issues and questions that people rightly have, to providing facts, to dispelling myths and to making sure you have access to the people you want to talk with as you contemplate your position.

In closing, I deeply believe it is time for us to move forward. It is no longer okay for a group of South Australian workers to be stigmatised, to be marginalised through fundamental unequal access to rights and protections. It is time for sex workers to be safely heard, to safely access health care, to seek out advocates and to report incidents without fear. It is time for sex workers to have avenues to safely pursue those who exploit them or perpetrate violence against them. It is time for us as a parliament to be honest about the fact that sex work is work and, just as we would in relation to any other job, it is time for us to provide access to the protections, the rights, the dignity and the respect that workers in the industry deserve.

When this industry is decriminalised, we will better understand it. We will be able to work with sex workers to make sure that any limitations in rights and protections are addressed, to make sure that their voices are heard. Is that not one of the reasons we are here: to ensure people's voices are heard, to represent, to speak up for, and to progress rights for those most marginalised? I commend this bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (VOLUNTEER CHARTERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 June 2019.)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (11:08):** I rise to speak on the Fire and Emergency Services (Volunteer Charters) Amendment Bill, which has come to this place from the other place. It is a bill to amend the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. I am proud to rise to confirm that the government will be supporting this bill today. Put simply, the bill provides legislative recognition of the South Australian Country Fire Service and State Emergency Service volunteer charters.

The provisions within the bill before us today are identical to those which were introduced in this place by me on 28 November 2018 in the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. This bill is not a new matter for this place and it has been long foreshadowed. The



smooth passage of enshrining the volunteer charters into legislation is just part of the Marshall government delivering for volunteers.

We have delivered \$5 million to the CFS through Project Renew to improve facilities and assist volunteers in carrying out the functions of their work. We have increased the aerial firefighting fleet from 17 to 26 by injecting a whopping \$9.2 million into that program. We are ensuring that our CFS trucks are compliant with national standards, with a \$5.5 million investment. We have also unlocked \$2.74 million through the Natural Disaster Resilience Program to improve disaster preparedness and keep South Australians safe. We have also injected an additional \$1 million into the State Emergency Services to revitalise South Australia's SES facilities and upgrade vital equipment.

These funding boosts are illustrative of the Marshall Liberal government's ongoing support of the state's emergency service volunteers. The tireless work and countless hours donated by South Australia's emergency service volunteers can never be underestimated or undervalued. Day or night, rain or shine, our first responders are prepared to swiftly respond to emergencies right across the state.

Since coming into government, the CFS and SES volunteer associations have also been instrumental in selecting the new leadership of our emergency services, with their unanimous support and recommendation to me of Don Lane as the Chief Executive of the South Australian Fire and Emergency Services Commission. I highly value the opportunity to meet and consult with members of the SES and CFS volunteer associations and executive, and all volunteers right across the state. I know it is difficult for them because they are spread far and wide across South Australia, but we work hard to ensure that we meet regularly and discuss any issues in their area. I very much appreciate going out into the field and listening, as I have done on so many occasions.

The move to enshrine the volunteer charters in legislation can be traced as far back as the 2013 Holloway review, a review on which the former government failed to act. The recommendations stemmed from a concern of some volunteers at the time, some years ago now, that the existing agreements on consultation processes and consideration of the views of volunteers were not being treated seriously enough under the reforms proposed by Labor's then minister for emergency services, the member for Light.

When the member for Light was asked by the former member for Morphett on 18 November 2015 when he was going to put the SES and CFS volunteer charters into legislation and not just regulation, the member for Light answered, 'First of all, regulation is legislation.' The record shows that that remark was responded to at the time by the member for Bragg with one simple word: wrong. Unfortunately for our tireless, hardworking volunteers, those opposite for 16 years just simply did not get it. Sadly, when it comes to this important issue of enshrining CFS and SES volunteer charters in legislation, a review of *Hansard* from previous parliaments paints a very bleak picture for those opposite.

Numerous contributions from members now on this side of the house are forever etched in the history books. Contributions from the member for Waite, the member for Flinders and the members for Hartley, Hammond, Chaffey, Schubert and Stuart are consistent in one theme, and that is that on this side of the house we support our volunteers. We stand by them, we stand with them and we back them. In contrast, all we see in the record books from those opposite are votes to adjourn, adjourn and adjourn. Shamefully, debate was even adjourned on 24 September 2015 by the current member for Elizabeth, the now purported shadow minister for emergency services. The current member for Taylor is also listed as voting to delay the bill—

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Point of order, sir.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —during the previous parliament on the same day.

**The CHAIR:** Could the minister please resume his seat for one moment.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I am not in fact the purported shadow minister for emergency services; I am the actual shadow minister for emergency services. I ask the minister to clarify.

**The SPEAKER:** Could the minister please be cautious in addressing other members. I will listen carefully. Thank you, member for Elizabeth.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. Just to be clear then, it was the current shadow minister for emergency services who voted against this on that date, 24 September 2015. The current member for Taylor is also listed as voting to delay the bill during the previous parliament on the same date. We can only assume that he was alert to what was happening at the time, although we have seen recently what he likes to spend his time doing in parliament when it comes to discussing matters relating to our emergency services. Time after time during the previous parliament those opposite delayed and adjourned the passage of the bill. They took our volunteers for granted. On this side of the house we do not. We have delivered for volunteers.

Today marks 501 days since the 2018 state election. In that time I have been fortunate enough to travel to every corner of our state, including 52 CFS visits and 21 SES visits as well as a number of other events, to celebrate our CFS and SES volunteers. The highlight of all those visits has always been the volunteers themselves. Whilst in this place you may sit in a lot of meetings and meet a lot of executives—some of whom themselves volunteer, many of whom do not—but it is the opportunity to get out and say thank you to the men and women on the ground that is the most rewarding part of the job.

As all members of this place know, we pride ourselves on being a cooperative government. I commend the Hon. Ms Tammy Franks in the other place and the member for Mount Gambier for their work, assistance and support in bringing this important legislation through both houses of parliament and finally into legislation.

I have said it before and I will say it again: the state's volunteers are the backbone of our emergency sector. They provide valuable insight into how the emergency services sector should operate, and the Marshall Liberal government is proud to ensure their knowledge and feedback will continue to help build a safer South Australia for everyone. Again, to all our volunteers out there I say thank you.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:16):** I also rise to support the Fire and Emergency Services (Volunteer Charters) Amendment Bill 2018, and I want to largely agree with what the minister has had to say. I, too, believe that volunteers are the backbone of our emergency services. The emergency services sector could not perform the amazing work it does perform throughout the summer months, and of course through the wetter months as well, without volunteers giving up their time. Often they are also paid MFS or police officers, those types of people, who are committed to public service and who give up their valuable time, their family time, in order to help us all. I thank you—and I understand there are some the gallery here today.

I was not intending to make any political points but, given the potted history of this measure brought to the house by the minister—

**An honourable member:** The 'purported' minister.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** —the 'purported' Minister for Emergency Services—I want to make just a couple of remarks about the passage of this particular bill. In doing so, I want to thank the Hon. Tammy Franks from the other place for being so persistent with this bill throughout the last 14 or 15 months, and I also want to thank the member for Mount Gambier for bringing an identical bill to this place.

I will not make a string of political points, like the minister, but I will say that since a bipartisan position was reached in the last parliament, although it did not quite make it through all the stages of the passage of the bill, we did emerge into this parliament with a bipartisan, multipartisan position on this, and that is reflected in this bill that the Hon. Tammy Franks and the member for Mount Gambier have brought. It begs the question why it took so long for the government since the election, given that it was a multipartisan commitment to emerge from the election, including the government and the opposition.

From talking to the volunteers' associations and to volunteers themselves, it was very clear to me from the outset, when I came into this role, that it was important for them, in recognition of the work they do and the contribution they make, for this to be a standalone measure, for this to stand

alone in the statute book as a charter that protects their rights in terms of their relationship with the government.

This government, this minister, instead chose to bring in a bill with this measure at the front and then a whole lot of things tacked onto the end, including one measure that was so ill thought-out that it has now been dropped entirely and was the subject of a select committee brought on by a member of his own government. This held back the measure for—let's be generous—six months, given that the government did, in fact, introduce it as a package.

I am glad that the government has seen fit to support this as a separate measure, to support the measure brought in by the Hon. Tammy Franks and by the member for Mount Gambier. I am happy to support it, and I am happy the government has finally supported it. I look forward to seeing what emerges from the ashes of the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill later this year. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:19):** I would like to thank all members for their contribution to the bill. I think it is also important to recognise the genesis of this. People have talked about time and, without getting into it, it is good that these things finally do pass in a legislative way. Recognition needs to be given to previous members, including the previous member for Morphett, Duncan McFetridge, as well as former MLC the Hon. Robert Brokenshire, who unsuccessfully tried to have this bill passed in a previous parliament.

Of course, moving forward to today, the Hon. Tammy Franks, who is here with us today, really does need to be commended for keeping this issue alive and finally getting it to a point where, hopefully after this, we will pass the amendment bill. It is also important to realise the intent of the charter, and I will read a little bit from it as my closing contribution on this. When you look at it, you might scratch your head and wonder why it has taken so long. The intent of the charter is to ensure:

- consultation occurs with Volunteers about all matters that might reasonably be expected to affect them
- consideration of their views when approving or adopting new practices or policies
- consideration of their views when reviewing current practices or policies
- recognition that there is a mutual obligation and practical partnership based on respect between the parties
- that a fair, reasonable and non discriminatory approach is taken by all, and
- the safety of the South Australian community [is paramount].

With that, I would like to commend the bill to the house as well as thank our local SES and CFS volunteers. Over the past six or seven years, I have either been campaigning or involved in politics. Simon, in Mount Gambier, who is our SES coordinator, and Bob, who is my go-to in the CFS—I do not profess to have their correct titles in front of me, so I will not mention them because they do get quite particular about it—do a marvellous job. Looking at the complex down in Mount Gambier, on Jubilee Highway, and talking about the number of call-outs and how their family and their work pretty much gets put on hold whenever there is an emergency, I think it is a true credit to all our volunteers.

Of course, when you take on a coordinator or leadership role, that work is amplified. I really want to thank Simon and Bob on behalf of my community for the work that they do. They really put themselves at the front line when, unfortunately, others are having perhaps the worst day of their life, whether that is because of a tree, an accident or something like that. Our volunteers go above and beyond. This is a small way of putting this charter into legislation, and I thank all the people who have made a contribution to this, in particular, the Hon. Tammy Franks.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:26):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ASSAULTS ON EMERGENCY WORKERS) AMENDMENT  
BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June 2019.)

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:26):** I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

*Motions*

**HOMELESSNESS WEEK**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:30):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the importance of Homelessness Week;
- (b) acknowledges the important role that Ruby's house plays in reunifying young homeless people with their families; and
- (c) calls on the state government to provide funding for more supported accommodation options for young people aged between 15 and 18 who cannot be reunified with their families.

Next week is Homelessness Week, an important time to highlight this issue and this year's theme, 'Housing ends homelessness'. Around Australia right now more than 116,000 people are homeless; that is one in 200 people on any given night. Two in five of these are under the age of 25. Any way you look at it, those are incredibly sad statistics.

There can be many reasons for homelessness, including long-term unemployment, mental or chronic illness, disability and discrimination, but the main causes are poverty, family violence and being simply unable to afford rent. There is no simple definition of 'homeless'. Although we tend to assume being homeless means sleeping rough out in the elements, it is a far more hidden problem than that. The 2016 census shows only 7 per cent of those classified as homeless were sleeping rough. The majority are in crisis or transitional accommodation, rooming houses, caravan parks or just sleeping on a friend's couch. Having a home, a stable environment to come home to every night, is something many of us take for granted.

Homelessness can affect every demographic, but those who experience it at a young age are particularly vulnerable. Young people are at particular risk if this cycle begins early in life. In those teenage years, there are already so many pressures—education, family, social relationships, future work—and not having anywhere to live is a major burden.

There are two agencies providing homelessness services for young people in the Limestone Coast—AC Care and Ruby's. It is important to mention that there are no homeless shelters in the Limestone Coast as there are in capital cities, so if you are a young person who suddenly finds themselves without a bed for the night, it is very difficult to know where to turn. By speaking to local agencies, I can see there is a distinct gap for young people who cannot or should not be reunified with their families and cannot afford to go out on their own.

Trish Spark is the manager of homelessness and community services for AC Care in Mount Gambier. I asked her to tell me a story to demonstrate this gap in services and she told me about Jenny. Jenny, whose name has been changed to protect her identity, is a 17 year old studying year 12 and working part-time in a supermarket. She is from a blended family and her relationship with her stepfather has broken down to the point where she can no longer live at home. She is couch surfing out of town in what Trish knows to be an unsafe environment.

Jenny is trying to access Centrelink payments but is struggling to gain approval for the allowance and does not earn enough to pay rent. There are no vacancies in AC Care's transitional

properties right now, so the only emergency accommodation available is a motel or caravan park, but neither will accommodate people under the age of 18. Even if AC Care could find accommodation for Jenny, she does not fit the South Australian Housing Authority criteria, which state she must have a long-term outcome post-crisis and be able to self-fund from her next payday.

All Trish can do at the moment is continue to keep an eye on Jenny, give her vouchers and wait for a place in one of her traditional properties to open up, which relies on someone else in need leaving. As Trish says:

Early intervention is required so Jenny can remain engaged in both study and work. If she is forced to disengage, her future prospects are dim.

Jenny is doing everything she can to take advantage of life's opportunities, but it is becoming harder by the day.

Jenny is the face of this gap between services. Because she cannot be reunified with her family, she is not deemed suitable for Ruby's. She does not fit into the criteria for AC Care's traditional housing and is unable to support herself. So what happens to Jenny now? She is living in an unsafe place and could be forced to stay there for months and, although services are aware of her, they cannot do much for her.

AC Care provides independent living arrangements in transitional properties, but it is often full and there are problems with having a vulnerable young person live with people who are much older than them. There are currently four people between 15 and 18 who fit the criteria and are on the waiting list for their transitional accommodation, including a young mother, and it may be many months before a place opens.

Trish told me that supported youth accommodation is desperately needed in the regions, even something as simple as a traditional house solely dedicated towards supporting young people until other options become available. During the last financial year, there were 28 young people aged between 15 and 18 whom AC Care helped find some form of accommodation. I would also like to mention that AC Care's emergency accommodation unit in Mount Gambier has been funded by the local community, not the state government.

AC Care's biannual homelessness lunch, which was begun by the late Barry Maney OAM, has raised \$340,000 over the last eight years from generous local contributions. These funds have gone into tackling this issue locally, including financial counselling, tenancy education, employment programs and the emergency unit, so the Limestone Coast community are doing what they can to support local service agencies. There is also the Vulnerable Youth Framework in our region, with agencies such as headspace, Ruby's, AC Care, HYPVA and Housing SA meeting fortnightly to discuss who needs urgent accommodation and to help refer them onto more help and support.

In South Australia, we are very fortunate to have an excellent program with Ruby's, which has been running in Mount Gambier for eight years and in Adelaide for more than 25. Ruby's Reunification Program is an important early intervention program that aims to resolve conflict and improve relationships between young people and their parents or caregivers. When a family is struggling and might be on the verge of a breakdown or losing their home, or children may be in danger of being removed by the Department for Child Protection, Ruby's is there to provide supported accommodation for these children. It is a voluntary therapeutic youth service, but referrals come via other services, like CAMHS or headspace, or even the child's own parents who want a safe space for their child.

There is a house in Mount Gambier with five bedrooms available to people between the ages of 12 and 17 who may not be able to live at home full time. Sometimes a young person comes with nothing but the clothes on their back and Ruby's supplies them with personal items, clothes and even groceries. There is always a staff member at the house around the clock providing support and advice and continuing that all-important link to the family, so it is really a home away from home, a safe haven for children going through family issues.

Sharon Gray has been the coordinator at Ruby's in Mount Gambier for two years and has given me some insight into this issue. Sharon says that the hardest thing is knowing that there are beds free and that there are young people out there who need help and support but who are not

utilising the service, and that is probably because there is no possibility of reunification with the parents.

There are no locked doors at Ruby's; children are free to leave whenever they like. Instead of going to Ruby's, they are applying for unreasonable to live at home allowance from Centrelink. This allowance is being paid to kids as young as 15 who have no life skills, no concept of how to manage money or how to find a home. Not many people I know are going to rent to a 15 year old, so again that gap and the need for supported accommodation become more apparent. At any given time, Sharon says there might be anywhere from 20 to 30 young people in the Limestone Coast who fit into this category who are slipping between the gaps offered.

I am sure young people may think they can live on their own, but many do not have the ability or capacity to do this. Two stories in *The Advertiser* have concerned me during the last week; one revealed it is costing \$7.2 million a year for emergency accommodation for homeless people and many of these are women and children seeking refuge from family violence situations. The cost is one thing, but of more concern to me was that the number of people seeking emergency accommodation has sharply risen from 4,880 in 2017-18 to 6,573 in 2018-19.

The other article was about statistics that show more than 100 children are spending nights in emergency accommodation in the care of hired staff, and these numbers are not improving. For young people to grow up into happy, healthy, educated, functioning adults who contribute positively to our society, we need to give them the best start we can in life. If that support cannot be provided at home, and cannot be provided at a service, we need to look at other ways we can provide such support.

Of course, there is no easy fix for homelessness; it is an incredibly complex issue. We need a collaborative approach between agencies, all levels of government and the involvement of local communities. It is an issue that is different for each region and each region needs specific approaches. I decided to speak out about this when my electorate office was made aware that tents had been given to young people and families in need of emergency accommodation. This occurred because there was no emergency accommodation available. This was a real shock to me and I felt it my duty to highlight this issue.

Service agencies in our region are doing the best they can with the resources they have, often within strict criteria. I cannot imagine how tough it would be to tell a 15-year-old child in need that you cannot do anything for them. I ask the state government to provide funding for more supported accommodation and look at the conditions around some of the existing supported accommodation so that more young people can be accommodated in the Limestone Coast region.

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (11:42):** I stand to move that the motion be amended by deleting all words in paragraph (c) and inserting the following words in lieu thereof:

- (c) notes the development of a state housing and homelessness strategy which will guide sector reform, including youth supported accommodation and homelessness services, to ensure that all South Australians have access to appropriate and affordable housing and support.

The Marshall Liberal government is supportive of the important work undertaken by Homelessness Australia in coordinating national Homelessness Week, which is coming up very soon from 4 to 10 August. National Homelessness Week not only highlights an issue faced by some in our community but it is also an opportunity to recognise the work being done by some fantastic organisations and individuals to tackle homelessness, as well as highlight the work that still needs to be done. I commend the member for Mount Gambier's acknowledgement of the work of Ruby's houses and its incredible service in terms of delivering a unique, targeted, family reunification and conflict resolution program for young people and their parents or caregivers.

Ruby's houses are places where young people aged between 12 and 17 have a safe place to stay with 24-hour support and supervision while families receive counselling and assistance with a view to reunite, as outlined by the member for Mount Gambier. Uniting Communities delivers the therapeutic youth services, known as Ruby's houses, in Enfield, Thebarton, Edwardstown—which is near my electorate—and of course in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate.

In 2018-19, Uniting Communities received \$3.7 million in funding from the SA Housing Authority via the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement to deliver the Ruby's house service

in Mount Gambier and across the metropolitan sites in Adelaide. In the same year, Mount Gambier's Ruby's house outlet was able to support 34 young people, and the metropolitan houses supported a total of 201 young people.

Supporting young people and, in fact, people of all ages who face homelessness is absolutely important, making sure that it is about not just a house but also that wraparound support. After all, homelessness is not necessarily solved through just a house. Homelessness is often the result of many social, economic and health-related factors. In Australia, domestic violence is one of the leading causes of homelessness, so we must consider the causes of homelessness and work to address these root causes if we are truly committed to ending homelessness.

It is important, and I commend the SA Housing Authority for their work to fund specialist homelessness services to provide support for people of all ages who are experiencing or are at risk of homelessness and domestic and family violence. In 2018-19, 39 agencies were funded a total of \$67 million to provide 81 programs across 99 outlets in South Australia, including \$19.7 million for youth-specific services. The sector is funded through the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement, which commenced on 1 July 2018.

When national Homelessness Week begins next week, the theme will be 'Housing ends homelessness'. This is both fitting and somewhat ironic. We move the amendment to this motion because our government is responding to the needs of the housing and homelessness sector in a big way, developing a housing, homelessness and support strategy. Why? Because when we entered government last year, the housing and homelessness system, which we inherited from the Labor government at the time, was found to be broken, with housing stock severely neglected and depleted.

Under the previous government, thousands of properties were sold off to prop up their budget. I find this absolutely outrageous. A review of the South Australian Housing Trust last year by PricewaterhouseCoopers demonstrated that the remaining assets were left to run down. Labor left a maintenance backlog bill in the hundreds of millions of dollars. I have heard the member for King, who has been proactively working on behalf of her community to make sure people in Housing SA homes get maintenance, comment that they are really surprised by how quickly it is happening. Perhaps that is because we are absolutely committed to making sure that maintenance requests are not left unheard.

The need for reform was clear, so we responded. The Marshall Liberal government established the Housing and Homelessness Taskforce in November last year across the social, government and private sectors to lead this reform. The task force set straight to work developing a strategic intent to steer the development of the reform, and it was released on 1 July. For anybody who is interested, it can be viewed on the SA Housing Authority website. We are also undergoing consultation in regard to this matter.

We have a vision that all South Australians will have access to appropriate and affordable housing that contributes to social inclusion and economic participation. With the new housing and homelessness strategy, we are mapping out a 10-year plan to implement that vision. Using the strategic intent as a foundation, the SA Housing Authority is currently undertaking engagement and consultation with the sector, industry and the public to capture the voices of as many South Australians as possible to inform the new strategy. I encourage anybody out there in the community or in this place who wants to feed into this strategy to do so through the consultation opportunities currently available. We anticipate that the final strategy will be released by the end of 2019.

Our government is committed to improving outcomes across housing, from crisis homelessness services—including targeted youth services—to social housing, affordable housing and the general housing market. Targeting support for prevention and early intervention and facilitating housing pathways through the system will be part of the strategy to help address homelessness. We also recognise that strong partnerships across sectors in government are required to support a contemporary, multiprovider housing system. With our strategy, we look forward to building genuine alliances to deliver improved housing outcomes for all South Australians.

Members may be interested to hear more about this strategy at the Don Dunstan Foundation's 2019 Preventing Homelessness conference, which is being held next week at the

Convention Centre. The Minister for Human Services from the other place will be delivering the opening address for the conference. The South Australian Housing Authority will also be there, presenting on the development of the strategy. The conference will be attended by a number of representatives from incredible service providers as across the sector people work together to examine ways that those working in the public community and private sectors can collaborate together more effectively to prevent homelessness in South Australia.

I particularly want to take this opportunity to acknowledge all the service providers who are addressing and responding to homelessness. From those individuals working at the front line to the administrators and the managers of those service providers, I say a heartfelt thank you. Your work is complex, it is challenging, and it takes courage, care, commitment and compassion. I know that South Australia is a much better place because of the work of those individuals and those service providers as we work to end homelessness.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:51):** I rise to support the original motion as moved by the member for Mount Gambier:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the importance of Homelessness Week;
- (b) acknowledges the important role that Ruby's house plays in reunifying young homeless people with their families; and
- (c) calls on the state government to provide funding for more supported accommodation options for young people aged between 15 and 18 who cannot be reunified with their families—

which is a stark reality.

I will speak on behalf of the opposition in regard to this motion and say up-front that we will not be supporting the government's amendment. It is quite nonsensical to remove the regional member's call for funding, because he knows the reality—that there is not enough money in homelessness services. We all know that because there are young people who every night have no home to go to and no chance for reunification. There are no available beds, and young people, as an option, are being provided tents.

To refuse to acknowledge a regional member's call is pretty outrageous, but they then substitute it with some self-congratulations and backslapping around some strategy that they announced. Having all the answers before coming into government, they took six months to convene a round table to launch a consultation, only to do nothing but send out an email some seven or eight months later to again launch the consultation of the same strategy to a sector. I was swamped by people in the sector saying, 'What on earth are they doing relaunching some roundtable talkfest about housing and homelessness when they actually did that eight months ago?'

What we are seeing at the moment is a government that are trying to make people think that they are doing something different and innovative when in fact that is actually not happening. They stand here and congratulate themselves on some enormous housing strategy and stimulus package of \$104 million that contains the build of only some 90 homes.

In government, 1,000 homes were built across the 1,000 days. This project is just being completed now. They came into government with all the answers and then built 90 homes in 730 days—the calculation is quite obvious. They actually congratulate themselves on this, on a package of no new money. The money is actually being pulled out of the reserves from the Housing Authority. Once that money goes, it is gone. They try to stand on some moral high ground and have a crack at the Labor government and allege that it is the only government that sold off housing properties. The whole of government should actually do their research.

I pose this question: who, as Treasurer, has been solely responsible for the sale of the most housing properties from the public housing list? Do your homework. I ask members to research back to the late nineties, when the Treasurer, who is currently in the other place, was overseeing the sale of the said properties. Some of you should probably do that research before you make twits of yourselves by coming in here and alleging that the Labor government was responsible for this—it was Rob Lucas.



**Mr PEDERICK:** Point of order: it is unparliamentary to reflect on other members in this house.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey):** If it would assist the house, I ask that the member for Hurtle Vale please withdraw that reference to other members.

**Ms COOK:** I am sorry; I do not understand what I am reflecting on. I was pointing out a fact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey):** Order!

**Ms COOK:** What is the problem, sir?

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey):** You referred to members in this house with a particular term that members find offensive.

**Ms COOK:** That is the problem? Okay, I withdraw the word 'twit'.

**The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey):** Thank you, member for Hurtle Vale. You can continue.

**Ms COOK:** Thank you, I will continue. The Treasurer, during the late nineties, was responsible for the sale of thousands of public housing properties. Before members go throwing stones regarding any other people selling houses, I would suggest that any government now or any member of the government, if they want to be critical, should do some homework and ask the now Treasurer how many public housing properties are being sold to fund the Housing Authority.

The reality is that for the last six or so years we have also had a federal government that refuses to acknowledge that the current model of funding public housing is completely broken. It does not work, it is not sustainable and it will not bring housing to the front of mind or to the front of the funding cycle. It will not allow for the building, the construction, the maintenance, the support or the provision of adequate, affordable housing.

The cause of homelessness is a lack of housing. We have seen nothing happen from a federal point of view for the last six years. We need to work together, highlight the realities of this and talk about who we now have in public housing: a very vulnerable group of people who are unable to sustain themselves within the private rental market. They are in public housing, paying very low rents, and those rents do not help us to recoup enough money to maintain that public housing. I will save the rest of that for another time.

Needless to say, I do not support the withdrawal of the member for Mount Gambier's third part of the motion and I would support the member for Mount Gambier in seeking its reinstatement. Had the government come in here and negotiated a position where they wished to also talk about moving forward in a positive way around housing and not just some blatant backslapping load of nonsense, then perhaps we could have considered an amendment, but that is not on the table.

Homelessness Week itself is definitely an opportunity for us to focus on the nearly 6,000 South Australians who tonight will not sleep in a warm bed. These South Australians are either sleeping rough on the street or couch surfing in insecure housing. There are many other thousands who are in unstable, insecure rentals. Homelessness is something we must all tackle. We need to stop it from increasing.

We need to focus on long-term solutions. We need to stop focusing just on measures like the emergency housing and emergency support in extreme weather. We cannot take our eyes off the ball, either: housing is the solution. Around one in 10 Australian households across this country sit in the lowest income bracket. They are in the lowest 40 per cent of incomes. These households are also in terrible housing stress. They are paying more than 30 per cent of their income to put a roof over their heads. This is outrageous, and we need to address it. Affordable housing should be a basic human right. Households are facing severe and extremely unaffordable rents in all our cities and regional areas across Australia, with reforms in affordable housing needing to be addressed urgently in order to reduce that stress and prevent many people from becoming homeless.

Another clear issue is that our homelessness services are unable to keep up with the demand. In last week's estimates hearing we asked some questions. There has been a massive cost blowout in the provision of emergency accommodation, for example, night stays in hotels. These things are not budgeted for. They have not been budgeted for, and in order to fund that we are having to pull money from elsewhere. It is concerning, and there is a worry, moving forward, that if that continues to happen without the affordable housing situation being addressed costs will blowout continually and programs will be cut.

These people are housed through programs run by Hutt St. There is a great push through the Zero Project to ensure that there is more sustainable housing provided. These are women and children, families and young people who sometimes seek to remove themselves from the family home for various reasons and cannot return there. The government needs to listen to this, and we are happy to work with them in order to provide strategies and help support that. The Minister for Human Services in the other place is hearing our call, because we are making it regularly and loudly, and hearing the call from the homelessness sector.

We are faced with a piecemeal approach from the commonwealth government at the moment, and we must put pressure on them in order to resolve this. We do not need the strategy to keep being reannounced for consultation. We need to see that it is being pulled together, that commitments are being made and that funding is being provided. There are a lot of bad situations, but one that is not bad is the service being provided by organisations such as Ruby's and all the people who are involved in the Zero Project. We of course thank them for that. I support the member for Mount Gambier's original motion.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:02):** I also rise to support this motion as amended by the member for Elder. I thank the member for Mount Gambier for bringing to this place the opportunity to talk about homelessness. Across Australia, this is a very significant social problem that is particularly relevant to me, not only as the member for Adelaide but also as the Minister for Child Protection.

In South Australia, 60 per cent of those who are homeless are male, and 32 percent of all homeless people are aged between 25 and 44 years. It is estimated that 644 homeless people are in the Adelaide city council area right now, in the heart of my electorate. This includes those who are living in severely overcrowded conditions and those who are couch surfers. These are the biggest and fastest growing groups. The definition of 'homelessness' was expanded several years ago to include not only rough sleepers, whom most people identify as being homeless, but also those living in overcrowded conditions and couch surfing in temporary accommodation with friends or family.

In May this year, a recent survey of rough sleepers living in the inner city area discovered or identified that there were 226 people. These were registered by name, whereas in years before they were not ever recorded by name, as actual people, so that we could identify when they were helped and what help they were getting. I congratulate the Zero Project group on their wonderful work. They did their first complete study a year ago, in May 2018, with 200 volunteers.

That was the first record, by name, of people sleeping rough, so we could really see what difference was being made. While there are now 226 people sleeping rough in the inner city, I note that, since the identification last May, 180 people have actually been housed as part of the Zero Project. I congratulate them. They are doing such a great job and I wish them all the best for the future.

The Specialist Homelessness Services are funded by the South Australian Housing Authority to provide services to those experiencing or at risk of homelessness and domestic and family violence. In 2018-19, 39 providers received a total of \$67 million for funding of 81 programs across 99 locations. Sadly, of the 21,402 who accessed SA's Specialist Homelessness Services in 2017-18, 63 per cent were affected by domestic violence, drugs and alcohol, mental health or a combination of all those. These are also the three most common factors in why children are removed from their families and enter the child protection system.

Last year, in an effort to improve outcomes across the entire housing continuum, a new Housing and Homelessness Taskforce was established. The task force report, released earlier this month, called for reform of the housing and homelessness system in South Australia and is

anticipated to shape a new housing and homelessness strategy in South Australia, which will provide a 10-year plan and guide future funding for the sector.

Within my local community, I work to support various service providers who focus on supporting those vulnerable South Australians facing homelessness. Last year, I enjoyed attending the opening of the St Vincent de Paul Society exhibition, which was part of the SALA Festival. There was an exhibition by Andrew Slattery highlighting the diversity of people experiencing homelessness in South Australia, the fact that homelessness does not discriminate and the varying reasons that see people turning to shelters and crisis centres for assistance, while raising money for this important cause.

There are many amazing service providers in the city area. Soon after being first elected in 2010, I made it my business to find out what services were available in my electorate because that is predominantly where a lot of the services are provided. Since then, on multiple occasions I have met and worked with people doing wonderful work, such as Catherine House, the Hutt St Centre and The Big Issue, which is helping people to help themselves. Last Sunday, I attended The Big Lunch, which raised \$22,000 to support people to help themselves through working and selling *The Big Issue*. I note that EFTPOS is now accepted, if you are ever cashless and wish to buy *The Big Issue*; or you can do as I have done in my electorate office and become a subscriber. You can help people help themselves, which is a wonderful cause.

Next week, I will be joining the Hutt St team to Walk a Mile in My Boots to raise awareness and money for homelessness. I encourage anyone listening to register and join in such a great event, which is very popular. There will no doubt be hundreds of people out in the early morning, when it is freezing cold, to get a glimpse of what it is like to be homeless.

Prior to coming into government, I had read research that showed that 30 per cent of children leaving care were homeless within 12 months. To combat this, one of the policies that the Liberal Party took to the 2018 election was to extend foster and kinship carer payments to age 21. I am proud that this commitment was met within my first 100 days and has been fully budgeted and implemented since 1 January 2019.

Already, 17 young people have accessed the payment, four people yet to turn 18 have been referred to the program and more than 100 are set to become eligible over the next three years. With the growth of family-based care and the additional 50 registered primary carers we have recruited over the last financial year to 31 May 2019, I anticipate that more children in care will benefit from these arrangements in years to come.

The Department for Child Protection also works with the CREATE Foundation and Relationships Australia to support those transitioning from care to independent living and can direct care leavers to apply for the Transition to Independent Living Allowance paid through the commonwealth Department of Social Services.

The Transition to Adult Life Intensive Pilot Program delivers supports to young people aged 15 to 21 in Upper Spencer Gulf who are leaving care. This program involves intensive case management services, peer mentoring and assistance to access education and employment. During the school holidays I was fortunate enough to meet with some of the mentors and mentees and see the wonderful work that they are doing in Whyalla.

It is imperative that the young people in care who are transitioning to independent living have access to these services to support them on their path to adulthood, all key features to equip young people with the life skills necessary to reach their potential and prevent homelessness. I applaud the inroads made by my colleague minister Lensink from the other house in the area of homelessness and commend the amended motion to the house.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:10):** I thank the member for Mount Gambier for raising this important motion, and I thank the members for Elder and Adelaide for speaking on this topic today. As the member for Adelaide has said, I also applaud our minister in the other house for the work she is doing in this space to address homelessness.

The King community are a caring and compassionate community, and they have told me several times that they do care deeply about this topic, and they have contacted me whenever they

have seen people in need of housing in our community. In addition, in meetings I have attended with community service groups, such as the Tea Tree Gully VIEW Club and Soroptimists, members have raised their concerns about homelessness in our community, especially in relation to women.

Approximately 6,000 people are estimated to be homeless in South Australia. This includes people who are sleeping rough as well as people who may be staying with friends or family, couch surfing or sleeping in cars or in emergency accommodation. Sometimes there are people in our community who might be only one large electricity bill away from being homeless themselves.

This morning, on a cold winter morning, as I drove through the city I witnessed—and it hurt to see—people sleeping on the streets in North Adelaide, North Terrace and in Hindley Street. More and more I am seeing women on the streets in need. The reasons people experience homelessness vary, but it includes young people, too, leaving difficult family situations; women and children experiencing domestic and family violence; and people with mental health or drug or alcohol problems.

In my efforts to understand the current state of homelessness and services available I have found out that across South Australia there are currently 81 programs funded through 37 service providers. These programs are funded through the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement, which was approximately \$104.5 million in 2018-19. Services include crisis services, which operate 24 hours per day, and anyone can contact the Homelessness Gateway at any time on 1800 003 308.

The Street to Home Service engages with people who are sleeping rough in and around the CBD. Referrals can be made to Street to Home by members of the public through the Street Connect website at [www.streetconnect.sa.gov.au](http://www.streetconnect.sa.gov.au). The goal of all homelessness services should be to provide pathways out of homelessness, to assist people who are homeless to find stable accommodation, with supports if necessary, and to overcome the factors which have led to their unstable housing. We need this to deliver real, sustainable change.

There has been a lot of discussion in recent times about Code Blue. The reported increase in homelessness via AZP statistics has been linked to calls for the government to call a Code Blue, which is an elevated response for homelessness services during extreme weather events. A Code Blue activation, which is determined by the South Australian Housing Authority and the homelessness sector based on weather forecasts, extends some existing service to provide respite for rough sleepers.

Regardless of weather conditions, the Homelessness Gateway service is available 24/7 for people who are experiencing homelessness. The Street to Home Service in metro Adelaide also offers daily assistance to people sleeping rough. People sleeping rough are vulnerable regardless of weather conditions, so we always encourage people to connect with homelessness service providers. Good governments care for and support those who need help to get back on their feet and live their best life possible. Empathy and acceptance are key to helping people overcome hardship. Our government is committed to identifying opportunities to help vulnerable South Australians make positive changes in their life.

The Marshall Liberal government, in partnership with AZP, has prioritised the housing of rough sleepers on the By-Name List; and 161 people were housed through the By-Name List in the year between the 2018 and 2019 Connections Weeks, with an average monthly housing placement at the rate of 13. Housing stock is provided by the government and community housing providers, and private rental options are considered where possible. The government is committed to continuing this work with the Adelaide Zero Project.

In order to consider the current state and how we help improve the situation we have today for vulnerable South Australians, it is important to note what has been done in the past and what we have inherited as a new government. Let us reflect on Labor's record. The housing and homelessness system that the Marshall Liberal government inherited was broken and the housing stock severely neglected and depleted. At its peak, public housing through the South Australian Housing Trust had over 60,000 properties. Under the previous Labor government thousands of these properties were sold off.

What most South Australians do not know, and what I was shocked to learn, was that Labor systematically used up the assets of the South Australian Housing Trust to prop up its own budget, which enabled the previous government to splash money around on popular projects and activities. Over 15 years, Labor treasurers stripped out \$1.5 billion from the trust's assets through selling about 7,500 properties in the most lucrative locations.

I recently read the triennial review into the South Australian Housing Trust by PricewaterhouseCoopers, which was tabled in parliament on 4 July 2018 and which demonstrated that the remaining assets had been left to run down under Labor, leaving a maintenance backlog bill in the hundreds of millions of dollars. This makes sense to me now, because so many King SA Housing Trust tenants have come to my office for support and maintenance, and we have been working closely with SA Housing to achieve the desired outcomes of my constituents. Many of these King constituents have told me they have been waiting many years for help.

The triennial review into the South Australian Housing Trust stated that no condition asset report had been undertaken since 2003, which is now being corrected as inspectors examine each property individually. When Labor wanted to raid more cash to prop up pet projects in its latest budget, it would do at least one of the following: it would sell off public housing, it would raid the cash balance of the trust and/or slash the maintenance budget, delaying improved services for tenants.

In addition to issues with public housing stock, over the past 10 years housing stress has increased in South Australia from 22 per cent to 40 per cent of households. It is clear that South Australia faces now a range of complex housing challenges. We know that we cannot continue with business as usual when the current system has resulted in significant numbers of people still unable to access appropriate housing, public housing stock that is run down and unfit for purpose and people cycling in and out of homelessness.

The Marshall Liberal government has responded by establishing a housing and homelessness task force across the social, government and private sectors to lead reform. A report outlining the current state of the system and a strategic intent document defining our shared vision for housing in South Australia have been released. The task force, along with the sector, is calling for reform of the system, and now is the time to hit the reset button on a broken system. We are currently developing a new housing and homelessness strategy to map out a 10-year plan to implement our vision that all South Australians have access to appropriate and affordable housing that contributes to social inclusion and economic participation.

I will be promoting, in my King community, participation in this homelessness strategy. It is now available on the YourSAy website. There are a lot of ways to participate, so on my social media and through letters to people caring about housing I will be communicating how to become involved.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:20):** Here in parliament today I also take the opportunity to acknowledge that national Homelessness Week 2019 is being held from 4 to 10 August, with the theme 'Housing ends homelessness'. It is being coordinated by Homelessness Australia. Certainly, the Marshall Liberal government is supportive of the important work undertaken by Homelessness Australia in coordinating national Homelessness Week.

There are a number of key events being held in South Australia, including the Don Dunstan Foundation's 2019 Homelessness Conference and also the Hutt St Centre's Walk a Mile in My Boots fundraising events. The Don Dunstan Foundation's 2019 Homelessness Conference will be held on 7 August, with the theme Preventing Homelessness. It examines how the public and private sectors can collaborate with the community more effectively to prevent homelessness in South Australia.

The Hutt St Centre aims, with care and without judgement, to end homelessness for every person who walks through the doors. Each day, the Hutt St Centre helps hundreds of people who are experiencing homelessness and disadvantage to find shelter, food, care and support. Over 40,000 meals are served by the centre each year, which makes it one of the busiest eateries in the state. The centre itself provides essential services, including showers, toilets, laundry facilities, lockers, legal advice and financial counselling.

The Hutt St Centre's Walk a Mile in My Boots is a way for South Australians to show their support for people facing homelessness by joining other like-minded people to experience what it is

like on a cold winter's morning to walk just one mile. The walks will take place in McLaren Vale on Friday 2 August and then also in the Adelaide CBD, as the member for Adelaide noted, on Friday 9 August.

The important work of the Hutt St Centre is acknowledged by many in Morphett, including the students at St Mary's Memorial School in Glenelg. In term 1, I was invited along to the launch of their fundraising campaign by the year 6 students at St Mary's. Along with their teacher, Mr Mark Nelson, the students held a morning tea for parents at the school, with the school principal, Nat Izzo, and the Hutt St Centre's CEO, Ian Cox, attending.

The students had noticed that a number of their parents would walk into the school grounds with coffee in hand, so they set up a small business-inspired project to sell packs of coffee beans and also re-usable cups. At the time, the year 6 students entered a competition to come up with both a name for their enterprise and a logo. I can report that Toby came up with the name 'Green Beans' and that the logo is a small coffee tree with a trunk coming out of a split coffee bean.

On the morning, the students served all the parents who attended a barista-made coffee made from the coffee beans that they were to sell, and they also served that coffee in the Green Beans re-usable cups, complete with the logo branded on the cup; it was a white cup with a green lid. The students made sure that everyone who participated left with an order form to help raise funds. In fact, their fundraising efforts have been ongoing. Recently, the students also sold black-and-white iced doughnuts. These are the Dominican colours of the school and were part of their celebrations for the upcoming Saint Dominic's Day.

I can report that the initiative has been so successful that Mike from the Hutt St Centre visited the school just this month to receive some of the much-needed funds raised by these year 6s that will be put towards programs run by the Hutt St Centre. For example, \$350 can help provide meals for a day for up to 200 people experiencing homelessness. The students were able to ask Mike questions and got to find out that homelessness can happen to anyone, and the reasons are varied, ranging from mental health, relationship breakdowns to drug and alcohol dependency. I certainly commend the charitable work of all the year 6 students at St Mary's Memorial School. The school itself is on the same grounds as Our Lady of Victories Church, which also helps people by assisting them with food parcels.

In fact, all the churches in the local Glenelg area assist people experiencing homelessness: St Paul's Lutheran, St Andrew's by the Sea, the Uniting Church and St Peter's Anglican Church. The churches work alongside each other and meet together to try to share experiences and also data and information regarding homelessness in the area. They certainly try to maximise the efforts of their valuable volunteers and also their outreach programs. I have had the opportunity to attend some of these meetings, both in my former role as mayor of Holdfast Bay and now as the area's member of parliament.

I would like to touch on one of the valuable programs that is run in Morphett to assist those experiencing homelessness. It is called Mary's Kitchen. Glenelg will always be a popular spot amongst those who are without a bed for the night, as it is perceived as a safer place to be than particularly in the city itself. Mary's Kitchen operates in the St Andrew's by the Sea church hall each Tuesday night between 6 o'clock and 7.30pm. The soup kitchen is a Christian outreach program established in 2002 and named in memory of the late Mary McGrath, who was an integral part of the St Andrew's church community outreach program.

Mary's Kitchen has grown from a small core group to now providing food and support for between 30 and 50 people every Tuesday night. Patrons of Mary's Kitchen on Tuesday evenings will also find the Orange Sky Laundry van parked at the front of the church. That van began as a partnership with Mary's Kitchen back in 2016. It offers a mobile clothes washing service for the homeless. People can drop off their clothes and get free washing and drying facilities in the van. It takes only an hour or so, so they can have dinner and then return to have clean clothes from this service.

On the Tuesday before Easter this year I joined Lisa McGrath, who is the co-convener of Mary's Kitchen at St Andrew's by the Sea, and many volunteers from Mary's Kitchen, to serve soup and dinner to over 50 needy people. The volunteers are very caring. They took the time to chat to all

the people being served dinner and gave them a listening and supportive ear. The dinners themselves are prepared with great care and variety. On the night, there were two soups to choose from, tomato or pumpkin, and I can report that the pumpkin soup was certainly the most popular. Dinner was also a choice of chicken or beef patties, chops and sausages. At the end of the night, there was nothing left over, so the food was gratefully received.

I also saw the kitchen in action. When I was mayor of Holdfast Bay one of the grant programs which I was particularly proud of, and which the council supported, was an upgrade of this kitchen to help Mary's Kitchen. It allowed the cooking areas to be upgraded, with some larger fridges to be purchased to store the goods prior to cooking and also a commercial dishwasher which allowed for the dishes to be cleaned quickly after dinner each Tuesday.

Mary's Kitchen relies on the support of many people and it is generously supported by donations from the local Jetty Road traders, including Baker's Delight, Coles, Bendigo Bank and Caruso's Fresh Foods. Mary's Kitchen also has wonderful partnerships with the wider community, including, as I mentioned before, St Mary's Memorial School, the Rotary Club of Holdfast Bay, the Rotary Club of Glenelg and the Lions Club of Edwardstown. The people who receive these dinners from Mary's Kitchen, and similar services provided by other local churches, are immensely grateful, and I would like to take the time here to acknowledge this important work being provided by many volunteers in the local community, and supported by the local traders and service organisations.

One of those service organisations is the Rotary Club of Glenelg. Each year they hold a fundraiser called the Cold Plunge. They put money from that event to organisations to assist with homelessness, including Mary's Kitchen. Last year I was joined by my parliamentary colleague the member for Black, and also some of my federal colleagues, Nicolle Flint, the member for Boothby, and the Hon. Simon Birmingham, Senator for South Australia, to take part in the Cold Plunge.

Over previous years I think we were lulled into a sense of false security because while the water was cold the ocean itself was quite still. On the occasion last year, nothing could be further from the truth; we were faced with one of those winter storms that occasionally pop up in Glenelg where the waves were actually over head height and there was nowhere for people to hide. It was a bit like watching the *Titanic*: there was a lot of noise in the first minutes but by the time five minutes had elapsed there was not too much movement or noise.

I commend the Rotary Club for their fundraising efforts in supporting homelessness in Morphett.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:30):** I would like to speak briefly on this motion and also on the original motion and against the amendment. While I do not have any difficulty with government members moving an amendment to a motion that we put up, I do have difficulty in the way this motion is proposed to be amended because the part they are trying to delete is the critical part of the motion.

It is interesting how all the government speakers have tiptoed around this issue and have given a whole range of platitudes about how we deal with homelessness issues. If you talk to the service providers now, the key issue here is basically the need for an investment in housing not only in this state but nationally—if not internationally. We need a huge investment in housing as the major driver to resolve homelessness, not only from a social justice point of view or a humanitarian point of view but also from an economic point of view. The economic benefits of having a fairly strong build program in this nation would obviously help with the issues around skilling our nation, giving jobs to people in our nation, and also addressing this really key issue.

Some of the comments made by those opposite, whether they realise it or not, are quite inconsistent. They are saying that all these current housing service providers are doing a really great job—and I concur with that. There are a number of people in the emergency housing sector who work not only across the state but also in my own community, groups like UCare, Vinnies, Salt Care/Endeavour Care, and the Salvation Army. These are not-for-profit organisations that do really good work in supporting people who for whatever reason find themselves homeless and in need.

There are also a number of other service providers right across the state that do a wonderful service not only providing emergency care but also supporting people to get short-term housing and also, hopefully, long-term housing. I will not go into the reasons people become homeless, because

they are quite complex, but is interesting to note that at the national level our Liberal government seem to think—the way I interpret their policies—that if you work and pay taxes you are deserving of government support through tax cuts, etc., but if you do not work, if you are homeless, etc., you are actually not worthy of any expenditure.

They would rather cut tax for multinational companies and the wealthy than spend money on a national housing build program that would support people who are the most disadvantaged in our society. It is also very galling that we have a prime minister who professes to be a very strong Christian who is head of a government whose empathy towards disadvantaged people in our community is less than worthy.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Yes; I certainly do not share his view of what the Christian faith believes in. On the one hand we are told, in the words of the member opposite, that the system is broken and we need to reset the button, reset it all. If the system is broken and it needs to be reset, that is a reflection on those providers today who work very hard to support those people in the homelessness sector, people who provide emergency services. They are critical of the people who work very hard—a lot of them volunteers, a lot of them non-government organisations—and on the other hand they talk about how wonderful they are.

The reality is that we do not need platitudes and we do not need another report, a third report, or a committee to be set up. We know what the solution is to this matter, and the solution is that additional funding is required. That is what paragraph (c) of this motion talks about. So this state government's policy is actually shown by their seeking to cut out paragraph (c) from this motion.

This shows this government's lack of empathy for people who are actually homeless, because they could have amended this motion to include their bit as paragraph (d). They deliberately removed paragraph (c) because they do not believe it is worthy of a financial contribution, a financial commitment, to some poor people in our society who are actually homeless. That is the only way you can interpret their amendment.

They are not adding to the motion. They are deleting paragraph (c) and substituting their paragraph (c), which is just a platitude that talks about this fancy new thing they are looking at. They want to engage more, and they want people to have their say. Well, if you talk to people in the street, those who are homeless or the people who care for them, they can tell you what the problem is. They do not need a new fancy report, a new strategy. They can tell you how it can be resolved. So, for members opposite to labour on about what they are going to do in terms of a whole range of processes, etc., is really quite insulting to those people who are doing it tough today.

I will give you another example of this government's actual performance compared to what they talk about. The churches in my community have been working very hard for quite a time now to establish a service to help homeless people in our community, more correctly defined as people who are sleeping rough in our community. I have been working alongside them. It has taken five months to access a bureaucrat to talk to them about this program—five months. It is disgraceful that, when we put in a request, it took over three months to get a response to the original request, and it has then taken two months to see the right public servant to talk to about this program.

We have a group of churches that are prepared to work with the state and local governments to make a practical difference on the ground, and the response from this government has taken five months before we could actually talk to them. It is absolutely disgraceful. For those members opposite to say what they have said today is an insult to these people. It is an insult when their government behaves in this way.

In summary, we do not need this new paragraph (c), which has been moved by the government member. What we need is for the original paragraph (c) to remain. If they want to add their paragraph (c) as a new paragraph (d), that is fine. I do not have a problem with that; I would not object to that. However, removing paragraph (c) is insulting and it undermines people who are already disadvantaged, and it is a shame on them.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:37):** I want to thank all members who have made a contribution to this private member's motion by raising the importance not only of homelessness but



of a government, a community and a whole-of-society response to it. I also indicate that I do not accept the removal of paragraph (c) and its replacement with an alternative paragraph (c). I ask members to reflect, perhaps even on their own speeches, on the fact that what they were talking about actually talks to paragraph (c) as originally moved.

Beyond that, without playing political games, the reason why paragraph (c) is in the motion—and I do not want this to be lost—is that there is a distinct gap in the system for 15 to 18 year olds. By removing all of paragraph (c), it removes the emphasis that I want to place on 15 to 18 year olds, which suggests that the government has not actually thought about this properly.

I am not going to try to use this as a political wedge; I will leave that for others to do, but I am genuine in moving this motion. People know how hard it is to get a notice of motion before parliament because we only have a limited time. Had the government come to me and said, 'Listen, we have a problem with paragraph (c). We have a Treasurer, as you know, who does not like the word "funding" put into private members' motions,' or anything like that, I would have changed paragraph (c). I would have removed the word 'funding' and replaced it with 'options'. It would have read:

- (c) calls on the state government to provide options for more supported accommodation for young people aged between 15 and 18 who cannot be reunified with their families.

If you listened to my speech, the point I was trying to make was that we have Ruby's in the Limestone Coast. They have full-time staff there who can take young people in accommodation, but they cannot take 15 to 18 year olds if there is no hope of reunification with their parents or step-parents. So we have a facility but, because of bureaucratic constraints, we are not able to actually provide a service. We have 15 to 18 year olds in the Limestone Coast unable to access that service and they have to sleep rough, couch surf or be in vulnerable places.

I really want to home people in on that. Sometimes people come in here and just dismiss parts of a motion for political reasons. This was not put in there to have a dig at the government: it was put in there for the genuine reason that we have a real issue with the current set-up. I would have changed the word 'funding' to 'options' had I actually been consulted.

This has been on the *Notice Paper* since the start of this year. For people to then come in one minute beforehand and say, with no consultation and no negotiation, 'We are just going to dismiss whatever you want and the point you are trying to make and put in our own,' is really pretty insulting but also naive as to how we can use private members' motions to actually improve and put a spotlight on some of these very serious issues.

Having 15 to 18 year olds unable to go to a place that is set up with supervisors and sometimes has spare capacity because of a bureaucratic ruling, in my opinion is ridiculous. That is the point I was trying to make. By removing paragraph (c) we are removing the spotlight I am putting on that. I understand how this place works—people will be bound to follow what has been said beforehand—but next time, perhaps, in a joint party room when these things are just being thrown out willy-nilly, and they are not trying to be used as a political wedge, people might think about what this actually means. With that, I commend the original motion to the house.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes ..... 22  
 Noes ..... 20  
 Majority ..... 2

AYES

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

## AYES

Wingard, C.L.

## NOES

Bell, T.S. (teller)  
Boyer, B.I.  
Cook, N.F.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Michaels, A.  
Piccolo, A.  
Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brown, M.E.  
Gee, J.P.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Wortley, D.

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

## PAIRS

Cowdrey, M.J.  
Brock, G.G.

Bedford, F.E.

Speirs, D.J.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

**WORLD WAR II ANNIVERSARY**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:49):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) notes that 1 September is regarded as marking the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the commencement of the hostilities that became known as the Second World War;
- (b) laments the devastation wrought across the world and, in particular, the extraordinary loss of human life numbering in the tens of millions;
- (c) pays tribute to all those who served our country throughout the course of the war; and
- (d) expresses our sincere commitment to honouring those who paid the ultimate price, remembering their sacrifice and ensuring that the lessons we have learnt are passed on to future generations.

1 September 2019 marks the 80<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the beginning of World War II. Although not directly threatened by the European conflict at the outset, Australia sent a volunteer army, the 2<sup>nd</sup> Australian Imperial Force (AIF), to support Great Britain, which had declared war on Germany after the German invasion of Poland. Almost a million Australians, both men and women, served in the war. They fought in campaigns against Germany and Italy in Europe, the Mediterranean and North Africa, as well as Japan, South-East Asia and other parts of the Pacific.

The Australian mainland came under attack for the first time on 19 February 1942, with Japanese aircraft bombing Darwin and other towns in north-west Australia. Japanese midget submarines also attempted to attack vessels in Sydney Harbour in late May and early February 1942. During the Second World War, 39,000 Australians gave their lives and more than 30,000 Australian servicemen were taken prisoner. Two-thirds of those taken prisoner were captured by the Japanese during their advance through South-East Asia in the first weeks of 1942. While those who had become prisoners of the Germans had a strong chance of returning home, 36 per cent of prisoners of the Japanese died in captivity.

Nurses had gone overseas with the AIF in 1940; however, during the early years of the war women were generally unable to make a contribution in any official capacity. Labour shortages forced the government to allow women to take a more active role in the labour force, and in February 1941 the RAAF received cabinet approval to establish the Women's Auxiliary Australian Air Force. At the same time, the Navy also began to employ female telegraphists, a breakthrough that eventually led to the establishment of the Women's Royal Australian Naval Service.

The Australian Women's Army Service was established in October 1941 with the aim of releasing men from certain military duties in base units in Australia for assignment with fighting units overseas. Outside the armed services, the Women's Land Army was established to encourage women to work in rural industries. Other women in urban areas took up employment in industries such as munitions production.

After six terrible years, on 7 May 1945 the German high command authorised the signing of an unconditional surrender on all fronts—the war in Europe was over. After 4½ years of war in the Pacific, on 14 August 1945 Japan accepted the allied demand for unconditional surrender. For Australia and Australians, it meant that the Second World War was finally over. The world war had directly involved more than 100 million people from more than 30 countries. It was the deadliest conflict in world history, with—who would really know—estimates of between 70 million and 85 million fatalities.

The Second World War also had major effects on agriculture in South Australia. Those left behind were urged to increase production to feed both themselves and the troops. There were shortages of artificial fertilisers, shipping was disrupted, loading machinery and storage bins were out of use, chemicals were in short supply and, most significantly, there were labour shortages. It would be some time before the full effect of the war was felt by the average person on the land, but ultimately all were impacted by the war effort.

Around the nation, war memorials that had sprung up following World War I were either replicated or added to following World War II, and the soldiers who had served from each tiny community were commemorated for all time. I would also like to recognise the efforts of those involved with establishing the Virtual War Memorial. It is an outstanding commemorative collection purpose-built to honour the personal experiences of those who served. It continues to grow as people contribute more information from their own family histories. The Virtual War Memorial is acknowledged for its integrity and relevance and provides a worthy home for records and personal experiences for all involved, their families and communities.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:55):** I rise to support this motion and congratulate the mover on moving the motion, but I also congratulate the mover on his very eloquent speech in support of his motion. Both the tone and what he said are worthy of our support in this chamber, but he was also respectful in the way he honoured those people who served in that war. This motion has a number of parts to it, and I will not repeat anything the mover has already said because I think he has covered that field very well. My speech could be considered to incorporate all that he has said, but I would like to make the additional following comments.

Paragraph (b) of the motion is worthy of further discussion, where it talks about 'lamenting the devastation wrought across the world in particular the extraordinary loss of human life numbering in the tens of millions'. It is not only the human lives lost, which was a huge loss and a huge tragedy in itself, but also the tragedy of the lives of those people who did return to this country wounded not only physically but mentally and the generations who went on to suffer because of that war. Members of their family and future generations suffered because of their suffering as well. Even today, we have people who were affected by that war, as people who had served returned damaged in some way by that experience.

Paragraph (c) 'pays tribute to all those who served our country throughout the course of the war' and made the ultimate sacrifice. The other part of the motion that really caught my eye was that we need to ensure 'that the lessons we have learnt are passed onto future generations'. I would like to say I am convinced that we have. I would like to stand up today and say, 'Yes, we have learnt from the Second World War.' Well, we have not. If we have, it must be very recent because I do not think we have learnt.

After World War II, there were subsequent wars in which we have fought. One has to ask how necessary our involvement in those wars was. Have we learnt the cost of war, not only in human life at the time but also for those nations and future generations? Have we understood the cost in an ongoing way to those people involved? We were involved in the Korean War, the Vietnam War, the Afghanistan War, the Iraq War, other gulf wars, etc., so those wars that were supposed to end all wars have not quite done that.

I think today we owe it to those people who gave their lives and we owe it to those people who suffered through that war, and their families, to make sure that we do not just run into another war willy-nilly or quickly jump onto another bandwagon to fight a new war because it probably will not be us who will be fighting; it will be other people and they will pay the price. As a nation, we need to make sure, before we sign up to the next war, that we are looking after our interests and also the interests of the world because, irrespective of where people die, they die and they hurt. I would also like to very much question the efficacy of war and whether we are using peaceful and diplomatic ways to resolve conflict, or whether we are still going to war both feet first trying to show how strong we are.

In my concluding comments in support of this motion, which I think is worthy of our support, it is worth again reminding ourselves of the great tragedy that war is, and the great tragedy that comes from those wars, and to make sure that we learn those lessons from the past and that we do not jump into another war unless it is absolutely necessary for our own safety and wellbeing. We should not try to find excuses to go into another war like, unfortunately, Tony Blair did in England, and perhaps our own leaders have in the past, because our future generations deserve better and those who gave their lives deserve better from us.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Ellis.

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

#### *Petitions*

### **TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale):** Presented a petition signed by 297 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reverse its decision to discontinue the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme from 31 December 2019 and to continue the scheme indefinitely akin to other Australian jurisdictions or engage with the disability sector in helping to create a new scheme enabling South Australians the transport freedom and flexibility they deserve.

### **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.

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ABORTION LAW REFORM) BILL**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth):** Presented a petition signed by 54 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action and oppose the Statutes Amendment (Abortion Law Reform) Bill 2018 and ask members to vote against the bill.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Return to Work Corporation of South Australia—Charter

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

Electoral Commission of South Australia—2018 South Australian State Election Statistics report by the

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Land Acquisition—General

Victims of Crime—Statutory Compensation—General

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today the Hon. Dean Brown, former premier. Welcome to parliament, sir.

*Parliamentary Representation***CONGRATULATORY REMARKS**

**The SPEAKER:** I wish to inform the house that Fletcher John Cowdrey was born on 26 July, weighing 6.6 pounds and measuring 47 centimetres. Mum and baby are doing well, as well as the father.

*Parliamentary Committees***ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:04):** I bring up the fourth report of the committee, entitled 'An inquiry into South Australian investment attraction policies'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:04):** I bring up the 23<sup>rd</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time***LIBERAL PARTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier assure the house that no current member of his government, government staff or MP is the alleged assailant of Ms Chelsey Potter?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05):** I have no reason to believe that that would be the case.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leader of the Opposition.

**LIBERAL PARTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier assure the house that the alleged assailant of Ms Chelsey Potter has never been in the employment of the South Australian Liberal Party opposition or the South Australian Liberal government?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:05):** Can I give this assurance to the house—that in the event that anyone in the workplaces of our offices is in any way assaulted or has misconduct appropriated towards them, they will have the support of myself and this government to ensure that, firstly, they have all of the redress of support of the available facilities to them and that, secondly, if appropriate, they be assisted to refer the matter to the police and/or an appropriate authority, such as the Equal Opportunity Commission.

I make this commitment to the parliament—that in any circumstance such as that, if any of the members of this house feel in any way that a member of their staff was placed in this position and they need assistance or guidance as to where the matter be referred to, I will personally have my door open to assist them in that regard.

**LIBERAL PARTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is again to the Premier. When did the Premier first become aware of the allegations made by South Australian Liberal member Ms Chelsey Potter that she was sexually assaulted by another Liberal colleague?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** I became aware of this matter only last night, when it became a subject within the media.

#### FEDERAL LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:07):** Can the Premier update the house on his travel to Canberra yesterday to ensure delivery of key priorities for South Australia?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** Absolutely, I can, sir. It's a great pleasure to update the house on my visit to Canberra yesterday, and I thank the member for Kavel for his question. It goes without saying that we have established a good working relationship with the returned Coalition government in Canberra. We saw an improved relationship in our first 15 months of government with the federal Coalition, so we are of course delighted with the federal election result with the continuing Morrison government in place.

Scott Morrison is a great friend of South Australia. He has demonstrated this time and time and time again. He was the one who announced in South Australia, towards the end of last year, that Adelaide would host the national Space Agency headquarters and Mission Control, and the Space Discovery Centre. Earlier this year, of course, he announced that we would have the SmartSat Cooperative Research Centre—the largest research project of space in the history of Australia. We have been the beneficiaries of the great friendship and affection that he has for the people of South Australia.

On my agenda with the Prime Minister yesterday were a number of key issues which are important to the people of our state: (1) the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, (2) developing cyber as a really important strategic sector for our state, (3) bringing some of the infrastructure investments in South Australia promised beyond the forward estimates into the forward estimates and, finally, the issue of the submarine workforce going forward.

In addition to my meeting with the Prime Minister—who was, might I say, very generous with his time—I had meetings with other cabinet ministers, other ministers and key personnel in Canberra, including Ken Wyatt, who I had a lengthy discussion with; minister Paul Fletcher, who I met with; minister Stuart Robert; and, of course, Senator Linda Reynolds, who is defence minister for Australia.

Just going into a little bit more detail in the allocated time that I have today with regard to my discussions with the Prime Minister, the Murray-Darling Basin Plan is an incredibly important plan for us here in South Australia at the end of the river. I emphasised the importance of making sure that all jurisdictions stayed at the table, that we didn't have people leaving the table, leaving the plan and not implementing the plan.

We know that there are difficult circumstances in the part of Australia that is affected very significantly by drought at the moment, but Queensland, New South Wales, the ACT, Victoria, South Australia and the commonwealth signed up to the plan. We need to see that plan implemented in time and in full, and that is our position in South Australia. We want to keep every single jurisdiction at the table but, more than that, we emphasise that we need to have as part of that plan an independent umpire because we do not believe that states and other jurisdictions should be essentially marking their own homework.

To restore trust into the plan—negotiated, I might say, under a federal Labor government and a state Labor government here in South Australia—and to make sure that that plan is implemented, we think that there needs to be an independent umpire. I gave warning to the Prime Minister that we will be advocating hard for this at the upcoming COAG meeting, which will be held on 9 August. We will be arguing hard with the other jurisdictions. We will be fighting to ensure that every single drop of water that we are entitled to—the 2,750 right up to the 3,200 gig—is delivered on time and in full to us here in South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** I call to order the Minister for Transport and the Leader of the Opposition. The deputy leader.

#### LIBERAL PARTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:11):** My question is to the Premier. Should someone who assaults women hold office as an MP?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11):** It's a very broad question. I would like to say unequivocally that we reject—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —bullying, harassment and attacks in any workplace—any workplace—whatsoever. It's completely and utterly inappropriate, but every circumstance is different. My very strong message to anybody who has been subject to any of these actions is that they should be directing their complaint to the appropriate authority and making sure that appropriate action is taken.

#### LIBERAL PARTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier inquired as to the identity of Ms Potter's alleged assailant?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12):** No, sir. It's not my position to do that. I am not an investigative body. I don't think it would be appropriate to do that, but my strong message is that this allegation—this very serious allegation—should be taken to the appropriate authorities, and in this instance I think it would be the police.

#### LIBERAL PARTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** My question is again to the Premier. What action will the Premier take against any member of his government, MP or staff, who conducts themselves in the manner alleged by Chelsey Potter?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: clearly, that is hypothetical.

**Mr Duluk:** How are you going with John Setka?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite is called to order. With respect, I have given a fair bit of latitude in this type of questioning. I'm going to uphold—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** —just wait for it—the Attorney-General's point of order. I have given the opposition fair rein on this line of questioning. I am now going to switch to the member for Heysen. I will come back to the deputy leader.

#### SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:13):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house of the benefits of adding a third lane on each side of the South Eastern Freeway between Crafers and Stirling?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:13):** I can very much. I can also attest, as can the member for Heysen and the member for Kavel, how cold it is at Crafers at 8 o'clock in the morning on a Monday morning.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Why do you all live up there?

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** According to the bureau, it felt like minus 1° and can I tell that on the ground it felt like minus 1°.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** But an absolutely brilliant morning—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left and right!

**The Hon. Z.L. Bettison:** But they do have the best hotel.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ramsay is called to order. The minister has the call. It was so good for the first eight minutes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister has the call, thank you.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I didn't realise that commenting on the weather was going to be that disconcerting.

Can I say that it was fantastic, I must admit, to be up there and discussing the history of this project, this managed motorways project—one that has been on the books for some time. In fact, we sort of went back through the last budget under the former government and saw that it was an existing project, and then went back to the budget beforehand and the budget beforehand and the budget beforehand, and I think we actually had to go back to 2012-13 to find when this project was actually originated under the former government.

But what is really exciting is that, since March 2018 last year, we have been able now to get this project off the ground, make sure that it has enough funding to actually happen and that there is a proper construction profile for this project. For those people who live along that Hills corridor, and I am talking about the people who live in Mount Barker, the people who live in Nairne, the people who live in Crafers and Stirling—these are quickly growing areas of our state, even if you take it out to—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member West Torrens is on the board, and is called to order.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —Strathalbyn. People in the Hills areas have seen huge growth, and what they need is a government that is willing to invest to make sure that there is infrastructure in place to deal with the growth that we are seeing. There is \$14.2 million—fifty-fifty funded between the Morrison and Marshall governments—to convert what are existing emergency lanes into full lanes of traffic using an intelligent transportation system, a managed motorways concept, that is quite understood by people across other parts of our state, and one that is used in limited fashion here in Adelaide but one that is going to be used more and more, especially on the South Eastern Freeway.

We know that 54,000 vehicles a day use this, and that number is only going to grow as we see the Hills corridor get more and more busy as more and more people choose to live up in the Hills. Now, 10 per cent of that traffic is also heavy vehicles, and we know the specific issues in relation to gradient, which means that heavy vehicles on the South Eastern Freeway is one that we need to take particular care and advantage of.

These works will include road shoulder widening to allow three trafficable lanes in both directions, the upgrade of road lining for the extent of the works, the relocation of safety barriers, improved drainage, the upgrading of pavement and automated incident detection using video-automated incident detection technology. Essentially, that is the idea that, while we will be losing an emergency service lane, we are putting the technology in place so that when an accident does unfortunately occur on the South Eastern Freeway we have the technology to make sure that we quarantine that site but that traffic can continue to flow, in essence making sure that we use technology to make this road safer.

Can I thank very much the advocacy of the two local members of parliament who this most directly affects and also constituents from the Hammond electorate who would be driving down from Murray Bridge. This is something that they have fought long and hard for, and I am very glad to be able to deliver this, not the least of which so that they can get off my back, but more so for the people of their communities so that they can see a Marshall government that is willing to invest in their region.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*



**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light is called to order. The deputy leader has the call.

#### **LIBERAL PARTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Do you believe the allegations made by Ms Potter?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:17):** Again, I think the member is straying into an area which is potentially hypothetical, but I am happy to say this and repeat this for the benefit of the parliament, and that is that any allegation that is made of sexual harassment, assault, misconduct in the workplace, whether it is in this parliament, whether it is in our electorate offices, whether it is in other departmental offices, or any other workplace for that matter—and this is not something, sadly, if one reads the Equal Opportunity annual report each year, that is confined to government workplaces.

It is important for all of us, incumbent on all of us, to ensure that a person who raises these concerns is supported, including in the decision as to how and where they might prosecute that matter. I would frankly expect that the member for Port Adelaide would do the same in relation to anything that she was alerted to within the offices of members of the opposition.

We have a responsibility as leaders in the community. I have a direct responsibility as Attorney-General, and I know that the member for Port Adelaide, I would certainly hope and I think I would be confident in saying, would be available to ensure that these matters are followed up. We take this seriously, and I can tell you that the equal opportunity commissioner takes this seriously. I think that if we set the example in the community we have at least the beginning of a capacity to ensure that we minimise, at the very least, any conduct such as this in the future.

When these allegations are made, I think we should also have some respect for those who make the allegation and for whom they progress or prosecute the matter with. These are sensitive issues, and the last thing we want to do is impede them having the free will to be able to pursue the options that they see as most appropriate. They are sensitive matters. I can honestly say that, in the time that I have been here in the parliament but also as an employer in the outside world, it's not uncommon for this type of matter to be raised. I was very grateful for the establishment of equal opportunity law in this state, which I am proud to say was sponsored originally by former member for Bragg the Hon. David Tonkin and was the first in Australia.

The reason we have this type of law, the reason we have these protections, is to ensure that we have an avenue of redress, but also, if the conduct or circumstances are such that a criminal offence has occurred, we have a prosecuting and an investigative agency, namely, the police and/or the DPP, to take up those matters. I urge all members to ensure that if they become familiar with this they act on it in that manner.

#### **LIBERAL PARTY, SEXUAL ASSAULT ALLEGATIONS**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:21):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the public statements of 50-year Liberal stalwart Kathryn Greiner that there needs to be a very different attitude from the top in relation to dealing with allegations of sexual assault in the Liberal Party?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:21):** I refer to my previous answer.

#### **STATE BUDGET**

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:21):** My question is to the Premier. When did the Premier first become aware of a number of errors in the arts and culture pages of the state budget?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:21):** My recollection is that it was very close to the time that the estimates took place.

### ENERGY POLICY

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:21):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house about how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering new supply in the energy market to help improve competition for consumers?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:22):** Thank you to the member for King for this very important question. Of course, our policies will benefit her electorate and her constituents directly, and I know that is exactly why she is focused on these issues, doing everything she possibly can to drive benefits from our Marshall Liberal government for her electorate and the broader South Australian population.

Mr Speaker, you know and this house knows how fully committed we are to making electricity in South Australia more affordable, more reliable and cleaner for the smallest household all the way through to the largest employer. One of the ways in which we will do that is by increasing the supply of electricity generation in this state and increasing the competition that goes with it. We have our policies, as you know, with regard to interconnection, storage, grid-scale storage, household storage, voluntary and rewarded demand management opportunities and many other things.

But it is very pleasing to see that our government also continues to deliver the opportunity for industry to supply more electricity into our state. It is particularly pleasing to note that the Minister for Planning, among other things, has recently given approval for the Bungama Solar project, EPS's \$650 million project near Port Pirie that comprises 280 megawatts of solar PV generation and 141 megawatts of storage, which equates to 560 megawatt hours of battery storage, and also the Pallamana solar farm near Murray Bridge, which has 176 megawatts of generation and 66 megawatts of storage proposed by RES.

This comes hot on the heels of the Solar River Project near Robertstown in the electorate of Stuart. It is a 200-megawatt solar farm with battery storage as well. The fact is that Solar River and Alinta Energy recently signed a power purchase agreement, which will support not only the delivery of that project into the market but also more competition through Alinta's retailing arm into the South Australian market for consumers to work with.

On Monday of this week, I was at the Willogoleche wind farm opening at Hallett, where ENGIE established the official opening of their 119-megawatt power station. There are 32 turbines, so relatively small but relatively efficient, with a \$250 million investment creating 40 jobs during its construction and with half a dozen jobs or thereabouts ongoing in the region. This is another wind farm actually up and running. Two more solar farms with battery storage have just been given development approval, with another one signing an MOU for an offtake agreement. On this front, things are actually going very well.

I have to say that I am extremely pleased that so many of these renewable energy projects are accompanied by storage. We went to the last election highlighting to the electorate and to industry how important small-scale, medium-scale and large-scale storage is to accompany renewable energy so that intermittent renewable energy can become reliable and dispatchable on demand. It is very pleasing that the Marshall Liberal government's—

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —energy policies are encouraging so much additional and reliable electricity generation into the market.

### STATE BUDGET

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:26):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware that the official record of the budget is that which is tabled to the parliament, not a website?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26):** I am sure the member is correct.

### STATE BUDGET

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:26):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, have you now filed an erratum to the arts and culture pages of the budget?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26):** Of course, the budget is a matter for the Treasurer. I am happy to take up that—

**Ms Stinson:** Have you filed a correction or not?

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I am happy to raise that issue with the Treasurer. If that's required—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —then I am sure that will be done.

#### MEMBER'S REMARKS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it's nasty of women to ask him questions?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27):** I am happy to answer this, sir, because it was raised and I thought in a—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —pretty bizarre way where, of course, there was no allegation specifically made but something which was put. I would just invite them, if there is any specific claim by any member, to make it, preferably outside of this chamber where I think it could actually be taken up.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I will tell you what I don't think is acceptable—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —was the behaviour of some of the cabinet ministers in the former government. On very regular occasions we heard about some of the foul language the member for West Torrens used.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Could the Premier please resume his seat.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Conversational swearing, sir; I think that's unacceptable.

**The SPEAKER:** Could the Premier please resume his seat. Is the Premier finished?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens has a point of order for debate. I have to say that the Premier is beginning to deviate. I will listen carefully, but I will ask him to come to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Well, sir, the substance of the question was with regard to the use of the word 'nasty', which I think is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —a descriptive but not necessarily offensive word. By way of contrast, I am presenting to the house—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left would like me to rule on whether there is debate. It is a bit hard when I can't hear the answer.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —because I am asked whether it is acceptable and the answer is yes. What is unacceptable, of course, is the way that some members of the former cabinet acted. There didn't seem to be any consequences for that. We heard of the unbelievable conversational swearing offered by the member for West Torrens—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —which appeared in the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption's report into the maladministration which occurred with regard to the Gillman matter. We also heard—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —at some great length the foul language used towards a female counterpart of the former minister for environment and water down on Leigh Street.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I don't want to ever, ever utter those words. But, of course, that was language tolerated by the weak Labor Party, which was in government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, please be seated. Is the Premier finished? The Premier has completed his answer?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** No, I've got hours, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for debate?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** With respect, Premier, I have always allowed some compare and contrast. I think you have used up your quota, and I would ask you to either come back to the substance of the question or conclude your answer.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you, sir. I have tried to present to the house some examples of unacceptable language. I won't go into providing further examples because, as you pointed out, I have given two extraordinarily good examples so far. But there is a standard which needs to be observed. It wasn't observed by the former government; it will be observed by this government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Flinders. I will come back to those on my left.

### SEAFOOD INDUSTRY

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:30):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is delivering on its election commitments for the seafood sector?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:30):** Yes, I can, and I thank the member for Flinders for his very important question. Once again, he was a great host on the weekend. I travelled over to Port Lincoln to unveil the bronze statue, the *Tuna Poler*. It is a great story for Port Lincoln—it is a great story for the fishing industry by and large—as the nation's headquarters for fisheries.

We have seen Ken Martin, a great sculptor. Not only has he done some outstanding timber work but he has now undertaken some really, really good bronze statue work over at Port Lincoln, not only *Makybe Diva*, and many of you have seen that sculpture, but we now have the *Tuna Poler*, and it is outstanding. It depicts part of the tuna industry's history. From \$2 a kilo to \$45 a kilo, the tuna poler started that industry off.

Just as importantly, on Friday night I was also at the South Australian Seafood Industry Awards and made an announcement there that we as a government are going to establish a forum for the South Australian seafood industry and how that industry can grow together. For many, many years we have seen a sector that is made up of a lot of components that have been very, very fragmented. We now have an opportunity for an advisory forum. The announcement was to establish an advisory forum that not only encompasses the commercial sector, the charter fishing sector, the recreational sector, but also Aboriginal traditional fishing, aquaculture and seafood processing. They are all vital components in the fishing industry here in South Australia.

We know that the seafood sector has been overpromised and underdelivered over the last 16 years of the previous government. This government is working with the seafood sector to help it grow, bring it together so they can actually speak with a single voice so that the sector can grow together, not divide together. What this election commitment will do is establish a forum, that each sector can develop a growth plan, and that growth plan is on an individual silo basis, that they will develop a plan for themselves. Then, we will bring them together so they can sit at the table and we can work out how we can increase the value and the volume of the sectors and how we can also look after our pristine marine environment—not only the marine environment but also our waterway environment—for a very important sector.

Once we have established these individual plans, it will become very clear that a 10-year growth plan will be developed, and it has to be achievable, with a vision to establish the goals and to be able to achieve them. It is all very well to establish goals and have aspirations, but to be able to achieve those goals is more important than anything else. The consultation process is underway. The website is open. The PIRSA website was opened at 7 o'clock on that Friday night. The consultation will close on 23 August. I am very much looking forward to receiving feedback on a consultation paper outlining the seafood industry forum. After that consultation process has been through, we will look for nominations to further develop that forum on behalf of the whole seafood sector.

#### MINISTERS' INTERESTS

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:34):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier satisfied that his Minister for Environment and Water is paying the appropriate amount of land tax?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:34):** I don't have any reason to believe that he wouldn't be. He would be abiding by the law as it is stated at the moment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We, of course, have some propositions, which we are putting forward at the moment, which will adjust the land tax regime in South Australia. We emphasise that the budget measures that we announced in last year's budget and this year's budget taken together will effect a reduction in land tax payable here—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —in South Australia—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —not the misinformation put around by some of our opponents at the moment. We are for lower taxes in South Australia. We have been able to demonstrate that

since coming into government, with lower stamp duty, with lower payroll tax, with the halving of the emergency services levy—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and, of course—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —a reduction in the land tax. Those opposite presided over extraordinarily high rates of land tax in South Australia, the highest marginal rate and I think the lowest threshold in the entire country. For some reason, they have become unable to express themselves with the current public debate with regard to land tax. Hopefully, they will find their voice—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —some time very soon.

**Mr Malinauskas:** Lower costs? I don't think so.

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned. The member for Lee.

#### LAND TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:35):** My question is again to the Premier. Premier, is someone holding a portfolio of eight investment properties in different ownerships in Kingston Park, Oaklands Park, Mitcham, Christies Beach and Inman Valley required to pay land tax on aggregated land values?

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:36):** I am happy to receive the information and/or ask the member to refer the matter to the Treasurer if there was any circumstance in which he has a case suggesting that. Obviously, we are not in a position to provide legal or financial advice to the member in relation to the scenario that's been outlined. If he has any concerns—it's a constituent, for example, or someone who has approached him—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Or a minister of the Crown.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —in relation to it—

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —I would invite him to provide the information to the Treasury office.

#### LAND TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:36):** My question is again to the Premier. Given that the Minister for Environment has told InDaily that he will not be subject to the new land tax aggregation measures, and the Treasurer has indicated that he would be, which minister is correct?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:37):** I am not going to be providing this house with a commentary regarding a person's portfolio. I have no expertise to provide that legal or accounting advice whatsoever. That is not my role.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We have made it very clear that we would like to see a reform with regard to land tax. This was an issue that had been raised with the previous government over a long period of time, but they were content to sweep this problem under the carpet, under the mat, out of sight, out of mind, and preside over the highest marginal rate of land tax in the entire country. This was helping to make South Australia an unattractive place for investment. We are working through the mess that we inherited from those opposite. I will not be coming in here providing specific tax or legal advice—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** They are all right behind you.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to anybody with regard to their property investments.

**The SPEAKER:** If this level of interjection continues, respectfully, members, I will be asking members to depart the chamber. We will switch to the member for Narungga. I will come back to the member for Lee.

#### ROAD SAFETY

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house how SAPOL and DPTI are working together to combat road trauma and fatalities on South Australian roads?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:38):** I thank the member for Narungga for his question and acknowledge his interest in road safety. We know that road safety is a responsibility of all South Australians and I hope, on both sides of the chamber, it is of great interest to everyone who is here in this place.

Any injury or any death on our roads is one too many, and to see any tragedy in anyone's local community, as a member, is truly devastating. We know that road trauma does devastate individuals, families and, more broadly, communities as well. The ripple effect that it has through a community does go on forever really.

South Australia's police officers, unfortunately, and our emergency service workers and volunteers are so often at the front line of a lot of this trauma as well. It's probably an opportunity to take a moment and have a think about what they have to deal with and what they witness firsthand at any road accident. It really can be a devastating sight, and we want to do everything we can in this place to eliminate that and reduce our road toll.

I have said in this place before and publicly as well that 'road toll' is not a term that I like to use or hear because 'toll' indicates a price that we are willing to pay and, again, I think collectively in this house we know that we do not want to pay the price for people driving on our roads, be it a death or serious injury. That position of SAPOL and the front-line response that they have puts them in a great position to deliver our road safety messaging for the South Australian community, and that is the part they are playing now. They are taking over the advertising. Having that firsthand experience as well as the wealth of knowledge within their operation as far as communications is concerned, they will do that and do that well and deliver that for South Australians.

What we have also seen as we look at some of the stats is that 60 per cent of the fatalities this year have occurred on our regional roads, and too many of these fatalities have involved people from within that region when they travel on our country roads. I talk about the ripple effect but, for some reason in the regions, with everyone being so close and everyone knowing one another, whenever there is a tragedy—a death or a serious injury on our roads in the regions—it does really roll throughout that whole community and it has a great impact.

SAPOL are tackling this issue through enforcement as well, obviously, so here we can link the advertising campaigns with the enforcement that SAPOL do. They are very much out there with

a visual presence on the roads, and doing these types of targeted campaigns and awareness campaigns are what they specialise in.

On the other side of the road safety landscape we have DPTI, and they are there making our roads safer for all South Australians. DPTI has the right mix of knowledge in this regard as well, as far as safe systems are concerned and putting in safer road infrastructure. We know that decisions on road designs are made through the analysis of data and crash history as well. As well as having that expertise, DPTI are also going to be looking after the sponsorships and partnerships to make sure we can drive that into the community as well.

So road safety is a collective: it is about the policing and also advertising campaigns; it is about the enforcement as well; it is about, from a DPTI perspective, making sure we have safer roads and safer systems; and it is also about pumping out those promotions and partnerships. Unfortunately, there is not a magic wand that can just fix the road safety scenario as it is. We know that it has been worse this year than we would have liked when it comes to deaths on our roads. Thankfully, serious injuries are down.

We will keep working on that through these departments, and they are delivering that road safety drive for us. I mentioned DPTI, and they have put in more than \$1 billion to improve our regional roads across South Australia, which is the Marshall government again delivering for South Australians. I have no doubt that this positive relationship between SAPOL and DPTI will deliver us great outcomes right across the board.

#### LAND TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:42):** My question is to the Premier. Was the Minister for Environment present at all budget cabinet committee meetings and cabinet meetings when the land tax aggregation measure was considered?

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42):** I don't have that information with regard to a specific attendance at meetings, but they—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —are, of course, cabinet considerations and they are not subject to disclosures that would occur in other areas. I'm convinced that we have arrived at the right position. We are out for—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leader.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —substantial consultation on this matter as we speak. We have already received a huge amount of feedback on this matter. I expect that there will be further feedback—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —on this matter and we will be making our position clear in August. Then there will be a further opportunity—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —for consultation. What we would like to see is the legislation introduced into this parliament soon so that we can get the land tax reductions in place so that the people of South Australia can be benefitting from this by 1 July next year.



*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Playford is called to order and warned. Member for Lee.

#### LAND TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:43):** My question is again to the Premier. Should the Minister for Environment have declared a conflict of interest during cabinet deliberations over the land tax aggregation measure?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43):** That is a matter for cabinet to consider, and I am absolutely convinced that we have made the appropriate provisions with regard to that.

#### LAND TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:44):** My question is again to the Premier. Did the Minister for Environment draw the Premier's attention to his landholdings before these matters were considered by cabinet?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44):** The Minister for Environment and Water makes disclosures, as all members of parliament make their disclosures, and they abide by the laws. We are all required to abide by the law. Everybody makes their disclosures in accordance with the practice of this house, and that is precisely what the member for Black has done.

#### MAJOR PROJECTS CONFERENCE

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:44):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house about the SA Major Projects Conference and how the Marshall government is delivering a strong pipeline of infrastructure projects?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:44):** I am happy to update the house on the Major Projects Conference that is currently underway. I had the great joy of being able to address that conference this morning, following on from my colleague the Minister for Energy and Mining. He outlined some of the work that is happening in his space. My address was of less a solar and battery nature and much more a dirt, gravel and bitumen nature.

The room was excited to hear about a government that has been serious about creating a pipeline of projects that delivers a strong and stable future for the civil construction industry. I had to update them that the cupboard was pretty bare when we came to office and that at the end of this year major works on three sections of the north-south corridor are coming to completion with no plan for what is going to happen after that time. I also updated them on the work we did last year to put four major projects on the table, all of which start either by the end of this year or early next year, to give the industry certainty that there is a solid pipeline of work going forward.

I was able to outline to them today the benefits of a cooperative relationship between the state and federal governments, delivering huge amounts of money, almost 12 per cent of the national share of road infrastructure funding in the federal budget handed down in February that is again going to push that pipeline of work out further.

The member for Finniss might like to know that we discussed some of the projects that are important to his electorate, such as the Victor Harbor Road duplication, a project that the former government had sitting in the back of its integrated land use plan. They just forgot to do any work to get the project off the ground or get any money committed towards that project.

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

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** There is \$90 million on the table to duplicate the Victor Harbor Road—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —down to the member for Mawson's electorate.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** 2026.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Well, 2026 is still quicker than anything that the former government put on the table. I can guarantee to the people of South Australia—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Mawson is warned.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —that that road project is going to be delivered posthaste, especially with the great advocacy of the member for Finnis. We also talked about some of the road safety treatments that we are putting in place in the member for Finnis's electorate, as well as a pretty specific and special project, one that we again know is for another mess that we are having to clean up after 16 years of regional underinvestment, and that is the \$20 million we have on the table towards fixing the causeway down in Victor Harbor.

It is a huge tourist attraction, one that drives people to the South Coast and one that is so important for that community, and it was left to rot—a state heritage item left to rot by the former government. We are now having to pick up the pieces, but, like the good government that we are, investing in regional South Australia, we have put \$20 million on the table in the state budget to deliver for that.

What I was able to deliver today to the civil construction industry was confidence to move away from this boom-bust cycle of delivering infrastructure that is expensive. It delivers poor outcomes for the workers and the companies themselves because they do not have longevity or certainty, and it also hits taxpayers because it increases the cost of construction. We have an opportunity to deliver a smooth and consistent profile of projects, especially when we see the north-south corridor as that mammoth project sitting there, that we need to build our infrastructure profile around.

We were able to talk this morning about the fact that we can give 10 years' plus worth of certainty to that industry, which will drive interest in South Australia. It will drive interest in the projects that we put on the table. Most importantly, it will give certainty to civil construction workers who are looking for a future for the next decade rather than just the next 18 months.

#### **MINISTERS' INTERESTS**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:48):** My question is to the Premier. Have the Premier and the Minister for Environment met all requirements of the Ministerial Code of Conduct in relation to the declaration of the minister's property interests?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:48):** As I have stated before, this is a matter that is subject to cabinet confidentiality. I have no reason to believe that there has been any breach whatsoever. I refer the honourable member to my previous answers on this matter, which I have already provided to the house.

#### **MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES, SHARES**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:49):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Minister for Human Services receive approval from the Premier under section 4.6 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct before she disposed of her shares in private hospital operator Healthscope?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:49):** This is another matter which is subject—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to cabinet confidentiality, and I just refer the honourable member to the statements which the Minister for Human Services has already made to the estimates committee. I think she covered this matter—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —which she disclosed to the estimates committee. I hear those calls—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —from the other side. If those opposite have some substantive claim to make, I suggest that they make it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Lee, the member for Playford can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A. When he does, I will give the member for Lee another question.

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

### MINISTERS' INTERESTS

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:50):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Auditor-General be reviewing all declarations of ministers' interests following the interests of the Minister for Environment and the Minister for Human Services, as outlined in the Ministerial Code of Conduct?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:50):** The member has raised the question as to what the Auditor-General investigates. All the members are aware of the responsibility that the Auditor-General has to report to the parliament annually or as he sees fit in relation to any matters which he considers, within his remit, the government is failing to properly undertake, whether that be financial application, protocols, guidelines, etc.

If the member has a matter of concern in relation to that, or wishes to seek some further inquiry of the Auditor-General, there is no impediment on him referring a matter for consideration. It's up to the Auditor-General, of course, as to whether he undertakes any further assessment or investigation of the matter. I can remember being in his position and writing quite often to the Auditor-General, actually, about areas of concern that I had in respect of the previous government. It is entirely open to the member to raise these matters and ask for that inquiry.

He may or may not be aware, but the Auditor-General isn't accountable to him or me or any other individual member of parliament. The Auditor-General, if he sees fit to investigate a matter, will of course in due course report that matter to the parliament either as part of his annual report or as an individual report. He is not obliged to give any response back to the member, but I invite the member to put that reference to him.

### GLENELG SAFETY BOLLARDS

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the installation of the safety bollards at Glenelg Primary School?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:52):** It's interesting that there's a degree of flippancy I hear from members opposite in relation to this question. Can I—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** I think you just attract that.

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Can I update the house that actually information has been brought to my attention which needs to be explored further. The safety bollards that were put in place only in

recent weeks down at Glenelg actually saw their first accident in the past 48 hours. In fact, I think there is a very strong suggestion that we managed to avoid further carnage because of what is, yes, an otherwise simple project. Yes, it may not be a huge amount of money but, yes, it is also delivering a massive benefit to the people in that community, especially when we consider that not three or four metres from where these bollards are installed is or was a playground for the Glenelg Primary School.

This is a very, very important project. Interestingly and serendipitously, last night I spoke to the Australian Institute of Traffic Planning and Management—a group of traffic engineers who essentially help us to understand how we should be designing our roads and how we should be developing our road network to improve it, not only for productivity and congestion busting, but also from a road safety perspective.

I had the opportunity to visit one of the stalls of Roadside Services and Solutions and met Craig Woods, the director of the company who actually built the bollards that have been installed in the member for Morphett's electorate. He in fact went through with me how the design of these bollards absorbs the kinetic energy when a crash takes place and does a lot to help save not only the pedestrians and the people behind the bollards but also the people inside the vehicle.

The bollards are designed for the vehicle not to nosedive at the back of the vehicle coming over the top, in effect crushing the driver, but to push the front of the car up and push the passenger back into their seats and suffer far less serious accidents. There is a lot of science that has gone into this and work that has been done by a great company based here in South Australia.

This election commitment is one that the member for Morphett, then the candidate for Morphett, fought extremely hard for, in conjunction with the City of Holdfast Bay and Glenelg Primary School. After having had a couple of accidents happen on that very corner, the department has installed bollards along the north-eastern side of Diagonal Road in front of Glenelg Primary School.

Yes, it's only a 40-metre section and, yes, it only cost taxpayers \$130,000, but this is a very clear example of the types of things that this government is undertaking to make our road network safer. Certainly, the minister for road safety outlined in the previous answer the fact that we are spending over \$1 billion on regional roads to improve road safety, but there are small treatments, such as this, that are just as important.

Can I put on the record to the gentlemen that I met last night, Jim and Craig and the other guys there as part of the Roadside team, my thanks for the work that they do and the commitment that they have to improving road safety through something you would otherwise consider is pretty simple. It's just a bollard, but the science that has gone behind that work is extremely rigorous. It's one that will save lives and it seems like, in the last 48 hours, it has done its job to keep people on our roads and people walking next to our roads and people playing in playgrounds—our children playing in playgrounds at local primary schools—safe as well.

#### **MINISTERS' INTERESTS**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:56):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier ensure that the Cabinet Office makes available to the Auditor-General declarations of interests made pursuant to sections 3.3 and 3.4 by the Minister for Environment and the Minister for Human Services?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Could the member just repeat the question?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Duluk:** Stop being nasty.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Waite, you are warned for a second and final time. Member for Lee, could you please repeat?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Will the Premier ensure that the cabinet office makes available to the Auditor-General declarations of interests made by the Minister for Environment and the Minister for Human Services pursuant to sections 3.3 and 3.4 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:57):** The member may or may not be aware but the government, via the Premier's guidelines, has issued a new statement under the new government as to how the operations will apply to the provision of information from the cabinet in respect of Auditor-General inquiry. Unlike the previous regime, who had I think been singularly embarrassed by the Gillman report—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: the member for Bragg is unfortunately mistaken and as a result is debating the matter. My question was about declarations of interests held by the cabinet office not cabinet decisions, which are covered by the Premier and cabinet circular she is referring to.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. I will be listening very carefully to the Deputy Premier's answer. Thank you, member for Lee.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** In respect of the matter which the member purports to clarify—  
*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —I repeat that the government now operates under a new set of guidelines. In respect of the support that they provide and access to the Auditor-General and/or his office, that has been restored under those guidelines as to be considered on a case-by-case basis. We felt as a government—and the Premier has issued the guidelines in relation to that—that the previous position was appropriate. Clearly, we felt that the Auditor-General ought to have access to certain material and the direction reflects that.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** No, it doesn't. It's on application.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The member seems to have his own view about that. I'm indicating to him as best I can what applies in this regard. Certainly in the time I have been here in the parliament, the Auditor-General, who annually reports to the parliament and, as I have indicated, from time to time gives special reports, has identified in his report quite often reference to having viewed either cabinet material or matters which would otherwise be confidential and been satisfied as to whether there has been some inadequate attention to a protocol, or a rule or a regulatory obligation.

Certainly in that time, he has, I think, responsibly reported minimal information to confirm that but, as he has rightly pointed out, it is important for him to be satisfied in relation to a number of processes that those—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: the Deputy Premier is not only debating but she is doing so to run down the clock. I ask—

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, respectfully, you can leave for the rest of question time. Thank you.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** For the rest of question time, sir?

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier has the call. Have you finished your answer?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will conclude by saying that I would invite the member, or any other members who wish to view that, to do so, of course, from the website.

#### COUNTRY ROAD SPEED LIMITS

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Transport. After 501 days, can the minister inform the house how he is delivering on his election commitment to raise speed limits on the Port MacDonnell and Carpenter Rocks road?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We have the question.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:00):** I thank the member for his question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** It also gives me a great opportunity to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** It is very entertaining, but I can't hear the answer.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —correct the record, especially in relation to comments made—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —by the member for Elizabeth in the paper. What I really enjoyed—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Premier!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —was that the people who didn't invest in regional roads in South Australia, who dropped the speed limit in the first place, are the ones now having a go at us, who actually had, as part of \$143 million in the budget, the money on the table to fix these roads so that the speed limit could be put back up.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The very people who created the problem in the first place now try to attack those who are fixing the problem. Yes, this is taking some time—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please be seated for one moment. Members on my left and right, be quiet so that I can hear the minister's answer, please. Thank you.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition, you will leaving if this continues.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Yes, this is taking some time—

*Mr Bell interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I will take the member's maths at his word, but can I say this: it is there in the budget. There is a \$143 million package that has been put aside. Part of that is for overtaking lanes, part of that is for shoulder sealing works right across South Australia and part of that is to fix eight roads so that we can put the speed limit back up.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Again, the cacophony, Mr Speaker, from those opposite really does underscore the fact that they are embarrassed about their record in regional South Australia.

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kaurana!

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Mawson, be quiet!

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

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries has been doing it all day. I ask him to stop, please.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I think maybe the member for Mount Gambier should have given a trigger warning with his question. Can I say that we do take this very seriously, but we have said always and often that we will put the speed limits back up once the roads are in a state where they can be put back up. That requires investment.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The money is there in the budget. I look forward to accepting the member for Mount Gambier's recent invitation to come back down and visit his electorate for a further time. I look forward to taking the member up on—

*The Hon. G.G. Brock interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Sorry, and also the member for Frome, but we did meet the other week.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I look forward to being able to update the member's community personally on the progress of this very important promise.

#### **SPORTS FACILITIES**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister update the house on round 1 of the government's grassroots football, cricket and netball facility grants and how the funding will deliver grassroots sport in South Australia?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:04):** Thank you very much, and I thank the member for MacKillop for his fine question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and acknowledge his understanding of how we are delivering for South Australia yet again, especially when it comes to sport, in partnership with, of course, the SACA and the SANFL, and netball is on board as well. Those sports that are growing in their female participation have been a real key focus for us to make sure that we deliver the facilities that they—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —have been lacking for so many years. In our first round, we have unearthed more than \$15 million worth of projects and, in total, will be delivering more than \$24 million worth of projects across the two rounds. That's an amazing achievement and we are very proud of that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** We look forward to this rolling out as we go. That really is just getting started. The delivery of these projects has been from Hope Valley, in the member for Newland's electorate, to Flinders Park in the member for West Torrens' electorate, and up in Whyalla, in the member for Giles's electorate. Just on the weekend, I was down in the South-East with the member for MacKillop, and we also bumped into the member for Mount Gambier. There are some great projects and some great communities, who are very appreciative of what we are delivering.

I will run through a couple because the people we met over the weekend, gee, didn't they think the member for MacKillop was a super guy for the great work that he has done. At Kalangadoo, \$153,000 has gone into developing their project. It's a wonderful project, neglected by those opposite for so many years, but the member for MacKillop has delivered for them. The president of the football club, Adam Box; the president of the netball club, Katie Croser; Jayde Peacock, the grants coordinator; and Andre Carlson, the president of the Community Club, were so happy to see us down there. Can I tell you that the afternoon teas there are as good as I have had. Don't tell anyone else, but they were as good as I have had, and the slices were adding to my waistline.

Then we went to McLaughlin Park, and that was fantastic as well, with the Saints over there—\$108,000 for increased lighting on their facility. Craig Tunkin is the president there. They have done a great job with their facility because they have worked with the other sports. They have come together, and they do the projects depending on what the need is. The lighting there is fantastic, and they are improving the goalposts, and the goalpost pads as well, because they are not at spec at the moment. They work in conjunction with the basketball club, the netball club and the soccer club, and they really come together to deliver projects for their community. They should be commended for that.

We managed to travel to the South Gambier Football Club as well. There is more than \$200,000 going to their club, and they were very ecstatic about that too. It is a great football and netball club that really is growing its participation. To see so many games happening there was wonderful. They are redeveloping their change rooms and they are getting lighting for their netball courts and resurfacing a cricket pitch. They have some plans to do more things down the track, and it was great to help them out. I was there 12 months ago, with the member for Mount Gambier, to follow through and see these delivered after they had put together their application. They went through the process and they were successful. It was fantastic.

A couple of others, while I have the time, include \$264,000 for Hope Valley, in the member for Newland's electorate, to install a comprehensive modular unisex change room facility, which is on the plan. Scott is the chairperson of the sports club. The member for Newland was very happy to be delivering that project in his community.

I was up at Karoonda with the member for Hammond maybe a month or so ago. Bruce Kerr is the president there, and they were really pleased with their project—over a quarter of a million dollars for them—that really is the heart of their community. Half a million dollars is going out to Northfield, in the member for Enfield's electorate, to a really great project at the Edward Smith and LJ Lewis precinct at Northfield. Sandy, the president of the Adelaide Warriors Cricket Club, told me that he had been waiting 13 years for that. I am not sure what was happening on the other side, but to deliver this for their club, after 13 years of waiting for an upgrade, was fantastic.

In Flinders Park, the member for West Torrens's electorate, they were elated when they got \$224,000 for their family-friendly unisex change rooms. It is a great club, and I commend everyone there for the great work they did, in particular Carol Shard, who is the executive committee member.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:08):** As we know in this place, the dignity that employment provides individuals cannot be underestimated. It is important that people have an opportunity to work. Work provides a whole range of opportunities, not only to gain independence but also to learn new skills and the importance of socialisation within the community. This is just as true for people living with disability. Often in the past, people living with disability have been denied the opportunity to find meaningful work—and I do stress 'meaningful'.

Meaningful work is very important for young people, for people living with disability and for their families because they are keen for their young people to gain independence. It is also important for their families to know that, once they are not around anymore, their child can actually look after themselves and provide for themselves. That is very important.

It is also unfortunately a fact that in this country we have one of the lowest work participation rates in the world for people living with disability. It is way below our comparative countries. It is



important that we understand that and do something to address it. There are a whole range of attitudes that we need to change in terms of people with disability being able to work—family attitudes and also employer attitudes. Also, at a fundamental level, we need to make sure that people living with a disability have the skills and abilities to actually gain meaningful work.

I am very pleased to advise this chamber that last week I attended a disability hospitality enterprise pilot project graduation ceremony. This project involved a range of young people who engaged in a project to gain skills. Before I describe the project, I would like to mention that in African culture it is often said that it takes a community to educate a child. That is the premise of this project.

A range of partners included the City of Playford—and I would like to particularly acknowledge Cyndi Neuzerling, an advocate in the council—Uniting SA and Cherie Jolly, the advocate there; Barkuma; and also the Independent Institute of Food Processing, operated by the Knoll family. And yes, they are related to the Knoll family of this place, in particular Thomas Knoll, who was actually the trainer in this program and who, I am told by the project leaders, provided way beyond the contract requirements for this project.

The participants in this program came mainly from the City of Playford area. The program came about from a discussion I had with Dermot Cussen, the Director of the Stretton Centre, a unit within the City of Playford. We were talking about employment programs. In fact, one of the employment and training programs we talked about the former minister for education was involved in launching at the Stretton Centre when she was minister. Again, this involved young people. Mr Cussen said that his council would be interested in partnering up to provide a program for young people living with disability to gain skills and abilities and also to gain those skills and abilities in a live situation, actually working in some sort of hospitality environment.

One other partner I should mention is the former department of state development, which provided the funding under the previous government. I acknowledge that that funding was continued by this current government through the Department for Innovation and Skills. The project was about giving the City of Playford, as an NDIS supporter, the capacity to undertake programs to build the skills and abilities in young people in our community, and in particular young people living with disability. The project was a hospitality enterprise, staffed by people living with disability, who undertook a tailored and concurrent hospitality training program established at Coventry Road, Smithfield Plains.

The comprehensive training program covered all aspects of retail food service, such as logistics, sourcing and ordering supplies, food preparation, marketing, product costing, budgeting and all front-of-house retail and customer service activities. A very important part of the program was to put those young people in a live environment where they could gain skills and also the confidence to undertake those tasks and show future employers that they could actually do this work in a live environment.

The training program was delivered in a fully functioning commercial hospitality environment provided by the independent institute, providing real-life experience in the operations of a commercial kitchen and all associated aspects of a hospitality business, including back and front-of-house activities. The aim of the program was to ensure that participants had sufficient training and work experience to be able to work in hospitality roles of their choice within supported or, more importantly, open employment environments.

It was a very successful program. I commend all the partners. This is an example of government and non-government sectors working together to improve the lives of people living with disability.

#### **REMELJEJ, MR A.**

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:13):** Here in parliament today, I take the opportunity to speak about a person who is held in the highest regard at the Glenelg Surf Lifesaving Club—Alexander Remeljej. Such is the respect for him that the surf club's most prestigious award—the Remeljej Award—is awarded in his honour.

Alexander Remeljej was born in Detmold, Germany, on 22 May 1947. His family migrated to Adelaide when he was three to start a new life, and he grew up in Rostrevor. He worked as a

draftsman's assistant with the state department of lands as a young adult; however, his true passion was found on Glenelg beach as a surf lifesaver. He first joined the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club at the age of 12 in the 1959-60 season. He obtained his bronze medallion as a 15 year old—the age that many still do today—in the 1962-63 season.

The primary role of surf lifesaving is to save lives, and in this endeavour Alexander excelled. Even though he was not a stand-out athlete, he was loyal and had a reputation for reliability, completing his volunteer patrols enthusiastically. He was known as Rem by his mates. Lifesaving matured these young adolescents and taught them the importance of service, while at the same time providing them with plenty of enjoyable memories with mates.

Glenelg beach was a world away from the Vietnam War, which took place between 1955 and 1975 and saw Australian involvement to support our ally, the United States, fighting alongside the South Vietnamese against the communist Viet Cong. From November 1964, Australia introduced national service based on a birthday ballot of 20-year-old men. National servicemen on full-time duty were liable for what was called 'special overseas service', which included combat duties in Vietnam.

Rem was conscripted by the Australian government at the age of 20, in February 1968, and was soon sent along, with many other young men, to Puckapunyal for military training before being quickly thrown into the jungle warfare of Vietnam. His first involvement was on 17 September 1968, and February 1969 saw him serving with the 5<sup>th</sup> Battalion of the Royal Australian Regiment in Phuoc Tuy Province. Lying on the South Vietnamese coast, three-quarters of Phuoc Tuy was covered with rainforest and grassland. The Viet Cong established bases in the province's mountains and jungles and undertook insurgency operations to harass the allied forces in an attempt to wear them down.

As part of 5RAR, Rem continued to apply his attributes and skills obtained first as a surf lifesaver. Fifty years ago, on 11 April 1969, at the young age of 21, Rem was in the heat of the action defending a forward position in the Phuoc Tuy Province when he noticed the enemy descending upon their position. In this jungle warfare, most casualties were inflicted in the first few seconds of the firefight by the side that opened fire first. It is believed that Rem engaged the enemy early, taking the full brunt of the Viet Cong, risking his life in order to alert the base of the enemy closing in. Tragically, he was killed in action while putting his mates and country before himself.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr PATTERSON:** In hearing about Rem's supreme sacrifice, the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club commissioned a trophy for one of its favourite sons. The trophy is a likeness of Rem. It is carved from driftwood and awarded to the member that best displays Rem's characteristics of professionalism, loyalty, integrity, courage and teamwork. Since its inception at the awards night 46 years ago in 1972, there have been 28 individual winners. Some of the recent winners include Shane Daw, Lisa Harvey, Dee Armstrong and her son Shaun, Pete Tidswell and current club president, Georgie Cole.

I attended the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club's presentation night recently. Fifty years after Rem was killed in action, the club paid special tribute to Rem, with young lifesaver Cormac Sammut speaking about Rem's qualities before local legend Anthony Merchant was presented with the Remelje Award for 2018-19. Fittingly, the award was presented by one of Rem's former clubmates, Brenton Quimby. The club remembered Rem's selfless sacrifice for his mates and, like so many valiant heroes who gave their lives for this country, we will remember him.

#### **CAUSBY, MR J.**

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:19):** I rise to note the passing of Mr John Causby. Mr Causby was a local cricket legend at the Woodville District Cricket Club. He was a life member and a man who also made an immense contribution not only to his club but to South Australian cricket and the western suburbs.

The western suburbs are home to many great clubs and, just like the Woodville District Cricket Club, they form part of the intangible connectivity that our community in Cheltenham enjoys. These clubs have a deep and lasting place in our western suburbs. Many of them were formed by the distinct working-class communities within the broader west. They were formed and continue to

serve the purpose of bringing people together. No matter the club, the sport or the suburb, these clubs are built by the hard work and dedication of individual members and their supporters turning their shoulders to the wheel and putting in the hard work to make these clubs great, both on and off the field.

The Woodville District Cricket Club, the club of the late John Causby, is one such club in my electorate with a long and storied past. The earliest formation of the club dates back to 1874, and they first played their matches in the paddocks just across the road from the Woodville Town Hall. Over the ensuing decades, the clear, cogent record of the club becomes slightly more obscure until the reformation of the club in 1937 at the instigation of the then mayor of Woodville district council, who would later become club legend, James Spencer Butler. This reforming of the club coincided with the turfing of Woodville Oval—the great Woodville Oval, in my electorate of Cheltenham—the home and base of the Woodville District Cricket Club today.

Woodville Oval has over the years seen its fair share of exceptional sporting talents in many sporting disciplines. On the cricket end of the turf, the likes of Sir Donald Bradman and Sir Garfield Sobers have plied their trade with the dominance that they are remembered for. The club developed a number of household names over the decades, most notably Australian test cricketers Rodney Hogg and Barry Jarman, and amongst these household names is Mr John Causby.

He was a life member of the club and for very good reason. He started at the club in Woodville in the schoolboys team in 1954, and he played out the rest of his career at the very same club before taking on roles and responsibilities as a volunteer, coach and other executive roles in the club. With 10 A-grade centuries and almost 6,000 runs, John is easily one of the most accomplished batsmen the club has seen.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr SZAKACS:** John was a classical opening batsman, respected by all, and an inspiration to batsmen of all ages throughout his time with the club. John Causby excelled and represented South Australia for 12 years, clocking over 3,000 runs and helping to secure Sheffield Shield victories for our state in 1968-69 and 1970-71. With only three Sheffield Shield victories since then, it is fair and reasonable to say that John Causby was clearly part of a golden era for South Australian cricket.

John's talents were obvious and they were obvious from a young age. In the SACA under-16 championships, he secured 10 centuries from just 11 innings, and in the innings he missed out on he was run out. John never stopped setting records throughout his career. Until this day, John, along with another SA cricketing great, Les Favell, holds the record first wicket partnership for South Australia, 281 runs. He was the deserving winner of the Viscount Hampton Trophy in 1968-69, awarded for the most valuable South Australian player for this season.

In addition to his on-field contributions, John pitched in around the club in many different roles both in coaching and helping to run the club. While I understand that, in the most recent few years, his ill health slowed his involvement, he will be remembered fondly by everyone down at the Woodville District Cricket Club and by many others in the broader west. John is survived by his wife, Ruth, and his two daughters. My sincere condolences to the family and John's many former teammates, and friends.

**HUGHES, MS J.**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:26):** Today, I would like to talk about Jenny Hughes, a 40-year Soroptimist International member at Port Pirie. Over 40 years ago, Jenny Hughes formally entered the Soroptimist world in Whyalla where she helped establish Soroptimist International Whyalla. Jenny was a secondary school teacher and moved to Port Pirie to teach at Risdon Park technical high school, where she achieved deputy principal status. She retained her Whyalla membership as an attached member, often going to Whyalla or to Adelaide for regional meetings.

In 1983, Jenny assisted with the charter of the Port Pirie club and at the changeover dinner, the group celebrated their 36<sup>th</sup> birthday. Jenny's name is on the Soroptimist International Port Pirie regalia as the inaugural treasurer at the time of the club's charter on 11 June 1983. In the club's first

year, Jenny was appointed public officer when the constitution was registered and she still holds that role.

In 1990, Jenny mentored women in the Jamestown area and helped charter Soroptimist International Northern Highlands. Jenny has always been considered by club members as the fount of all knowledge in the Soroptimist world and justifiably so, as she has fulfilled important roles in all three levels of the organisation. Soroptimists believe in building the leadership, confidence and skills of women, so some positions are time limited; for example, presidents can only serve a maximum of two consecutive years. However, there are no recycling rules and Jenny has put her hand up for club president for a total of four years: 1989, 1990, 1995 and 2016.

There has not been one year in the 40 years of her service when Jenny did not hold a club responsibility. Secretaries are appointed by the president so everyone knows who to turn to, and Jenny served as club secretary from 2001 to 2007 and later in 2011, 2013 and 2014, a total of 10 years. In the region of South Australia, Jenny was president in 1993, treasurer from 1998 to 1999, and secretary from 2010 to 2012.

She has been rewarded for her dedication with life membership in the region. Jenny's passion is programming and, in 2001, while she was the Port Pirie secretary, she began her service as program/UN coordinator for the region of South Australia from 2001 to 2004. She served in the federation of the South West Pacific as assistant program director from 2006 to 2008 and became SISWP program director for four years from 2007 to 2010.

During this time, Jenny had the enormous privilege but huge responsibility of being on the board of Soroptimist International and was required to travel throughout the South West Pacific and all over the world. Jenny has always had the travel bug and, with her long-time friend Evonne, continues to enjoy travel expeditions, linking these to federation and international conferences. The Australian government has their diplomats travelling the world; Soroptimist International Port Pirie has its own diplomat in Jenny Hughes, making connections and lifelong friends. Jenny has attended every conference of clubs held in the South West Pacific federation every two years.

An outstanding part of her dedication as a Soroptimist is that Jenny has sometimes fulfilled a combination of roles at the same time over the three levels. The most obvious example of that is in 2010, when she was federation program director and region of SA secretary to support newly elected positions. That was also the year she was awarded Citizen of the Year by the Port Pirie Regional Council.

In 2016, Jenny again served as Soroptimist International Port Pirie president, and she is currently mentoring Kendall Jackson in that program. She has been the local ICT liaison officer and region representative for many years. Jenny has seen much change over the past 40 years and continues to learn and adapt to the new technologies and systems. When she was introduced as a member 40 years ago, Jenny made the commitment pledge of allegiance to soroptimism and the ideals for which it stands:

- The sincerity of friendship: Jenny has made lifelong friends among all present and past members of Soroptimist International Port Pirie and soroptimists across the world.
- The joy of achievement: Jenny has achieved so much through her commitment to Soroptimist International.
- The dignity of service: every day of her life for the past 40 years, Jenny has given service to Soroptimist International as a club member in Port Pirie doing environmental services, picking up other people's discarded rubbish as part of Clean Up Australia Day.
- The integrity of professions: as a professional educator, Jenny has excelled in her employment and volunteer roles.
- The love of country: as mentioned before, Jenny is an unpaid foreign minister and proud ambassador for Port Pirie and Australia throughout the world.

Jenny has put forth her greatest efforts to promote, uphold and defend these ideals. I am very privileged to know Jenny and very humbled by her dedication.

### RECYCLED WATER AUDIT

**Mr BROWN (Playford) (15:31):** I rise to speak today about the issue of clean drinking water, something that many in this chamber take for granted but something that residents of Mawson Lakes, including myself and my family, are now rightly concerned about. Following an application under the Freedom of Information Act, I was given access to internal SA Water documents that show that in 2018 SA Water had been alerted that a home in Mawson Lakes had for some years been sourcing its drinking water from the Mawson Lakes recycled water system.

This means that the occupants of this house had been drinking and bathing in water that the minister confirmed during estimates is sourced from recycled sewage. Further analysis revealed that the purple pipe from the house was connected to the mains potable water system and the pipe used for drinking water into the house was directly connected to the recycled water system. Documents also showed that, following the discovery of this misconnection—as it is called by SA Water—SA Water acted quite quickly to rectify the fault, and for this they are to be commended.

They also quickly convened what is known as an RCA meeting, which I am advised stands for 'root cause analysis'. This is a meeting of relevant experts who decide not only how an incident could have occurred but how to rectify it and how to make sure it does not happen again. The cause of the incorrect water connection to the home in Mawson Lakes remains unknown. Documents show that a conclusion was drawn that it seems so unlikely that an incident of this nature could have occurred by accident that it could in fact have been deliberately done by persons still unknown.

When the RCA meeting came to recommend solutions to ensure that such incidents did not recur, one of the most important recommendations was that a widespread audit be conducted of recycled water connections in the Mawson Lakes area. This suggestion was found by the group of experts to be not only appropriate given the circumstances but also cost-effective in nature. Sadly, no such follow-up audit appears to have been conducted. I am aware that the properties on either side of the home involved in this case have been checked, but it appears to have stopped right there.

I think that the Minister for Water needs to inform the public of who decided that such an activity was not worth the money and why they thought it so, given that SA Water is returning an increased dividend of millions of dollars to the Treasury. How many more instances of this type of mistake do we need to see before SA Water will finally decide to offer residents a free audit to give them peace of mind?

I would ask all members to contemplate this: you and your families could have spent years drinking recycled effluent instead of ordinary, decent drinking water. I urge the minister to change his mind about these audits and listen to the residents of Mawson Lakes, who are rightly concerned for the health of their families. I also urge the minister and indeed the government as a whole to stop penny pinching, stop fattening up SA Water and deliver peace of mind for my constituents.

### LYELL MCEWIN HOSPITAL

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:34):** Mr Speaker, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I am excited about the actions that the Marshall Liberal government are taking to improve health services and car parking at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Over the past couple of years, I have been blessed to meet many amazing doctors, nurses, hospital staff and volunteers in my King electorate from the Lyell McEwin and Modbury hospitals who have regularly provided me with feedback and are very dedicated and passionate about improving our healthcare system.

The feedback I received in King was very consistent before the state election: people wanted a government that would listen to the community and would advocate for better health services and facilities in our community. I would like to thank everyone in my King electorate for continuing to have their say and for regularly keeping in touch with me as we work together to improve our health system. As a result of my community's feedback, I was thrilled to recently join our Minister for Health and Wellbeing at the Lyell McEwin Hospital to announce the \$7 million expansion of the multideck car park facility at the hospital.

People in King have regularly told me that parking near the hospital has been an ongoing concern for them, especially for many in the local community who work and volunteer at the hospital. I, too, have struggled to find parking at the hospital. This expansion of 205 additional car parking

spaces will provide much-needed relief for our patients, staff and visitors to the hospital. The parking improvements the Marshall Liberal government are delivering will include full weather protection, lighting, signage and CCTV to ensure safety and security for all who use this facility.

The next step in delivering our commitment is to further consult our local community via a survey to seek views on what measures we can take to make the car parking safer and how to improve the availability of access to the hospital from car parks and public transport stops. The survey is open for two weeks; one week has already passed, so there is one more week for you to have your say. We want to hear your ideas on how we can make the hospital car park safer and more accessible. If anyone would like a copy of the survey link, please email me at [king@parliament.sa.gov.au](mailto:king@parliament.sa.gov.au) and I will certainly send it to you. There is a copy of this link on my Facebook page. I encourage my community to participate.

The construction works on the new \$7 million multideck car park at the Lyell McEwin Hospital will begin in September. Further to this commitment, in the budget estimates committee last week in parliament we discussed the planned works to transform the Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department to ensure that it can cope with the population growth planned for Adelaide's north. The state government is seeking approval for a \$58 million project, which involves expanding the existing car park before adding a three-level extension to the emergency department, along with adding a new purpose-built eight-bed short-stay mental health unit. Our plan will almost double the capacity of the emergency department to help cater for the increase in population.

We want to alleviate the pressure on the existing emergency department at Lyell McEwin Hospital, and our plan will deliver on this. As leaders and as a community, we are judged by how we look after our most vulnerable people. I am pleased to say that through the development of the new purpose-built eight-bed short-stay mental health unit, we will be providing a much-needed and more suitable care environment for mental health patients requiring a short stay. This will help to improve patient flow through the emergency department.

It is anticipated that construction will be scheduled to begin in early 2020 and is forecast to be completed in 2022. If you would like more information about our plan to upgrade the Lyell McEwin Hospital emergency department, with the new purpose-built eight-bed short-stay mental health unit, please email me at King. Mr Speaker, I thank you again for this opportunity to speak about what the Marshall Liberal government are doing to improve services for people living in King.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Mr Speaker, I call your attention to the state of the house.

**The SPEAKER:** A quorum not present, please ring the bells.

*A quorum having been formed:*

#### *Bills*

### **LIQUOR LICENSING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:40):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:40):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce the Liquor Licensing (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2019. The proposed amendments are largely in support of the review into the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, conducted by the Hon. Mr Tim Anderson QC in 2016, which led to the passage of the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Review) Amendment Act 2017 (the Liquor Review Act).

The Liquor Review Act has been commenced in stages and the final stage is proposed to commence on 18 November 2019. This will predominantly relate to the provisions that create new

licence classes that transition the current licence classes to those new classes. Considerable consequential work, including in relation to the drafting of regulations, is being undertaken in the Attorney-General's Department to prepare for the new licensing regime.

With one exception, it is proposed that the amendments that are the subject of this bill be passed by parliament and given royal assent prior to 18 November 2019 so that they may be commenced when the remaining provisions of the Liquor Review Act are proposed to commence. This is reflected in the commencement clause of the bill.

The commencement clause provides that the provision in the bill creating interstate direct sales licences as a new class of licence will commence on proclamation, as this provision will require the making of supporting regulations. The purpose of the proposed amendments, some of which are technical and some more substantive, include:

- to confer on the commissioner and the court the power to vary or revoke an exemption that has been granted by the commissioner or court or pursuant to a code of practice, but not statutory exemptions conferred by the Liquor Licensing Act itself. The commissioner considers that this would be a useful power to be able to exercise in appropriate circumstances;
- to provide for fines and expiation fees on breach of codes of conduct to reflect the level of potential risk and significance of the breach;
- to provide for a streamlined process whereby interstate licensed liquor retailers can obtain a licence in this state. These provisions are modelled on existing provisions in the Northern Territory's Liquor Act;
- to reflect omitted portions of Mr Anderson's recommendations in respect of on-premises licences, namely, that liquor be able to be sold to a resident of the licensed premises for consumption on or off the premises;
- to clarify the ability to impose annual fees for short-term licences;
- to confer power on the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner to refuse a name change for licensed premises. It would be a matter for the commissioner to determine when the name should be refused; for example, the commissioner might refuse a misleading name or an offensive name;
- to require a licensee to inform the commissioner of any changes to their contact details;
- to confer on the commissioner and the Licensing Court the ability to exempt a licensee from a mandatory condition or rule that applies to a licence (other than conditions imposed under section 42 of the Liquor Licensing Act). The commissioner considers that this would be another useful power to be able to exercise in appropriate circumstances;
- to introduce fines of a maximum of \$2,500 and expiation fees of \$210 for breaches of a direct sales licensee's obligation under section 107A(1) of the Liquor Licensing Act to indicate their licence number in any advertising and their obligation under section 107A(2) to require the prospective purchaser to notify the licensee of their date of birth;
- to clarify provisions relating to the display of copies of liquor licences on the licensed premises, including that a copy be readily visible to members of the public and be up to date; and
- to enable records of liquor transactions to be kept out of the state, for example, in servers located interstate.

For the benefit of members, I will now explain more complex provisions in the bill in more detail.

Currently under the Liquor Review Act, where a licensee sells liquor by a direct sales transaction to a person in the state the licensee can only dispatch and deliver the liquor between the hours of 8am and 9pm. This will be changed and clarified so that the obligation is only to deliver the liquor—the relevant factor—between the hours of 8am and 10pm. This will affect holders of the new

Interstate Direct Sales Licence, General and Hotel Licence, Club Licence, Packaged Liquor Sales Licence and Liquor Production and Sales Licence when they sell liquor by a direct sales transaction.

The extended time frame is consistent with the period that holders of general and hotel licences, club licences and packaged liquor sales licences will be able to sell liquor on their premises for consumption off the premises. This particular provision was the subject of consultation with Retail Drinks Australia.

The bill makes an amendment to section 50A of the Liquor Licensing Act. This is the provision that relates to the obligation to pay annual fees and contains complex escalating sanctions for non-payment, including the first suspension of the licence under section 50A(5) and then a revocation under section 50A(5b).

When the remainder of the Liquor Review Act commences on 18 November 2019, section 50A(5b) will have the effect that if a person does not comply with a default notice to pay an annual licence fee before the day it is due to be paid, the commissioner may revoke the licence. The bill will change that time frame to non-payment within 60 days of the service of a notice of suspension under section 50A(5a). This change is sought to ensure that any overdue and outstanding invoices are dealt with prior to the ensuing annual fee period, including the revocation of any licences.

As a further red-tape reduction measure, the bill proposes that a licensee should be able simply to notify the commissioner if the licensee has reduced the number of trading hours, or capacity of the premises or no longer trades under endorsements previously applicable to the licence. The commissioner would then vary the licence accordingly. Currently, they would have to formally apply to the commissioner to make this change. This is proposed to be a notification process only and licensees will not receive a pro rata refund of fees as this is not consistent with current practice.

The bill would enable the commissioner to place on the commissioner's website an application required to be advertised under the Liquor Licensing Act, and associated material. Practically speaking, any person would then be able to access the material. Currently, the commissioner is only obliged to make this information available for inspection by a 'person with a genuine interest', who then is restricted to using that information only for the purpose of making submissions to the commissioner under the Liquor Licensing Act or intervening in proceedings.

The removal of the reference to persons with a genuine interest is necessary to facilitate inspection via the website, as it will be virtually impossible to determine if the person inspecting has a 'genuine interest' in doing so. Such persons would, however, still be subject to the restrictions on using the information so inspected.

The Liquor Review Act will insert section 65A into the Liquor Licensing Act in November 2019. Section 65A applies where a number of incorporated associations, each of which is the holder of a club licence under the Liquor Licensing Act, seek to amalgamate under the Associations Incorporation Act 1985 as a new single incorporated association that is to carry on business at the licensed premises of one of amalgamating clubs.

This provision will allow the commissioner to revoke the club licences of the amalgamating clubs and grant a new club licence in respect of those premises in favour of the single incorporated association. However, where one of the amalgamating clubs also holds a gaming machine licence under the Gaming Machines Act 1992, the desire of the amalgamating clubs may be that the new single incorporated association should continue to have the benefit of that licence at the premises at which the gaming machine licence applied.

The difficulty is that, as section 65A is currently drafted, section 34 of the Gaming Machines Act relevantly provides that, where a liquor licence is revoked, any gaming machine licence held by the licensee in respect of the same premises will be taken to have also been revoked. This outcome is not intended by the government. The intent of the amendment to section 65A in the present bill is that, if an amalgamating club also holds a gaming machine licence, the club's liquor licence will not be revoked but a replacement licence will issue in the name of the new single incorporated body, thereby avoiding the revocation of the club's gaming machine licence.

Finally, the bill would enable a prescribed person to require production of proof of age only where the prescribed person reasonably suspects the other person is a minor. This was the position



that existed prior to 24 September 2018, when section 115 of the Liquor Licensing Act was amended by the liquor review act to remove this as a precondition to the exercise of the power.

Section 115 now applies to empower a prescribed person to require another person to produce evidence of their age simply if the other person is on, about to enter or in the vicinity of licensed premises or is, or has recently been, in possession of liquor. The commissioner considers that this power is excessive and open to misuse. SAPOL were also consulted on this amendment. I commend the bill to members and table a copy of the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

### **ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:51):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Associations Incorporation Act 1985. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:52):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Associations Incorporation Act 1985 (the act) regulates the creation, operation and dissolution of incorporated associations in South Australia. The act is administered by the Corporate Affairs Commission, which is part of Consumer and Business Services (CBS).

There are 20,904 incorporated associations registered in South Australia as at 30 June 2018. They represent diverse interests and groups in the community. The size and scale of activities range from special interest clubs who have few members and whose income is derived solely from subscriptions to large organisations that operate businesses. The act should be up to date with commercial and technological developments, and the purpose of this bill is to make minor administrative amendments that will support the transition to a new IT system for managing associations data by allowing for greater use of online forms and email communication.

Incorporated associations may already apply online to CBS to change their public officer details, request documents and lodge their annual returns. Statutory declarations are currently required to accompany applications for incorporation and applications for registration of proposed alterations to rules. The requirements for statutory declarations are incompatible with the development of online processing. It is therefore proposed to amend sections 19 and 24 of the act to remove the need for statutory declarations and to reduce administrative and compliance burdens.

It is further proposed to streamline the act by amending section 64 in order to also allow for service upon incorporated associations by email. To support these amendments, CBS will communicate directly in writing with registered incorporated associations about business process changes that will come with the amending act and developing a new IT system to manage their registration information.

CBS will more broadly communicate the changes via issuing a media release, placing information on the CBS website and within the CBS customer service centre. As well as liaising with key representative bodies, CBS client service officers will also be on hand to offer ongoing support on the basis, of course, that the parliament passes this legislation.

Incorporated associations make an important contribution to the community and to South Australia's economy. Regulations should not overburden associations, particularly small associations heavily reliant on volunteers. The amendments proposed in the bill aim to bring regulation into line with modern technology and business practice and promote greater participation in the affairs of incorporated associations by their members. I commend the bill to members and table the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gee.

**APPROPRIATION BILL 2019***Estimates Committees*

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:56):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr TRELOAR:** I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion carried.

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:56):** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr DULUK:** I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the minutes of proceedings be incorporated in the Votes and Proceedings.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:57):** I move:

That the proposed expenditures referred to Estimates Committees A and B be agreed to.

I thank members who participated in those sessions for their contributions. I thank the Deputy Leader of the Opposition for what I thought was, by and large, good decorum in the session that I was involved in. As she gets her notes together, I acknowledge the positive discussions we had about a couple of issues. I invite members to now proceed in the usual fashion with comments.

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:57):** I am the lead speaker for the opposition and I am happy to give a summary of my experience of the committee stage of the budget. I will confine myself to the estimates that I attended and participated in, rather than giving a fulsome summary at this stage of all the estimates, as entertaining as they were. I know that my colleagues will do an excellent job in doing that summary.

I start with yesterday. I was involved in nine hours' of estimates and I start with the second lot of 4½ hours, being the environment estimates yesterday afternoon. I was interested and concerned about some matters that were raised in that time. One matter raised was the question of rangers being appointed into the department. The minister has made much of the decision by the government that they will have more rangers—20 more rangers. In fact, I believe that the minister anticipates achieving those net additional 20 positions by the end of this year. Naturally, I have no objection to people being appointed into permanent positions as rangers within the department.

However, I am concerned that the department has had to bend itself out of shape to accommodate this election commitment, not least because there was absolutely no money given to the budget either last year or this year to pay for these additional rangers. Therefore, in the context of achieving significant savings in any case, the department has had to bend itself out of shape in order to get these positions filled as the minister has directed.

One of the issues, I think, that we are beginning to understand—and we expect to get more information from questions that were taken on notice—is about the pay level of the rangers. The chief executive, with the permission of the minister, spoke about the reprofiling of the workforce. I suspect it is there that we find the explanation to the otherwise mystifying decision to pay \$560,000 of public money to eight existing rangers to stop working while at the same time appointing, then, 18 new rangers, meaning a net increase at that point of only 10.

Why would a department do that? Number one is that they do not pay the TVSPs; Treasury do. They were not out of pocket, although the public are. I know that at least one of the rangers who was given a TVSP came from Kangaroo Island, and I know that at least one of the new rangers is being assigned to Kangaroo Island. Why would that have occurred? There was an interesting

discussion on ABC North and West a couple of weeks ago to that end, when the minister did not seem to have an explanation for why you would pay people to stop doing the job at the same time as recruiting people into the very same title of the position.

I think what has happened is that the wage profile of rangers has been dropped. The people who are coming in, the 18 who are coming in, are all or substantially coming into lower paid positions than those who have left. So the department have been able to make a saving by getting rid of experienced people being paid a decent salary and dropping the status and the level of the ranger workforce to a lower level because they have not been given any additional money despite the requirement to have additional staff.

Some of the new rangers, up until their recent appointment, have been graduate rangers, which is a two-year program at the end of which there is no guarantee of employment, and some of them had been on contract. I am concerned that there has been not quite a sleight of hand but a reduction in the status, the quality and the experience of the ranger workforce through using Treasury's generosity in paying for TVSPs, removing some of the more senior and experienced and expensive rangers and dropping the level.

I do not think that is consistent with the mantra from the minister that everything is about having more rangers. In fact, he is so keen on having more rangers that, in addition to the 20 new positions, there are people who have been doing maintenance and construction work whose title is now going to become 'ranger'. When I asked whether the maintenance and construction work was still going to be done either by someone new or by the same person, there was not a lot of clarity. I am looking forward to finding out more through questions having been taken on notice or through FOIs or through questions on notice. I am looking forward to understanding better exactly what this reprofiling of the ranger workforce means.

The Murray-Darling Basin, and specifically the Murray for South Australia, has been a very vexed topic for this minister. This minister is the only minister I am aware of in my time of observing politics as well as being in politics to have a royal commission finding that a decision he led was against the interests of the state, to have a finding that the minister did not act in the interests of South Australia in making an agreement with other states.

The minister defends that by saying that he knows better. He knows better than the people who advised him, whose department had written submissions to the royal commission saying that there was no need for additional socio-economic criteria to further bind up the criteria that a project must meet in order to receive funding to deliver water efficiency and therefore water down the Murray to us. He said, 'You just wait and see.'

Well, we waited from the January finding to now, and we are still waiting for a response to the royal commission. We waited from the January finding and the December decision, which the minister made which was so deeply criticised, to the end of June, when 62 gigalitres were due. None arrived. We are waiting to see whether the minister's gamble, for which he has been criticised by water experts in a royal commission, pays off. What we know is that the water coming down the Murray for the environment has dropped significantly. It is in the budget papers.

The minister was asked on ABC radio a few weeks ago: 'How much more water is there for the environment?' He said, 'I don't know how much more, but there's more, and gigalitres don't mean anything to your listeners anyway,' which is nonsense. But there is less, and there is less for two reasons: one, of course, is the drought. Of course there is less because of the drought, but also because every time we try to get more water from the Eastern States down the Murray we are checked by a federal government that is utterly on the side of Eastern States irrigators and utterly against the idea that there would be environmental water.

A National Party member of parliament only the other day said exactly the same thing, that the river is being wrecked because of water being needed for the environment, as if the river is not the environment. Because we have been unable to have a federal government show leadership since the conservatives have been in office, we have been unable to reset the way in which allocations are made and the way in which water is taken.

So when a drought inevitably occurs—and the one we are having now is awful and the next one we have will probably be even worse—we do not have the underpinning of efficiency and an appreciation of the importance of water coming all the way through to the mouth that means that the river is stable. The river is under dire threat and, when you look further up at the Darling, it is heartbreaking. The Darling is in the process of dying. If we are incapable of fixing that, then we are sacrificing current generations of irrigators, as well as future generations, and all those who depend on the Murray-Darling.

But here is the thing: I am not sure the minister has read the royal commission report, and I am not sure the minister has read the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. I say that because there was an exchange that I did not expect to have, when I asked about the additional socio-economic criteria that were signed off by the ministerial council, that he agreed to and that caused the very serious criticism by the royal commission. He said that they are not additional socio-economic criteria because there were no socio-economic criteria.

The Murray-Darling Basin Plan very clearly says that there must be no negative socio-economic impact and that it be measured through the willing participation of the water holder, the consumptive user, the irrigator. If they participate willingly, then that is proof of no socio-economic harm. That is the test—it is in the law—the plan being a legislative instrument. The royal commission, in criticising the additional socio-economic criteria, which run to several pages and which are very difficult for any project to completely fulfil, stated that they are going to cause a big problem in being able to have projects approved because they are additional to what is a very reasonable, straightforward and legislated approach to judging whether the socio-economic criteria have been met.

The fact that he disputed that these were additional disturbed me and surprised me, but it made me wonder, as I say, about the reason that we do not have an answer, a response by this government, to the royal commission six months after receiving it. Imagine if, when I was the minister for child protection, I had taken six months to respond to the Nyland royal commission. Imagine if I had taken six months and that royal commission had criticised me personally for a decision I had chosen to make. Imagine how the other side would have viewed that, quite rightly, as an inability to deal with a document that is of serious weight and has been critical of a government minister.

However, neither of those things happened. They were not personally criticised at all—and responded to expeditiously, seriously and quickly. This government has not responded for six months. This government has a minister who does not think there are socio-economic criteria in the Murray-Darling Basin Plan to which he has added complexity in the decision that was criticised by the royal commission.

Another area that we canvassed was the waste levy. The waste levy is going to cause all sorts of pain politically for this government. An increase of 40 per cent in the bin tax is very hard for anyone to swallow and very hard for anyone to accept as necessary and justified. But I am interested in reducing waste and I am interested in the problems that we have in our pattern of producing, consuming and disposing. I am very concerned about what is happening to this planet and our use of materials, our waste of materials, and the way in which we treat materials is a big part of the challenges we are seeing and visiting upon the next generations.

I did not ask, 'Why did you lift the waste levy? Will you not lift the waste levy? Why have you done this to councils?'. They are legitimate questions, but I did not ask them. I asked, 'What is your target for the reduction in solid waste to landfill? What is the plan?' There is not one. 'What is the modelling that says if you raise the waste levy by this much you will see that reduction in waste?' There is not any. I wait with great interest the answer to the question that was taken on notice. The question was: 'If you expect this to work and you are doing it because you want to reduce waste to landfill, how much of a tapering down of waste to landfill have you factored into the amount of money that you have booked to receive as a result of the increase?'

I will be very interested to see that modelling and whether there is much, if any, reduction in the expectation of waste to landfill, because if there is not a significant 40 per cent decrease in the waste to landfill commensurate with the 40 per cent increase in the levy, then this is about revenue, not about waste. This is about seeing an instrument where you can get more money in and leaning hard on that lever.

It is not about actually dealing with the challenges that we have in our use, in our production and in our disposal of materials. I will be very interested to see what happens. I think this minister has been used by the Treasurer to create a bit of a cash cow, to take some more money in, but not for the purpose that the waste levy ought to have of having a commensurate decrease in the amount of waste going to landfill.

I turn to education, another subject of which I am very fond and in which I am very interested. The minister just talked about relatively interesting discussions, and there were some good discussions over the course of the 4½ hours. However, there were some points of concern in the interaction that we had, and because I am in the opposition I will focus on those. First of all, in early childhood, I think that we are yet to show leadership on early childhood in Australia. Former premier Jay Weatherill did an extraordinary job in focusing attention on early childhood when he was both education minister and premier. He knew that those first years, the first 1,000 days and then the first five years of life, are crucial for the path that a child will have for the rest of their lives.

The development of children's centres, the bringing together of early childhood with education, making sure that people are being paid appropriately and trained appropriately, making sure that we had the national quality initiatives so that we had the right ratio of staff to students—excellent, but there is another step to go. That step is that we need to offer a quality early childhood education program to children from the age of three at least. People who do not know that are not really paying attention to what is necessary for not only early childhood but our school performance and the future.

When the federal Labor opposition went to the election, they committed to it. This government are not interested. They are not interested in doing the work required to work out how we expand the number of three year olds receiving early childhood education programming. A report presented to the ministerial council, of which the minister is a member, makes it very clear: forget doing better in NAPLAN, PISA or finishing high school if you are not going to do something about early childhood because the trajectory for kids who do not do well is set then. I was disappointed that the minister was not more interested in engaging in that.

We see a retreat in schools from NAPLAN Online, unsurprisingly given the very chaotic week that a whole lot of kids went through here and interstate. I am curious, though, that the interstate ministers seem very willing to be quite aggressive about this, to take it up to the federal government, to point out that the federal government has been incapable of providing a NAPLAN Online that works. Trials have failed, and this is when South Australia had the highest proportion of students in the public system sitting NAPLAN Online in all Australia.

It is not working properly. I recall when it was first happening. I had some insight not only because schools get in touch with the opposition when these things happen but also because my daughter was going through the last round of NAPLAN for her, and she experienced disruption as well. I recall the minister saying, 'Well, we shouldn't catastrophise this. It doesn't really matter. Don't overemphasise NAPLAN,' as if that were the way he spoke about NAPLAN in opposition.

I am not overemphasising NAPLAN: the minister and his department are. The minister and his department are using it to assess how schools are going in their performance. They are categorised according to NAPLAN and, if they are high schools as well, the SACE completions and SACE marks. For primary schools, it is only NAPLAN that puts them in the school improvement model. Is the minister going to reflect on the inadequate performance of the system so that these schools are being judged not only on NAPLAN this year? I do not know.

There are two elements that I really wanted to know about that I could not get out of the minister—firstly, how much capital money is being spent on moving year 7 into the secondary setting. It is a simple question. I have asked it twice on notice and just had words back, no numbers. I asked it in estimates. I asked how many schools were going to need capital spend and how many needed general learning areas, what we call classrooms. There was no answer. He does not want to say. I think the reason he does not want to say is that so much of the Building Better Schools money for high schools is being used to move year 7.

As I have long said, I do not resent the minister moving year 7, given that he made an election commitment and he was up-front about it: I resent money that was destined to build performing arts

spaces, more science spaces, language spaces and gymnasiums being used for classrooms for year 7s who have classrooms down the road. I think that is why I am not being given a straight answer, but I am going to persist.

The other area where I was trying to get clarity was: who are the 200 people who left the education department last year? There were only 1,200 staff in the education head office and, of those, 200 were given TVSPs. We asked on an FOI what jobs they were doing, and the job titles were redacted as if that were personal information. We do not want their names. We do not want to match their names and salaries; we just want to know what jobs they were doing that are not happening anymore. But, no, they were redacted.

I asked the minister. He referred three or four times in three or four different questions about how savings have been achieved to the fact that he has fewer staff from the department in his ministerial office. That is not giving me 200 FTE. I want to know what is not happening. As easy as it is to say, 'Oh, bureaucracy, head office, bureaucracy,' head office supports the schools. What head office does not do, the principals find themselves doing.

There is another \$48 million worth of cuts coming: \$12 million, \$12 million, \$12 million, \$12 million out of head office. Where is it coming from? The answer I received was, 'Well, we're working on that. We're working on it.' What have you already stopped doing? 'Well, we're having a look at it.' What about the incident management division, or human resources support for principals, which the minister seemed to think was only about helping with poor performance? Human resources does a lot of work for principals. Of course they do: that is where the staff are and where the students are.

What about communications? IT might be handy, given the difficulties with NAPLAN Online. No idea. The minister would not tell me, he did not take it on notice and has redacted an FOI. Why? Why not just say, 'We decided that these 200 staff were not necessary and that schools can absorb the work they were doing'? Be up-front. There was an interesting line of questioning which the minister had no knowledge was going to be asked and therefore took on notice.

There is something going on with special options in the northern suburbs of Adelaide. Special options are when a child with a disability of varying degrees might be better out of mainstream. Many children with a disability fit well in mainstream, but some may be taken out of mainstream in order to be in a special class, or in a unit in a school, or even at a special school. There appear to be a lot more students who qualify for those options than places for them to go.

There appears to have been a shift in what the department said about how those students would be supported in mainstream. Initially, it was no problem. If they were going to go to a special class, then you would automatically get this level of support, and if they were going to go to a special school, you would automatically get this level. A few months later, it would be, 'No, we have changed that. You are going to have to assess them one by one for the additional assistance they need.' Why is that? Is that part of the \$48 million saving? Why is this happening?

I appreciate that the minister would not necessarily be familiar with that level of detail, but I would be very interested to hear about the response he receives from the department in preparing the question on notice. Similarly, questions have been raised with me about the importance of students who have a disability being able to go on to work options and study options after school. The member for Light talked about this in his grievance earlier today. I am hearing concerning stories about how those students are being looked after at present and whether there is not as much support as there had been. If that is true, that is a tragedy.

Students have a good and supported experience in school. As long as they have the right funding, schools do a very good job for all their students, including students with a disability. If that transition is not being supported, I fear for the future of those young people, who deserve, as much as any other young person, to go on to study or to go on to work. The final area that I will canvass of the nine-hour extravaganza I had is TAFE. Let's go back.

Last year, the minister announced that several TAFE campuses would be closing and then a few months ago said, 'Actually, not all of them.' Still Port Adelaide—thanks very much—but not Urrbrae. He said, 'We have already closed the one up in Tea Tree Gully and we have already closed the one in Parafield, but we are going to keep Urrbrae and a couple of others.' This was in the context

of signing a memorandum of understanding with private providers to be able to use the facilities. Watch how that works. I have had concerned people from TAFE raise that with me.

However, Gilles Plains TAFE was not on that list. According to what the minister announced last year and this year in the 'saving' of a couple of campuses, there was no reason to think there was a problem with Gilles Plains TAFE. Yet Renewal SA held a public meeting a few months ago where they showed people the development around the Gilles Plains TAFE and had, over the Gilles Plains TAFE, open space and housing. The local member, the member for Torrens, questioned that. 'Isn't that TAFE?' 'Well, we're going to be looking at rezoning.'

So we went to the website for Renewal SA. Renewal SA has a contract with a company to do a preliminary site investigation that can be provided to future purchasers looking at the TAFE campus with a view to having it rezoned residential. I know that because there was a public meeting and there is a public website and there is a private company that has been employed by Renewal SA. Do you know who did not know about that? The minister responsible for TAFE.

How does that happen? How does Renewal SA and its minister start a process that ends with closure, demolition and building over the top of a TAFE campus that is a really good TAFE campus? It has dental training and vet nurse training. How is that minister not informed by his colleague that that is on the cards. I felt for the minister. He was genuinely surprised to hear it. He had no idea that that was the proposal that Renewal SA was marching towards. It is a mystery.

The minister says, 'That's okay. That won't be happening.' Won't it? He did not know that it was even being proposed, so what confidence can people have who might be receiving this preliminary site investigation as future purchasers or future developers of the land should it become residential? Would they not have reason to have confidence that that is in fact what Renewal SA wants to do? We shall watch that with interest. I would like to commend the member for Torrens who, when seeing the map at that open meeting, asked, 'Isn't that TAFE that you have a big green square over?' We shall watch that with interest.

There is much more to be thought about and understood. I have a picture of a fairly chaotic government that is not quite sure what it is doing or in what direction it is going. They are often supported by very good public servants—almost entirely—who are thorough, knowledgeable and try to keep them safe, yet they did not know that TAFE was being proposed for redevelopment and had not remembered that there are in fact socio-economic criteria already in the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

They were very proud to have new rangers. It does not matter that they are going to be really low-paid rangers for a while. That is okay. It does not matter that we are going to be renaming some people doing some other work as rangers as well.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** Then there are volunteer rangers. They want volunteer rangers as well.

**Dr CLOSE:** They are now looking for volunteer rangers. They were a little surprised to be asked a question about Friends of Parks striking on Kangaroo Island. They were a bit surprised. 'Striking?' They were very upset. Apparently that is all our fault, member for Mawson. It has nothing to do with the current minister who has been in there for 16 months.

It was interesting for only a second round of estimates in a government. It was interesting how many cracks are starting to show. Although we support the bill, I look forward to hearing from my colleagues in their summaries of their experiences in their estimates.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:28):** I rise to make a contribution about the conduct of the Appropriation Bill, in particular through the committee stage, or the estimates committee process as we more commonly know it. This is now the second estimates committee process that we have seen under this government. I think parliament and the people of South Australia in general were very much looking forward to seeing how ministers in the Marshall Liberal government would be conducting themselves during the estimates process because, of course, they were the ones who had complained for many years about the conduct of estimates.

They said it was a process that was not in fact designed to provide information to the house, and more particularly information about the expenditure of moneys within different portfolio areas, as set out in the bill. We were therefore looking forward to a substantially different approach to the estimates committee process from that of ministers under the Marshall Liberal government.

I have had the privilege of witnessing the estimates committee process for many, many years—certainly as a member of parliament, in the hot seat for some time as a minister, and for many years before that as a ministerial adviser. I remember some advice given to me by a former minister, by a former employer, who said that you can always tell those ministers who were confident in how across their brief they were because they did not feel the need to make an opening statement and they did not feel the need to take Dorothy Dixers from members of their own side in order to run down the clock.

I have been surprised, I have to say, by the approach by some ministers in this government who you would expect better of, who ostensibly are lacking such confidence in their own brief, lacking such confidence in their grip on what is going on within their portfolios, that they feel the need not only to make opening statements but also to take Dorothy Dixers questions from their own side, none more so than the Treasurer, who has been a member of parliament since 1982. Admittedly, and I am sure not through design or direct fault of his own, he has spent the vast majority of those 37 years in parliament in opposition.

Notwithstanding that, he has been a minister, firstly, for education, then treasurer and then the long period once again in opposition before becoming Treasurer again. To his credit, he did not feel the need to make an opening statement, but he did feel the need to take Dorothy Dixers during questioning, which I was very surprised by. I was particularly surprised not because those particular questions he was asked were designed to make a particular political point, or designed to try to speed up, I guess, the political pointscoring or the political progress the Liberal government was making against the Labor opposition or even the former Labor government: they were merely designed to run down the clock.

In one respect, during the second Dorothy Dixers that the Treasurer was asked, when he spoke for nearly seven minutes about medical malpractice claims, which are currently being handled by the South Australian Insurance Corporation, a division of the government's South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA), he made the extraordinary claim that, while SAFA has been responsible through its subsidiary, SAicorp, for managing and paying out medical malpractice claims for doctors working in the public sector, I think he listed that in the last (and I am sure this is not exactly the right figure, but it goes to show the point he was making) 10, 15, or 20 years \$140 million worth of medical malpractice claims have been paid out by SAFA on claims made against the performance of doctors in the public system and that that has now changed, an extraordinary change according to the Treasurer.

Apparently, in the 2018-19 financial year there has been a massive drop-off in medical malpractice claims, and the claims that have been made have attracted a maximum accounting expense of only a few hundred thousands dollars. I think that it was \$470,000-odd. The insinuation seemed to be from the Treasurer that, merely because he was Treasurer and merely because the member for Dunstan is Premier and merely because the Hon. Stephen Wade is now health minister, the performance of doctors in the public health system has so radically improved that medical malpractice claims have dwindled and that the expense against those claims estimated by SAFA has also reduced very substantially.

Of course, it only takes somebody who presumably has reached adult age and who is responsible for taking out an insurance policy to know—presumably the other million plus South Australians in the community—that the mere lodgement of a claim and the cost of receiving and filing that claim, which is what I believe the Treasurer to be referring to, does not equate to the final cost of the payout of those claims.

So his claim that because of his stewardship the cost of medical malpractice claims is going down in South Australia remains to be tested, because of course these claims can run for many, many years, particularly the more expensive ones. We look forward to that. The point is not necessarily about the costs of the claims; it was that the Treasurer felt that he needed to take up six



to seven minutes of the committee's time running down the clock because he did not like the direction of the questions being put to him by the opposition.

However, that was the better of the experiences of Dorothy Dixers. The first Dorothy Dixer that was asked—in my recollection, by the member for Narungga—was about the wage claims that were being put to the government by industrial groups and by public sector employees or representatives of public sector employees. I think it was meant to be another process of modest table thumping by the Treasurer to try to establish his bona fides in holding the line against excessive claims for pay rises by public sector employees.

Of course, it then led to an extended line of questioning from the opposition about the 6 per cent pay increase that had had been awarded to his media adviser, Ms Belinda Heggen—an \$8,000 a year pay increase. Understandably, the committee thought, 'If you think that a 3 per cent pay rise for teachers in South Australia is too much, why are you paying the individual, whom you charge with the responsibility of briefing against the interests of teachers out in the media, a pay rise approximately 40 per cent higher than the rise the teachers are claiming?'

The extraordinary response from the Treasurer about why his media adviser deserved an \$8,000 or 6 per cent pay rise each year, as opposed to what the government is proposing to pay teachers, was that Ms Heggen now has an important job to do, that is, to act as the Treasurer's delegate in considering and making approvals for government advertising. It is absolutely remarkable. Not only has the Treasurer said that he will convene and chair a political committee to consider political advertising campaigns—the very thing he railed against when he was in opposition—but he has now appointed a delegate, a political staffer, to take on that responsibility for him.

When he was asked what work value assessment had been undertaken into the workload of his media adviser and whether it would justify an \$8,000 a year pay increase, he said that he did it. Of course, we would like to see this work value assessment, and of course he had to admit that, well, perhaps he had not actually done one. I think he said that it was just done in his own mind and that he arrived at that being a reasonable figure. Well, good luck to the Treasurer's media adviser.

Unfortunately, her case was not as well made as that of the senior adviser to the Deputy Premier, Madeleine Church, who is not in receipt of an \$8,000 a year pay increase: she is in receipt of a pay increase of more than \$20,000 a year. The Deputy Premier tried to justify that by saying that she has had a change of role. Really? I wonder which portfolio responsibilities have changed for that staff member in order to warrant a \$20,000 a year pay increase. I do not think the portfolio responsibilities have changed. I think there might have been the insertion of one word in a gazettal notice—'senior' before the term 'adviser'—but I do not think anything else has changed.

That goes to show the double standard that this government is guilty of holding: there is one rule for hardworking teachers and there is another rule for those people closest to the Liberal government ministers who are charged with advising them. Those people who are closest to those ministers can expect generous pay rises when they have the wherewithal to ask for them. If only teachers were so lucky.

I have spoken to a lot of teachers in my electorate, teachers at schools like Seaton High School, Westport Primary School, West Lakes Shore primary school and Grange Primary School. They all think that they are entitled to reasonable pay increases commensurate with the ever-increasing workload that is being pushed onto them as teachers by the education department, particularly principals but also teachers. They are in receipt of an increasing workload. What they are not in receipt of is a commensurate pay increase from this government.

It was not just the Premier and his response to those Dorothy Dixers that raised eyebrows from the opposition; it was also the faux consultation process entered into between the government and the opposition. The estimates schedule was released and there was a request from the government: 'Do you have any suggested changes you would like to make?' Suggested changes are made, not to ask for more time in total, but perhaps a redistribution of the time between lines of inquiry for the estimates committee. They were transmitted to the government and the government summarily rejected each and every inquiry.

Despite questioning opening for the Treasurer at 9 o'clock in the morning and closing off again at 5 o'clock in the afternoon, some seven or so hours including lunch breaks, tea breaks and so on, only two of those seven or so hours were dedicated to Treasury and Finance. Instead, we had hours upon hours dedicated to areas like Shared Services, SafeWork SA, ReturnToWorkSA and Fleet SA, of course. These were all matters of such importance for the government that huge amounts of time needed to be dedicated towards them, at the expense of the Treasury and Finance portfolio.

The Treasury and Finance portfolio deserved some inquisition in the estimates committee process because we have the extraordinary situation of the government facing an internal revolt over its planned changes for land tax aggregation. There is uncertainty within the government, not just from their own backbench but apparently, as we learnt today from the media, within their own cabinet about what landholdings are liable for land tax, and that is under the current law, not under the proposed legal changes.

We have a situation where we have two ministers apparently in conflict in the same media article about what the land tax obligations are for land ownerships held ostensibly by the same person but under differently named ownerships. That is remarkable. There are serious questions for both the Premier and the minister to answer, particularly the minister about whether he is meeting his current land tax obligations.

We had a confession from the Treasurer that no external work, no independent advice, was sought by the Department of Treasury and Finance before cabinet made the decision to introduce this land tax aggregation measure. It is now hurriedly having to be engaged by the Department of Treasury and Finance: a Big Four accounting firm we are told, as well as an individual accountant who, according to the Treasurer, is very practised at setting up these mechanisms to try to minimise land tax liabilities.

How extraordinary. Here we are, nearly in August, nearly six weeks after the release of the budget, and Treasury is having to procure this advice. How much is the advice going to cost? Apparently it is uncapped. Was there a market call for it? No, it was a direct approach. Both are in clear breach of the procurement guidelines that all governments and all government agencies must adhere to.

Speaking of not knowing their obligations, the Minister for Human Services, Michelle Lensink, held on to Healthscope shares during the first 16 or so months of this government at the same time that services were being put to market by the government, that cabinet was arriving at decisions to put health services to market, where Healthscope was clearly either a registered tender responder or was likely to be. That is remarkable.

Did she furnish the parliament with appropriate answers about what steps she had taken to maintain her shareholding, divest herself of that shareholding or at least divulge that shareholding to the Premier and to the cabinet while these discussions were being held? She refused to answer the question. She refused to answer the question that would have established whether she had a clear conflict of interest or whether she did not. She could have exonerated herself. Maybe she would have been worthy of exoneration in this matter if only she had the wherewithal to be up-front and answer those questions in the parliament, but apparently she was not.

Of course, when it came to not answering questions, we had the Minister for Transport who, despite it being made clear to him and to everybody else in the estimates committee that they enjoyed the full privileges and immunities of the parliament, refused to answer questions about a chief executive who apparently had been stood down as a result of an investigation by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption. We will not know whether or not this is the case because, despite the parliament being covered by these privileges and immunities, we are refused by this government any indication about what is going on.

The Deputy Premier, who purports to be a lawyer of some standing, waded into this area after last year's estimates and, I have to say, nearly very quickly hastened the journey of the member for Heysen or even the member for Kavel into those portfolio responsibilities of attorney-general. If and when that happens, we will look forward to it. In fact, I think the state would look forward to it

because they will get much better service out of an attorney-general, but the Minister for Transport refused to answer those questions.

Last, of course, is the Premier. The Premier is the head of a government of which there are members who have stood in this place in recent weeks and made contributions about threatening and intimidating behaviour and that it had to end. We even had the Speaker stand and reiterate those concerns, that this sort of behaviour needs to stop and that there needs to be greater civility in this place. I think it is something we can all aspire to.

Then, of course, the member for Badcoe had to draw the Premier's attention to what she had heard being exchanged during the changeover of advisers during an estimates committee. That was denied by the Premier, yet, strangely, I think the next morning he contradicted that and perhaps confirmed that there had been some use of an inappropriate term by him.

I provide these little vignettes of the estimates committee as we have had to endure them over the past week. This is a government that promised to be different but is worse. The ministers sought to protect themselves by making opening statements and taking Dorothy Dixers, and when they took those Dorothy Dixers they embarrassed themselves and the positions of their own ministerial offices and ministerial staff. There is a culture of ministers being unwilling to provide information to the house when reasonably asked.

It could be open for the opposition to agitate for change, to say that we need to change the estimates process to make it more accountable to the public. That might be something that we are interested in because we refuse to be the bovine-like supplicants we saw in the last term of parliament: 'Oh well, it's estimates. I'll ask a couple of questions in a monotone and if I get an answer or if I don't get an answer, whatever; it's time to go home.' That is not the approach we will take. We will be interested in information and we look forward to continuing the debate on this matter.

**Mr PICTON:** Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (16:50):** I also rise to make some comments in regard to the pretty lacklustre performance we saw from the government in terms of this year's estimates committees. The first estimates committee I was a part of was in relation to the member for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Kurna, just a moment. I bring the house to order, please. The member for Kurna has the call.

**Mr PICTON:** The Minister for Human Services was the first minister who I sat in on for estimates, and she partook in a complete mockery of the process. What was revealed was the minister's significant conflict of interest and, I believe, the minister's breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct. It is not the first time under this government that we have seen a minister breaching the Ministerial Code of Conduct, but what has occurred in relation to the Minister for Human Services is a very clear breach.

Her shareholdings are three times that of any other minister of this government. She has declared over 30 shares in a wide range of different companies that are on the register, and it seems quite clear that at least one of those shareholdings has had quite a significant conflict of interest with her work as the Minister for Human Services and also her work has a minister of the cabinet. Members will recall that the Ministerial Code of Conduct makes quite clear that ministers should dispose of shareholdings that they have within 14 days of becoming a minister. If ministers do not do that, it is quite clear that they should not buy or sell shares during the time when they are a minister.

What happened is that the minister owned shares in Healthscope, a private hospital company but also a company that provides a wide range of different services in her human services portfolio specifically. The government then embarked upon a process of privatising a whole range of different public sector public hospital patients to private hospitals. It embarked on this over a significant period of months and has now signed contracts with 13 different providers across South Australia to deal with those patients.

Five of those 13 contracts are with hospitals run by Healthscope, so five of those hospitals have a very clear conflict of interest with the shareholdings of the Minister for Human Services. Both the member for Hurtle Vale and I asked a number of questions in relation to the minister's shareholdings, which she mostly refused to answer in their entirety, and eventually got an admission from the minister that she sold those shares.

She said she did not have any choice in the matter due to the company being bought out, but the Ministerial Code of Conduct is quite clear about situations such as those where there might be extraordinary circumstances. Normally it says you are not allowed to buy or sell shares, but it says that if there are extraordinary circumstances you need the Premier's agreement to that beforehand. Of course, we asked: did she get the Premier's approval as per the Ministerial Code of Conduct? The answer was, 'I'm not going to answer that.' We asked it again. 'I'm not going to answer that.' We asked it again. 'I'm not going to answer that.'

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

**Mr PICTON:** It was a complete dodge, as the member for Mawson says. It was a complete mockery of her responsibility to the parliament and a complete mockery of her responsibilities under the Ministerial Code of Conduct. This is something the opposition is going to be continuing to take seriously. We have taken it to question time again today in the other place and here, getting once again non-answers on this.

But we are going to take this up with other relevant authorities who have the power to pull documents, pull records, and find out the truth about whether the minister breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct, as appears very clear from the fact of the transactions that took place whether she properly absented herself from discussions in the cabinet and elsewhere in relation to private hospital contracting for public patients and whether she took measures that protected the taxpayers of South Australia and the government in relation to her dealings within her own portfolio in regard to human services where Healthscope provide a wide range of services in that area. All these questions are unanswered. We have started to get a bit of information through the estimates process, but the minister's complete lack of answers to these important questions is something that we are going to take much, much further.

I then had that afternoon the Minister for Health before Estimates Committee B, and it was quite telling. You really know when they are worried about a minister because they put them on Friday night when the journos have done their stories and no-one is paying attention. That is the timeslot that the Minister for Health gets in the estimates program devised by the government.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PICTON:** That's right. I am sure that if they could have organised it on Melbourne Cup Day at 3 o'clock they would have done that. Whatever time would hide the Minister for Health getting any scrutiny before this parliament is what this government would organise. So on Friday night from 2 o'clock until 6.15pm, I believe, the Minister for Health was before the estimates committee. Of course, those four hours that the minister was subjected to are significantly less than previous health ministers in previous health portfolios were subjected to.

I went back and looked at the records of the last term of the parliament, and the health portfolio, on average, had 4½ hours. This government has chopped half an hour off that to try to avoid a bit more scrutiny. So we have over \$6 billion worth of expenditure, about a third of the state budget, and the government is burying it away on a Friday night. They have cut down the amount of time for which the minister is subjected to questioning in estimates.

The other thing that was very clear from the estimates process was (a) how he was basically not answering any questions, and (b) how he abused, and the government abused, Dorothy Dixers to chew up a significant amount of those four hours over the time. What was quite interesting this time was the tactic, which I have not seen before in practice, of the minister now coordinating his Dorothy Dixers with the public servants. It was quite an incredible thing to see.

Every single time a Dorothy Dixer was asked by the government, not only did the minister have a pre-prepared answer but the senior public servants at the table had a pre-prepared answer as well. The minister would read out his attempt to soak up the time and would then say, 'Public

servant X, would you have anything to contribute?' and, funnily enough, that public servant would have some pre-prepared notes ready to read out on that subject.

So here we have public servants, who are required by the Public Sector Act in this state to act impartially, to act fearlessly and to act independently from the government of the day, partaking in the minister's attempt to avoid scrutiny in question time. This is something that we will be investigating a bit further, and we will look at the coordination that occurred in this regard. It was a very clear attempt. Every single time there was a Dorothy Dixier, we got a double-barrelled human shield answer to protect the minister from scrutiny. That happened time and time again. It was so farcical at one stage that the member for Waite—who does his best to shield the minister every single time we have these estimates committees—

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** It is a protection racket.

**Mr PICTON:** It is a protection racket, as the member for Mawson says. The member for Waite said, 'The member for Newland is seeking the call,' but the member for Newland was not even paying attention. He was not even looking. It was a complete farce. It was a complete attempt to soak up the time and ensure that he was not subjected to questions. But despite the reduced time, despite the soaking up of time with Dorothy Dixers, despite the Friday night timeslot, we did question the minister on a range of very important subjects in this very important area.

We kicked off in relation to comments that week from the Chief Executive of SA Health in relation to his ride along in an ambulance, when Dr Chris McGowan went on an ambulance and, funnily enough, found himself ramped. That would not be a surprise to anybody because ramping has doubled over the past 16 months of this government. Our paramedics and our patients are finding themselves ramped twice as often as ever before and twice as often as 16 months ago. It is not a surprise.

The surprise was that the Chief Executive of SA Health said that he was very bored with the situation and so he went home. That is not something that anybody else in that situation can do. That is not something that any of the patients can do. That is not something that any of the paramedics can do. They cannot just go home. The doctors and nurses cannot just go home. But the chief executive, who is being paid a total remuneration package of \$560,000 a year by this government says, 'I'm bored. I'm going to go home.' Well, I think that that stinks, and not only do I think that but there has been an outpouring of concern about this on social media.

We have heard that a number of SA Health staff wrote that they have lost confidence in their chief executive. This is the chief executive who is directly responsible for the SA Ambulance Service under the act—they report directly to the chief executive—and their staff have now lost confidence in him. We asked the minister about this. This would have been an opportunity to get the chief executive to respond to these claims and be able to answer them, but he did not want to do that. He answered for the chief executive, as is his right to do under standing orders, and said that he was happy that the chief executive got out of his ivory tower.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** He got back there pretty quickly when he found out that he was ramped.

**Mr PICTON:** That's right: when he was ramped, he was bored and got back there. But that is how this minister views his own chief executive—as living in an ivory tower. I thought what he said before the estimates committee was absolutely stunning. It became quite clear that the government's care, the government's knowledge in terms of the issues facing our Ambulance Service, is almost non-existent. Issues about the maintenance of vehicles we raised: the government said that they do not know anything about it. Issues about performance times: they do not know anything about it. Issues about reports, which we understand the government has before them and which recommend significant numbers of extra staff: 'We can't talk about that.'

This is an ambulance service that is under pressure it has never been under before. We have the union going to the Industrial Relations Court to try to get the government to actually implement their own enterprise bargaining agreement in terms of the breaks and entitlements that our hardworking paramedics are entitled to, but the government washes their hands of it, they are bored of it, they do not want to answer questions about it.

We also had a discussion in relation to KordaMentha. It was very telling from the Premier's estimates hearing a couple of days prior, which the Auditor-General attended, that the contract the government signed with KordaMentha to do their initial work in relation to the Central Adelaide Local Health Network is under investigation by the Auditor-General. That is a very startling admission and it goes to the fact that this government appears to have broken a whole series of state procurement guidelines in their signing up KordaMentha basically with no process behind it whatsoever, without going through the proper processes. So keen were they to sign this million-dollar initial contract with KordaMentha that the rule book went out the window.

That is something that we know is now under investigation by the Auditor-General. We know that the government has been asked for documents in relation to that from SA Health. The minister would not say whether all those documents have now been provided. He would not say whether staff have been interviewed by the Auditor-General in relation to this. I think that is something this parliament is going to need to have a continuing close eye on in relation to what appears to be a very dodgy arrangement in how that contract was signed up to.

While that is happening, we have KordaMentha—who are getting paid, as of this point, well over \$20 million, but it looks like they will probably get up to \$50 million by the time they are finished—going around cutting services, cutting staff and cutting dollars out of our healthcare system. We asked the minister about a document we obtained under FOI that pointed to TVSP payments, TVSP arrangements that KordaMentha were discussing with Treasury in relation to CALHN staff.

The minister did not seem to know anything about it, he claimed. He had to take it all on notice: 'This is a matter for Treasury to look at.' Well, this is your health department, you are in charge of this and here we have the minister deflecting knowledge of it. We need to know how many staff are going to lose their jobs, how much that arrangement is going to cost taxpayers and how hospitals that are already under the pump are going to be able to cope without a significant number of staff who are going to lose their jobs.

The budget papers reveal that 1,140 staff are set to lose their jobs in SA Health this year. That would be the biggest reduction in SA Health staff that this state has ever seen. At a time when our hospitals are under the pump, at a time when ramping has doubled, at a time when Code White is now the norm in our emergency departments, we cannot cope with losing that many staff. It also became apparent that this government, under their new governance reforms, have not signed agreements between the local hospital networks and the government, so all those local hospital networks are currently running without performance targets and without a proper budget set in place.

Clearly there are issues, clearly those board members are not happy with the budget presented to them by the government and SA Health and clearly that is going to be a significant issue to watch. We raised the issue of, once again, the minister's own breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct in relation to his office sending out cabinet attachment documents to Ms Georgina Downer, a private citizen. The minister says these are very sensitive documents that the public cannot see, but he was very happy to give them to a private citizen to see who still has those documents. The government, it appears, has not asked for them back. For all we know, they have been distributed elsewhere, but apparently the minister claims that these are very sensitive documents.

We asked the minister, 'What is the breakdown of the \$550 million for the Women's and Children's Hospital?' We got no answer. We got a panicked huddle about that. That is something that should appear in the budget papers but is not there whatsoever. This is a government that is clearly lost at sea in relation to that development.

We asked the minister, 'Who is getting free car parking?' At a time when he is increasing the car park costs for hospital staff by 129 per cent, when he is increasing the cost for hospital patients by 20 per cent, are his executives getting free car parking? Are his ministerial staff getting free car parking? Is his chief executive getting free car parking? Does he get free car parking? The only one of those he could answer was when he said that he did not recall paying for his car park.

I have to say that those hardworking nurses and those hardworking cleaners do recall paying for their car park. It is a cost they notice, but this minister does not even notice whether he is paying for his car parking or not. These executives, these ministerial staff—and we know that at least five ministerial staff in his office are getting free car parking—do not work night shifts, they do not work

24 hours a day, they do not have to come in late to deal with patients and they do not have to deal with security issues. There is no reason why they should be getting much more favourable car parking arrangements than our nurses who are working nightshift, who are subject to security risks when they go to work and who are going to work to save lives, not to draft briefing documents for ministers, not to draft press releases. That appears to be the priority of this government.

We heard about issues in relation to the Lyell McEwin emergency department upgrade. It has been delayed by a year by this government. They have delayed this very important upgrade by a year but, not only that, they have cut at least \$6 million perhaps \$7 million out of the budget. So the upgrade that the people of the northern suburbs are going to get to their emergency department is not only going to be a year later than it was meant to be but it is also going to be a smaller upgrade than was originally planned because of decisions by this government.

We also discussed this government's plans to cut 25 per cent of funding for non-government mental health organisations, which is going to have a real effect for organisations such as Catherine House. The people who go to Catherine House are not going to be getting NDIS packages, but it is going to have a real effect there. The government is pushing this all out to a review they are undertaking. We have the Mental Health Commissioner, whom the government is sacking, despite saying he is doing a good job. He is going to be out of a job, just as the victims' rights commissioner was out of his job and just as the DPP was out of his job. They are going to reappoint somebody to that position. They did not even bring him along to the hearing.

We had the mental health governance review, which had the worst consultation we have ever seen on a report, which had a video published to describe how bad the consultation was and which the government appears fine with. We had serious questions raised about this minister's delegation of eating disorders and whether or not it was done in a timely way and whether he made decisions in relation to that delegation before it was made that potentially could have been a conflict of interest. There is a whole heap of other issues that I do not have time to get to in this speech, but this shows how at sea this government is on a whole range of issues.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (17:10):** I rise today to make a brief contribution in regard to a follow-up from our estimates hearings. In my portfolio of human services, I have a range of areas that I consider to be extremely important in relation to supporting vulnerable South Australians. Throughout the course of the estimates hearing, with the assistance of an able team I constructed some questions to try to dig down to the heart of this budget, which is really letting down the people of South Australia. It has nothing in it for vulnerable people. It actually hits the hip pockets of South Australians who are already struggling.

I have spoken ad nauseam in this place before regarding some of the issues in relation to people with a disability transitioning to the NDIS, so I will not repeat those calls. I will just point out that we and many other people across the country have highlighted a number of areas of real concern in relation to disability, which have not been addressed in this current budget. We still hold out hope that the voices of people living with a disability in South Australia will be heard, as well as the voices of the providers who are doing their best to try to provide the best quality service to people living with a disability.

One of the hot areas at the moment that we are looking at is transport, in relation specifically to the cancellation of the taxi voucher scheme as it cashes out to the NDIS. Nationally, there is a whole range of different ways that that is being addressed. We hope to see a little bit more action in regard to that, and we will continue to press on that. There were some questions in estimates around the transition of the NDIS and, again, the movement of moneys that were block funded across previously. A small portion of money has been set aside to help facilitate this ongoing transition.

However, when we questioned the minister regarding this, we did not receive satisfactory information or assurances that amounts had been set for organisations using any specific calculation that was going to provide organisations with a way of delivering KPIs and outputs that were congruous to the amounts being delivered in terms of a dollar value. We will continue to pursue that and advocate for organisations on behalf of consumers and hope that, again, we can get their voices heard by the minister and see good outcomes.

The member for Kaurana in his health and mental health portfolios has spoken and asked questions about mental health funding to organisations where people are vulnerable. We see that some of these really amazing organisations like Catherine House are receiving a reduction in the amount of funding based on NDIS, as well as some of the other great places, like Diamond House. We will continue to advocate for that, because really what we are seeing is a pretty short-sighted response.

I take the responsibility of my role seriously, and I want to see that the minister is doing so as well. In this last week we have seen a light being shone on the quantity and types of shares held by the minister that have been declared as part of the pecuniary interests. Questions have been posed to see whether or not the Ministerial Code of Conduct has been followed in terms of decisions being made to privatise health services and other services, which include people with disabilities within the Human Services portfolio in hospitals or step-down facilities.

We have had no real answers to these questions. In fact, the responses have generated more questions than answers. As the lead questioner in the estimates hearing, I am very concerned that the hearing plus follow-up questions have not given us any real substance. I would expect that, if somebody has nothing to hide and everything has been done according to the specific code of conduct and the rules, then they would just come out and say so. This has left me with some degree of doubt at the moment, so I have made a referral to the Auditor-General in regard to this particular issue. I wait with interest to see whether that investigation yields anything.

In regard to questioning around housing in particular, we learned in estimates over the last week that the stimulus package that has been announced—which is \$104.5 million broken down into some commitments around maintenance plus some funding packages for homebuyers on low incomes and a very modest building package of some 90 homes over 700-odd days—is really nothing more than a cash grab out of the reserves of the SA Housing Authority. There really is no new money being used. It is simply the shuffling of deckchairs. As we know, if you take money out of cash reserves, you can only do it for so long and then there is no money left.

The very low and unambitious target of 90 homes is a microeffort. It is really a pootteenth of what we need. Some modelling suggests that some 14,000 homes are required to alleviate the affordable housing crisis. As we know, that flows down to housing stress and a pressure that ultimately can end up in increased homelessness, which is what we have seen here in South Australia for the last 18 months. There is an increase in the numbers of people sleeping rough. It is in the regions and it is in the city. We need more homes; the 90 homes are not going to do anything.

As well as that, none of the 40 beds that were promised for victims of domestic violence by the then opposition, the now government, are yet in operation. I asked a number of questions about whether that is 40 beds, 40 homes or 10 homes with four beds each and how different families would be accommodated in these houses. I had no firm responses other than that there are nine beds, I believe, coming online in September. That is one firm number. It is a far cry short of the 75 per cent promised by the end of the year, which would be 30 additional crisis beds. For those who are wondering, again we are left without any firm delivery on what was a firm commitment. We do not have any detail about this either. Unfortunately, I have not been able to get an answer, but we will see how that goes.

In respect of older South Australians, we know that there is a cut in this budget to the subsidisation of monitored personal alerts, which are used by many vulnerable South Australians. They are a great safety net. They provide confidence to families and confidence to the people themselves. They keep people out of residential care and often keep people out of hospital. It allows people to maintain independence and increase and improve their quality of life.

We heard from the federal minister before estimates, via a media interview, that the first information he had regarding this was a bump into the Premier in Canberra. He had not been consulted about this change in the funding model or the rebate that was happening. I would not have minded being a fly on the wall when the human services minister got the phone call asking, 'Please explain.' We are left wondering how that might have ensued, but during that phone conversation that he had on radio FIVEaa, I believe it was, he said that he did not think there was any change to the rebate of \$250 per annum on monitoring fees.



I rang in because I heard that this was said and I said, 'Actually, I think you might be wrong because we understand there to be a \$50 cut to the subsidy, which leaves people getting \$200 a year back.' I have spoken about this before. Okay, it is only \$50 but it is another \$1 a week added on to other dollars a week with a cascading, cumulative effect. I am here to say that I am pretty confident that the federal minister, who did not think that cut was happening, is sadly incorrect.

We have been inundated, as I know other members have, with letters from constituents informing them that they are now up for an extra \$50 unless the monitoring company would like to absorb the cost. Well, hello, trickle-down economics. This program saves lives and I think the minister just needs to suck this up, reverse the decision and help people in the community. I would hope that members of parliament on the other side are also putting pressure on the minister to do so.

One of the portfolios that I cover is youth and another is volunteers. While some of the questions that we asked last week in estimates were concerning to youth organisations, volunteer organisations and myself, the answers also explained some things to us. Without really any fanfare or change announced or information to the public, we understand that there really is no office for youth anymore, there is no office for volunteers anymore and the minister does not really know how many people are allocated to do what work in those departments either, in terms of youth and/or volunteers.

It seems that there is just a bunch of people working in the department, available to do a bit of this and that for youth and for volunteers, which probably explains the increase in phone calls to other non-government organisations about volunteering and some confusion about who they actually now contact to ask questions from a policy point of view. I think it also beggars belief that we do not have specific numbers or an understanding about who is going to implement the volunteer strategy, and how many people are going to develop, consult and then deliver the youth action plans.

I know there are some grand plans that have been spoken about but we do not know what is happening there. Over the last week I have spoken with many organisations who work with these groups of people, and they are quite concerned about the future of the priorities here. I am very concerned about the budget. I am very concerned about the lack of answers that we were able to secure.

I will certainly be following up for people who have asked me questions and asked for explanations and for people who are unhappy and bearing the brunt of this Marshall Liberal budget, and the unfair results that it will bring. Really, the blame will have to fall directly on the Premier and his cabinet in terms of the unfair decisions that have been made.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (17:24):** I rise today to talk about the estimates process. The Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment has a very important responsibility within the South Australian economy. In fact, when you consider the whole of the portfolio, it is worth around \$22.9 billion to our economy. Our total goods and services exports sit at \$15.7 billion for the 2018 calendar year. Added on to that is our visitor expenditure in South Australia, at around \$7.2 billion.

It was disappointing this week when CommSec's State of the States report said that South Australia's economic performance ranking has fallen to sixth position out of all the Australian states and territories. South Australia is now ranked either fifth or sixth on six of the eight economic indicators. From the estimates hearing with the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, I think it is quite clear that the Marshall Liberal government has no plan to turn this around.

There is a much talked about yet secretive South Australian growth agenda, but it is still a work in progress. In the 16 months that this government have held office, they have yet to articulate a cross-government agenda to boost our trade and investment. For those in the chamber who have not heard this backstory, I will give a short recap. When it first came to office, this government ripped up all our state's industry and regional engagement strategies. They then fired senior trade officials and our international engagement advisers. While all this was happening, guess what? There was not lot of movement or focus within the department.

The Premier then asked our conservative friend to come over from New Zealand and conduct a review. The interesting thing about the review was that he had a completely different view from

what the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment had been articulating. He said that the government's trade office plans were far too expensive and should not come at a cost of completely dismantling our trade missions. This was interesting. He gave the recommendation that the government needs to have a plan and that the plan would be called the South Australian growth agenda, which is a bit like the South Australian strategic plan that was ripped up.

Again, the public sector went through yet another machinery of government change. Alas, what do we hear about this budget? We hear that \$26.8 million was cut from the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment. If we are going to have this 3 per cent growth in state product—this 3 per cent target—why would you cut the department? I spoke to the minister at length about the way he changed the performance indicators. We have gone from very clear, transparent measures of the department's immediate impact on the economy to very broad and vague measures of overall economic indicators.

We know how much foreign direct investment we have received and we know how many international students we have. However, from now on, that is not going to be captured. What is going to be captured are our targets: our target for foreign direct investment and our target for growth in exports. Why is there a lack of transparency? That is my question. It makes me wonder what kind of signal we are sending to our own trade officials and to trade officials in the commonwealth and overseas.

Is this really the best we can do? Must we be the state that has no plan, no direction and no resources to grow our trade and investment? I can tell you that when I came away from estimates yesterday I did not feel that we were on track. I did not feel that this minister is taking charge of the so-called sector development plans. I feel that we have had 16 months and nothing has happened.

Let me turn to tourism. What do we know from the budget? That is right: a \$12 million cut. An efficiency dividend cut. Cut, cut, cut on a fantastic growth industry. Sure, there was an announcement that existing marketing funding was going to continue—well, so it should—but let's not get too excited that you are continuing what was already there and what was relied on so strongly by our sector, that marketing. The fact that our hardworking tourism operators are disappointed must be understood. I expressed that to the minister, that people know that marketing is important, but we have gone backwards.

We learned from estimates—because I asked the minister where these cuts were going to come from—that they are going to be cuts to areas that directly service the industry. I have asked for details, and it was taken on notice, but I thought it would be pretty easy to say; you have made these cuts, so what are you going to cut. The only thing I heard from him was that the signage program is cut and that internet connections in our tourist hotspots stay as they are. That is going to be cut.

What I was deeply concerned about in this budget—and the minister just said this is it—is that the government has stepped away from the industry. It has cut support to the Tourism Industry Council South Australia by 26 per cent. We heard from the minister, 'Oh, there's growth here. They need to stand on their own two feet.' I tell you what, if I were a peak body in South Australia that had support from this government I would be very concerned that I was next to be cut off because apparently they are all okay to go on their own. There is no shared partnership here. There is no shared collaboration. So watch out for the next budget if you are a peak body that has government funding.

I am very concerned about our hardworking regional tourism organisations, and I think they are going to be getting quite the rough deal. The minister continues to be evasive about making any commitment about the future of any funding for our regions. The minister was more than happy to talk about the importance of tourism in our regions, but when it comes to giving certainty and stability to those regional tourism organisations we get nothing. All I got was vague statements and no commitments, just promises of intention.

I tell you what, we know that more than 40 per cent of money in tourism is in the regional areas and they deserve better. They deserve better than a vague commitment. What they need is a multiyear commitment for regional tourism organisations from this government, and they need it sooner rather than later. Our tourism industry is an area of supergrowth. We know it provides

economic stimulus, job growth and long-term career pathways for the people of South Australia, so while the latest statistics on visitor spend are welcome we on this side of the chamber will continue to advocate for tourism operators.

There are 18,000 tourism-related small businesses that drive the visitor economy, and what they do not feel they have is a government standing up for this sector. I spoke to the minister about this and asked him for his commitment, but I think the reality is that this \$12 million cut is going to be hard, that it is going to be difficult and that we are going to hear about more and more of them going to have to be cut to reach those efficiency dividends. That is a concern for anyone out there. We know that the fashion festival went, we know that the motorsport festival went—what is next? How are you going to achieve this budget? How are you actually going to get there without making serious cuts to programs, services and events?

I had the absolute joy of representing the shadow minister for innovation and skills in the estimates committee to talk to the Minister for Industry and Skills about his budget, and I have to say that the lack of transparency was quite interesting. Instead of delivering on 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships that the minister and Premier constantly refer to, all we heard from the Minister for Industry and Skills was that this figure included pre-apprenticeships, pre-traineeships, higher apprenticeships and training with similar characteristics to an apprenticeships and traineeships.

It has now become very clear to the parliament, to the opposition and to the people of South Australia what this figure actually means. We thought that we were talking about traineeships and four-year apprenticeships, but instead—or in addition, one might say—in its figures it will count courses such as a four-week childcare course, which is a preparation course. It will include a five-week disability preparation course in its so-called apprenticeship and traineeship figures.

I asked the minister, 'Does that mean a person, an individual, could be counted multiple times in this figure?' Of course, we need to answer that question because yes is the answer. You could do a pre-traineeship course and you have completed a course. You could do a traineeship and be counted and maybe you will commence an apprenticeship and be counted again. One of the areas that we have always had concerns about, while this is an ambitious figure to have for additional traineeships, apprenticeships, pre-traineeships, etc., is commencements. It is not about completions.

I think everyone should share our concern that the completion rate is not good enough. What about support programs to make sure people are completing their traineeships and completing their apprenticeships? We are concerned. While the minister very clearly thinks that things are going well under his watch and that everything is on track, the facts tell us otherwise. Data from his own department shows that commencements of new traineeships and apprenticeships are down, completion of apprenticeships and traineeships are down and apprentices currently in training are down. We have concerns about the increasing numbers of cancellations of and withdrawals from apprenticeships.

We know that this has been an ambitious focus of the government, but it was very clear in the budget papers that so far only 3,400 of the promised aim, the target, of 20,000 have really been delivered, so we are only at 16 per cent. We know that the minister likes to talk about apprenticeships, and well he should as Minister for Innovation and Skills, but we are not getting there. We are not on track. Meanwhile, the other area that the minister is busy cutting funds from is foundation skills courses, such as Adult Communication Education.

Adult Community Education programs (often known as ACE) support many people in South Australia. These play a role in providing people with the opportunity and the chance to start their pathway on education and a pathway often into employment and further studies and skills. This opportunity might be just the thing needed to help them embark on a traineeship or apprenticeship but, alas, in this budget we have cut another \$1 million from the sector—\$1 million from the Adult Community Education sector. How are we reaching out to people who need the most support if we are prepared to cut the funding there? This service cut follows on from cuts made in last year's budget. I really think that it means we have abandoned those people, the people who need our support the most.

When it comes to small business—and the minister is the Minister for Small Business—we just feel that there is really not much of a plan and there are certainly no policies for small business

in this state. In a change of events, the MoG changes, the minister had the portfolio responsibilities for the Office of the Small Business Commissioner taken away from him earlier this year. In the most recent budget, there is hardly a mention of small business.

As every South Australian knows, most South Australians are employed in small business. This is an incredibly important area, if not the only area, where most South Australians are employed. There was no mention of any new initiatives to assist small business, no mention of any plans for the state to assist small business. There is no new funding for small business support in this budget. You have to wonder, what does the Minister for Small Business do? What is the direction he is taking South Australians? What is his focus?

We also had some interesting questions around migration. I am personally quite concerned about the polarising response we had to what is supposed to be an incredible area of focus for this government—population growth—encouraging skilled migrants to migrate to South Australia. They could not tell me quite what the headcount was initially and then they said it is 24 people. So you have 24 people who are working on this area, and this is my concern. I asked: how many of these people have more than five years' experience as case managers? They will come back to me on this.

One of the areas I was most concerned about is the understanding of South Australians about how much money the commonwealth is providing to Skilling South Australia and how much of it is actually coming from South Australian employers. These employers, who want to sponsor skilled workers to come to Australia, are required to pay four up-front annual payments of \$1,800 each, that is \$7,200 to the commonwealth, which goes to the fund of Skilling South Australia.

While we have this great agreement with the commonwealth, it is actually South Australia's employers who are wanting to have skilled migrants come to work here, who are paying into this fund. So the fanfare around gaining this funding from the feds failed to be pretty clear to South Australians that they are actually footing the bill. I thought that was quite interesting.

During this time, we raised with the minister questions about his appointments to boards and the industry skills councils, with some dark clouds remaining over his head about his perceived continued way of appointing people to boards. There have been widespread cuts to the Department for Innovation and Skills, and we are going to see \$51 million of cuts over the next four years.

We have seen lots of MoG changes for this department. We have seen the Small Business Commissioner lost and we have seen the Office of the Industry Advocate lost, but what is interesting is that the minister himself has slightly increased the funding to his own office and not reduced any of the full-time equivalents there. So, while the Minister for Innovation and Skills takes the axe to his own department, he keeps his staffing levels in his office the same. The minister obviously has one message for his department and another for his office.

While it was a somewhat entertaining estimates schedule, of course, the ambition for both these ministers is incredibly important for South Australia—the development of innovation and skills, the development of skilling South Australians for the future economy. These are incredibly important. Trade, tourism and investment, these are where jobs will come from in the future. We need to make sure that we are focused, that this government is on track and actually has a plan. I have to say that, from this estimates process, I am convinced of neither.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:43):** I would like to take a few minutes to make some observations about the estimates process. I will not cover the same territory my colleagues have, because I think they have covered that territory better than I have, but I will add some of my own observations regarding not so much some of the issues but perhaps some of the approaches the ministers have undertaken towards the estimates process and some of the behaviours, etc.

The first thing I would like to raise with the house is the actual presentation of the budget, which is the government's second budget. When you compare the presentation of this budget with last year's budget, it is interesting to see how it is actually structured. When you look at it closely, the first thing you notice is that it is actually hard to find the different bits and pieces, compared with last year's budget, in which there were discrete parts so that you could quickly reference those areas of interest to you if you were a shadow minister and also quite easily find stuff that may be of interest to your electorate.

I found that there was a lot less detail in the budget, or fewer reference points, which made it very hard to raise questions because often there was no reference point, or the reference point was not very direct, and it was very hard to find things that were not actually mentioned. They were obviously in the budget, because they had to be budgeted for, but not actually in the printed document of the budget. So it was very hard to find points to hang your question onto. One can only speculate whether it was a deliberate policy of the Treasurer to restructure the budget papers in a way that would reduce accountability. Certainly that was outcome; that is what was achieved.

I would say that both Chairs of the committees were reasonably fair in their approach and assisted the opposition to find reference points on a number of occasions. I think it was very frustrating when clearly an item of expenditure existed but was not represented in a way that made it readily accessible or able to be referenced for questioning purposes. The government may think that that is pretty smart politics, and it may be, but it tells parliament and the people that this government, despite their rhetoric to the contrary, are less interested in accountability and transparency.

For all their faults, our previous budget documents had a lot more detail in them, and that made it easier for the opposition of the day to find points to ask questions about. It will be interesting to see what next year's budget looks like. If this trend continues, the budget papers will be half a page: there will just be budget items and the ministers and the Chair will start arguing about whether the question we are asking actually relates to that budget page or not.

It was certainly clear this year that the government said a lot less in its budget. I think that that was deliberate, because the less the government said, the less they could be held accountable for. As I said, I commend both Chairs. Certainly your chairmanship, sir, was very fair and honourable, despite your disagreement with some of my questions. In the time I spent in committee B, I found the Chair had mellowed since last year too. His chairmanship was quite fair and reasonable, certainly during the time I was there.

Another thing that I found quite interesting, which happened last year and also this year, was the handballing, where a minister says, 'Sorry, it's not in my budget. Find the reference point in my budget for that,' or he notes that someone else is the relevant minister. When you ask that minister, he says, 'It's nothing to do with me; it's actually that minister.' Unfortunately, that minister had already come and gone, in terms of estimates, and you could ask no questions. Ministers may think that was a smart tactic, but it is not. As far as I am concerned, playing those sorts of games shows that there is more to be dug up in that area, and I would be spending some time to look into those areas. Clearly, if ministers are playing that game there is something to hide or something they are trying to spin.

I will give the example of rental subsidies for start-ups at Lot Fourteen. The amount allocated, \$4.8 million, was in the Renewal SA budget last year, but this year that amount did not appear anywhere. Through questioning, we then found out that that amount was actually transferred to the Department for Innovation and Skills. I was not in that committee, but I understand from my colleague who asked those questions that, when they asked the Minister for Innovation and Skills questions regarding rental subsidies for start-ups, the minister said, 'My department doesn't deal with leasing; that's Renewal SA's business.'

Then minister B, the minister responsible for Renewal SA, said, 'No, we don't provide subsidies. I can guarantee that there were no subsidies given. We sublease to the Department for Innovation and Skills, and I can tell you that we have given a commercial rent to that department.' We do not know which department that is actually leased to—that is their business. We do not know if they have been given any subsidies. There is some sort of artificial Chinese wall in this department.

In further questioning, Renewal SA acknowledged that actually they did know, but they are not responsible for it; therefore, they do not have to answer our questions. At the end of the day, we were not able to find out—and I think it is quite appropriate to find out—what the level of these subsidies is and who they are being given to. They might be quite legitimate. Are the subsidies now being given so huge in order to attract the right people?

Is it that the commercial rates, which the overall policy is about, are actually being diminished? Is the government, despite their rhetoric about people beating on their door, finding it

hard and therefore have to find more subsidies? If there was nothing to hide, why did the minister not say, 'These are the subsidies and this is what we have attracted.' It was a very simple question.

I move on to veterans affairs. I try to be very cautious in what I say on veterans affairs because I understand that we try to be as bipartisan as possible in this policy area. I think it is important for the reasons outlined today in your motion, sir. That does not mean that, as an opposition, we have to agree to everything the minister does or that we do not make the minister accountable. The approach we take is very important in this area.

I certainly try to do that, and I will give you an example of how I do that. I actually have a regular forum with ex-service organisations in the sector. Probably about 15 or 20 different organisations attend those forums. Just to show my bipartisanship, I actually invited a representative from the department to attend those meetings. They can hear everything we say and any concerns raised. The department obviously works for the government, so the minister actually knows what is happening.

It was quite clear from the last meeting that the department did report back to the minister because the minister was ready for some issues that were raised at that forum. They did not appear in the budget, yet the Premier was quite happy to talk about them. He raised them himself. They did not even appear in the budget lines, but he was happy to talk about them. It was interesting that with things that do not appear that they do not want to talk about they do not talk about them. But things that do not appear, that they are happy to talk about, appear again. That was an interesting thing with veterans affairs.

One issue in veterans affairs that I think is a growing issue is the merger of Veterans SA into Defence SA. There is certainly disquiet in the veterans community about that merger and what impact it will have on the delivery of services to veterans and their families. Certainly the answers I got at the estimates committee did not reassure me that the concerns are not there. They are quite valid and they need to be progressed.

Then we come to HomeStart Finance. One of the key issues raised by people in the industry who play an important role is the amount of time that HomeStart Finance is taking to approve finance. Contracts are going over into a second financial year, which means that land tax is now payable by the person providing the land, which is then passed on. We have a situation where land is actually costing more because of the government's inability to progress these HomeStart Finance contracts very quickly.

Another issue is the lack of communication between HomeStart Finance and developers in trying to streamline that to make sure that the buyers—the people we are trying to support and help, the people on low incomes who need HomeStart Finance—are the beneficiaries of the cheapest possible land. It was disappointing that the department seemed to be disinterested in improving—

**Dr Close:** Uninterested.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Sorry, uninterested. I have my pet dislikes as well. They were uninterested in progressing that, and that was an issue. Another issue which has been raised, which the minister either did not know the answer to or just refused to give the answer to, was the impact of aggregation on land tax, particularly how it hurts this sector and how it will add cost to the land in this sector.

Then we come to planning. The area of planning is a major area of reform and therefore requires quite a bit of resource, and that is understood. What became clear from the minister's answers was that, for him, engagement or consultation—call it what it you like—is literally ticking a box to say you have done it without actually trying to engage truthfully. Do you need me to finish very quickly, sir?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Light, it is entirely up to you. We can move to go past 6 o'clock.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No, I will not go past 6 o'clock.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** We need a few minutes just to wrap it up.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I will keep it brief. It has been helpful that I have had no interjections as well, except for the one about my grammar.

**Mr Pederick:** And that is out of order.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** It was out of order. The minister gave pretty flippant responses to the issues regarding engagement. He said that one of the committees he engages with is called the infill committee, which provides him with early advice on how to address infill issues within the metropolitan Adelaide area.

The only stakeholders involved in that committee are industry people. There is no-one from the community, local government or any other sector. He justified that on the basis of, 'They can talk to us later. We will get our real opinions from industry and talk to the community when we are actually just ticking the box at the end of the process.' That is why there is quite a bit of disquiet with this particular minister's approach to the implementation of these reforms.

In relation to local government, the minister was quite dismissive about concerns raised by local government. One bill he had regarding local government failed to pass, yet he has this bold agenda about reform. Given his record to date, we will have to see how that pans out.

The EPA is interesting because the minister who deals with the EPA and waste management was quite dismissive and displayed a level of contempt for local government in terms of their concerns about the impact the waste levy increase, the bin tax, of 40 per cent will have on illegal dumping. The minister continued to say that he has received no advice that suggests it is an issue, yet local governments tell me that the cost of collecting illegal dumping and the clean-up of illegal dumping is increasing.

The minister did not even suggest that he work with local government to make some assessments. He was quite dismissive. He did not actually want to hear about it. He basically said, 'It's not an issue. Let's move on to somewhere else.' When ministers behave in this way, they think they are scoring political points. That might be fine, but they do two other things: they diminish this parliament and insult our electors.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (17:57):** I move:

That the remainder of the bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (17:57):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until Thursday 1 August 2019 at 11:00.