

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 25 September 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

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

Bills

HEALTH CARE (HEALTH ACCESS ZONES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (10:31): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Health Care Act 2008. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It gives me a great sense of fulfilment to be able to introduce this bill, for it to be my first piece of legislation to introduce into parliament in my name. This bill is designed to support women's reproductive health choices by ensuring that all women can access health services that provide abortion without fear, intimidation, harassment or obstruction. The Hon. Ms Franks and I have worked together to prepare and co-sponsor this reform with the support of many other members in this place.

The bill before you, Mr Speaker, acknowledges that women have a legal right to access reproductive services without fear, intimidation or harassment. Importantly as well—I am a healthcare professional myself—staff who work where reproductive support services are undertaken have a right to enter and leave their workplace safely every day without being obstructed, interfered with, hindered, harassed or photographed.

An important distinction between this bill and the previous bill that has already been tabled is that it gives us as parliamentarians the opportunity for these protections for women and staff to pass this parliament without being impeded by any other contentious issues that might arise when we are seeking to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. Members of this parliament and our community have—and rightly so—deeply held views about abortion. It is their right that they are free to express their views.

This bill does not seek to prevent anybody from holding or expressing their views. It provides, however, a safe place for women, a safe place to seek advice and medical treatment if they so wish. In every jurisdiction in our country, Australia, with the exception of WA, these reforms have already been implemented, and WA is also now preparing legislation to address this.

The bill allows the Minister for Health to declare a specified premises, which will have a zone of 150 metres around it as a protest-free zone, allowing for a safe pathway to access the premises. It does not stop people from protesting; it just provides a legal space of access. We currently do this in the election process. This should not be any different.

The reason I am introducing the bill to parliament today is that we already have a clear mandated legal position under the right circumstances, determined by medical practitioners, for abortion services. They are legal health services. Expressing deeply held views does not carry with it a right to subject others to fear and intimidation. It is unreasonable for any groups to target women at the very time and place they are seeking to access any health service, but in particular a service for abortion.

I am guided in this respect, of course, by my own personal views and experiences. I cannot imagine the pain, the suffering and the trauma that go through not just the woman's mind and her

life, but that of her partner, her friends and her family, when faced with a choice about continuing a pregnancy or not. I have been through a dozen cycles of IVF and I have had multiple miscarriages. I know grief and loss and I understand completely what it is like to no longer be able to carry your baby. But I was never confronted by people around my reproductive choices. I was never intimidated or harassed by anybody when facing my reproductive choices and my losses, so why should a woman faced with this decision have to go through this?

There have been recent challenges to similar legislation in Tasmania and Victoria and these were rejected by the High Court of Australia, stating that zones did not create and impermissibly burden the freedom of communication on governmental and political matters that is implied in the constitution. These challenges have failed. Who are we to argue with the High Court?

I have received a number of messages already since speaking about this yesterday. Last night, I received a message from a supporter of this legislation and his name is Shane. Shane and his wife were faced with a terrible decision: whether or not to terminate a pregnancy at 20 weeks. This was due to their son being diagnosed with a terrible medical condition not compatible with life. After weighing up the ongoing medical problems a child would have, their own situations, how they would deal with the remainder of this pregnancy and the toll this was taking on their relationship, they made the decision to terminate the pregnancy.

They then went to the Belmore Terrace Pregnancy Advisory Centre in Woodville, a place filled with loving and caring staff to provide them with support. However, the same love and care was not shown to them at the gate. Shane and his wife were confronted by protestors. Protestors were not only outside the centre but at a cafe and a clothing shop really distastefully named Reborn Babywear adjacent to the centre. I am not sure what kind of evil this is that you would put people through at a time in their life when going to a pregnancy advisory centre for care. It is some new kind of evil that I just do not understand. Last night, Shane said to me, and I quote:

These people run a purely psychological game, they're not protesting, they're causing massive harm at an extremely vulnerable time, and they know it, they run it like that on purpose, it's deeply evil.

At a time when Shane and his wife together were in this deeply emotional state, with a desperately wanted pregnancy, these protestors made it worse. Needless to say, Shane in part blames this experience for the eventual breakdown of the marriage, the inability to cope with this grief and trauma that they went through. He told me a lot more about that day, but I choose not to put you through the realities of what was done to him and his wife by the protestors. The bill seeks to prevent this type of psychological distress to women and families.

I have also been communicating with a wonderful clinician named Brigid Coombe, who was a clinical nurse from 1994 to 2002 and a director of this clinic until 2012. She is a registered nurse with a master's in community health and primary care. She is no lightweight; she is a professional dynamo. We need to listen to professionals and the evidence and the science when making these decisions. She is highly respected, and I acknowledge and thank her for her enduring work.

Her personal experience of protestors over an 18-year period as a staff member includes protestors anticipating and arriving at the workplace where you remain unsure of what you will confront; regardless, you know that these people are there to make you uncomfortable. You know they will have material that makes false and outrageous claims about the work that you do and the people who you care for.

For so many women the experience is shocking. On arrival at the clinic, they are teary, anxious and in no fit state to access appropriate information, which is what they are going there for. Their support people—it may be their husband, their partner, their mother, their grandmother, their friend, their sister; I have provided support to someone so it could have been me—are distressed at being unable to ensure protection, and they are angry, and rightly so.

The job of the clinical staff becomes one of managing their own emotions about the injustice of a patient's experience while helping them to do likewise and focus on their immediate healthcare needs. There are many stories that Brigid is able to relate to me regarding the impact and the confrontation that have occurred over her decades of working in this situation, none of which should be put up with by anybody, healthcare workers or people attending a clinic at a time in their life when they need love and support.

Emily, from the South Australian Abortion Action Coalition, said that she found it so intimidating walking past the protesters that it makes her enormously angry. She recently had to support a friend going to the centre and was deeply distressed by encountering the protesters. I think these are powerful stories that need to be heard. We need to stop this type of intimidation at what is such a vulnerable time. I would like to acknowledge the work of the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Attorney-General, the South Australian Law Reform Institute and many other people who took the initiative of developing and supporting conversations around this private member's bill to address a longstanding problem.

The bill entitles women and those accompanying them to access these services in a safe and confidential manner without the threat of harassment. It enables staff to access their workplace without being verbally abused, obstructed or threatened. It is decent. It does not seek to amend laws about abortion itself. It does nothing regarding access to abortion, which is a legal health process.

I ask all members to consider supporting this bill. I look forward to having many conversations in the near future about the bill. I am happy to hear from any member who has any issues or changes that they are thinking about at this point. I am certainly available at any time to discuss that. I commend the bill to the house. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary 1-Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal

Part 2—Amendment of *Health Care Act 2008*

3—Insertion of Part 5A

This clause inserts a new part 5A

5A—Health access zones

48 B—Interpretation

Provides definitions under this Part for a *health access zone*, *prohibited behaviour*, *protected premises*, and *public area*.

A prohibited behaviour means:

- To threaten, intimidate or harass another person; or
- To obstruct another person approaching, entering or leaving protected premises; or
- To record (by any means whatsoever) images of a person approaching, entering or leaving protected premises; or
- To communicate, or attempt to communicate, with a person about the subject of abortion; or
- To engage in any other behaviour of a kind prescribed by the regulations

48 C—Minister may declare premises to be protected premise

This section allows the Minister to declare specified premises to be *protected premises* for the purposes of this Part, by notice in the Gazette. This section outlines the requisite conditions for the Minister to consider (the Minister must be satisfied that abortions are being or will be lawfully performed at the premises), and also allows for the Minister to vary or revoke a notice under this section.

48 D—Certain behaviour prohibited in health access zones

Creates an offence for engaging in prohibited behaviour in a health access zone, with a maximum penalty of imprisonment for 2 years. However, the section also specifies that subsections 1 does not apply to a person employed or otherwise providing services at the protected premise, or does not apply if permission has been given by the person being recorded/communicated with.

48 E—Police officer may direct person to leave health access zone

Allows for a police officer to direct a person to leave a health access zone if they suspect that that person is engaged or about to be engaged in prohibited behaviour within the health access zone. This section also provides for an offence and penalty for someone who fails to comply with a direction under this section, and for re-entering a health access zone within 24 hours of a direction under this section.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECRIMINALISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 31 July 2019.)

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (10:44): I rise to speak today on the Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill 2018. Back in 2016, when this was last proposed, I did extensive surveying and researching not only in my electorate but also statewide. I conducted an online Survey Monkey questionnaire that around 1,000 people contributed to—several hundred being constituents of mine, so they are the ones that I have paid the most attention to. Broadly, from those I represent, around 82 per cent were supportive of decriminalisation of the sex work industry.

There were three main areas of concern, if we did decriminalise, where they wanted to put in place safeguards: ownership, so who could own brothels; where the brothels might be; and street solicitation was also of great concern. There was widespread acceptance that decriminalisation was better for the safety of the workers so that they would have access to police and be in a better position. In contrast, the safety of girls who are street workers or who work on the streets would be in contradiction to that. There were also concerns raised regarding advertising, but I believe they have already been dealt with with amendments in the upper house, which I will briefly refer to.

In the Legislative Council, amendments were passed that will require a review of the legislation after three years. They now have police search powers, a ban on advertising, assistance from the minister for sex workers who want to leave the industry and a ban on children working in a brothel. So several safeguards have already been put in place; however, there are others that I am considering. I have had amendments drafted—I had them drafted back in 2016, in fact—specifically relating to ownership, who could own a brothel.

In speaking to parliamentary counsel, their advice was that there already exists a negative licensing scheme that is used for tattoo parlours, second-hand dealers and hydroponics. That is a relatively inexpensive way of licensing and it is fairly simple to bring in because it already exists. There are two components to this: firstly, you are automatically disqualified on the basis of certain grounds, such as criminality or being a member or an associated member of a prescribed criminal organisation, as defined by the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act. So, if somebody attempted to open a brothel that is relevant under that act, they would be automatically disqualified. They cannot operate a brothel and there would be up to four years' imprisonment or a \$250,000 fine for a corporation. I believe that that would be one way to address this.

There are other amendments being put forward by other members in this house that I would also consider, but this was the recommendation I was given as a fairly simple way of bringing that in, which already exists and is commonplace with other industries. I think that would satisfy the concerns of my constituents. There were concerns around location, and maybe I will deal with them second.

Street solicitation was broadly unsupported for several reasons but, firstly, for the safety of workers, because getting into a car with an unknown person is considered unsafe. Also, with changes in technology, it is not necessary because nowadays everybody has a mobile phone, internet or other ways of communicating. There are certainly lots of massage parlours and different ways, such as street frontages, that do not require a person to be put in any further danger.

I heard concerns from people I took on tours of Parliament House. Mothers and daughters, even a grandmother, were concerned about solicitation being legal because, while sitting at bus stops, they had already had people yell out inappropriate comments about whether they might have

been sex workers. This was on Churchill Road and Regency Road in my electorate. Even a letterboxer who was handing out campaign materials in Enfield was approached for sex.

So I think if we know that it is definitely illegal, then it would be easier to prosecute and there would be less likelihood of women being approached on the street. I was actually quite surprised to hear from men who said they also find it very confronting and uncomfortable to be approached by a woman on the street. On the basis that there is not really any need for it and I think that my residents are particularly uncomfortable with the idea of street solicitation, I have drafted amendments that would maintain that as being illegal.

There is also the idea of location. If solicitation is already illegal, we do not need to worry about where it is happening. Amendments have also been drafted by the Attorney-General, I believe, regarding location. As stated in the paper on the weekend, in the city area it would be 50 metres from schools, churches, preschools (there was a range) and 200 metres in the suburbs. My understanding is that the definition of a 'brothel' would be four or more workers, so it would only limit the larger brothels.

As principals I have met with at the schools have said, it is highly likely that they are mothers of children at the school. They are local people; they are part of our community—of course they are. It is going on already. You are walking past houses right now that are not offensive to anybody. Nobody even knows what is happening. There is no risk in that continuing, so I do not see any need to really restrict locations unless it is a larger facility.

It should be subject to the same business laws. I started a business from home. I had to get permission from the Prospect council, and there were restrictions over car parking, how many people and hours you can work. There already are laws around those things if you are starting a business from home. If you are a larger business starting on a main road, there are already restrictions. Again, I know that when I started a business on North Terrace I had to go through all the planning approvals from the Adelaide city council. I had to have fire safety, air-conditioning, electricity and building approvals. There were endless approvals that any business would be subject to.

In summarising, broadly my electorate was in support of decriminalisation. This is an occupation that people would say is the oldest occupation in the world. It goes on. How can we make it safer? What safeguards can we put in place? That is my proposal.

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (10:52): I rise to indicate my support for the passage of this bill. In doing so, I acknowledge my colleagues in this place who have moved and sponsored this bill: the Attorney-General, and the member for Reynell and the Hon. Ms Franks in the other place. I also note a generation of former and current members who have worked tirelessly in pursuit of such reform.

Before coming to this place, I spent my career fighting for the rights of working people, for those who are marginalised and often exploited in our communities, to help them win fairness, justice and equality; to ensure that they come home safely from work every day; to ensure and fight for their right to enjoy the same rights as any other worker and, most importantly, as people, to be respected; and to have remedies and authorities to approach if they are mistreated or exploited at work. It is through this lens that I have come to this debate.

Every worker should be afforded basic, fundamental rights and protections. That is why I am supporting this bill. When work is criminalised, its workers are forced underground, to work in the shadows. It is said that sunlight is a great disinfectant. If we want to truly make it fairer for workers, we must take work out of the shadows. We will not end this industry no matter what form this bill takes. The industry is here, the industry exists and, frankly, outdated legal frameworks, which date back as far as 1935, have failed.

This is a debate about an industry that, while not exclusively, is predominantly female dominated. In my mind, in large part it is for this reason, like gender pay equity, that we have seen successive parliaments fail to act. What we can do is make it safer for sex workers. What this bill aims to do—and why I am supporting it—is to put a proper approach to an industry so that those working in it can enjoy the same protections afforded to every other worker: the right to organise, to have a collective voice, and to be treated with the dignity that every worker in this state deserves.

In my view, sex workers should be treated no differently from any other worker in this state. Every worker should have the same protections under workplace laws, access to the National Employment Standards, workers compensation and antidiscrimination protections, as well as the protections and obligations extended by the Work Health and Safety Act. That is what this bill will do.

I know that many members in this place have made a contribution to this debate expressing their deeply held concerns that people working in the industry are at serious risk of exploitation. I could not agree more strongly, but it is only through reform and decriminalisation that this can be realised. Any argument to the contrary simply fails to recognise the centuries of lived experience of sex workers. I want to make special note of the advocacy and courage of those sex workers, many of whom are in the gallery today. Your personal stories and experiences have been profoundly moving and profoundly compelling.

In advocating for law reform and this bill, I note that we as proponents are supported by leading organisations around the world—no less than the World Health Organization, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch. This support is simple, because decriminalisation is not only about justice for workers; it is also about public health and community safety.

I do understand and respect that some members bring a particular faith-based perspective to this argument. They are often very strong proponents of better workplace protections for workers, and for community justice, and that is why I commit to continuing to work with those members for the passage of this bill. In addition to meeting with workers and their representatives, I and many others have also heard from faith-based organisations, the Equal Opportunity Commission and SAPOL.

I thank the representatives from SAPOL who have made themselves available to members of this place. During one of these briefings, one case in particular was mentioned by SAPOL as an example of the exploitation currently faced by workers in our criminalised models. There was a situation in which police officers raided a brothel after reports that women there had been forced to work 84 hours a week.

This is an abhorrent practice, but if the answer is to send in the police and report the women involved to immigration authorities, why then do we not call police to every case of worker exploitation? Where is the similar gusto? In my view, that is not the way to investigate these cases. Where these workers are exploited and investigated by SAPOL, were they referred to the Fair Work Ombudsman to recoup their stolen wages? Was SafeWork SA notified so that they could attend to assess civil or criminal breaches of the work health and safety laws? No. Instead, Home Affairs was notified and visas were breached.

This is just one example amongst many raised with me by sex workers who simply cannot raise their voices in the face of worker exploitation. Another issue raised by the police in their briefings was their concern that street soliciting is a threat to any woman, going about her own business, being propositioned by men. I hate to break it to members, but women are subjected to this kind of behaviour every single day, where they live, where they work and where they exist. To criminalise women for the behaviour of men is a disgrace. It is time that men stand up and be accountable for their behaviour and not blame women for the type of behaviour we have heard about from police.

A number of amendments have been filed by the Attorney-General. These amendments have arisen from general discussions and briefings between various organisations and members of this place. These amendments are largely threefold. Amendments will ensure that soliciting in a public place is strictly managed and prohibited in proximity to schools, kindergartens, childcare centres, religious institutions or other places, as determined by regulations. Further, an amendment will require that the three-year statutory review of decriminalisation consider, amongst other things, whether the special entry powers of police officers, as amended by the other place, have been exercised properly and to what extent.

Finally, an amendment will require an operating certificate or licence, depending upon the language used, for brothels operating with more than a certain number of sex workers. This operating certificate will take into account criminal intelligence and impose proximity restrictions to places like schools and churches. Certification may not be granted to individuals not fit and proper or those already prohibited under commonwealth or state law, for example, those individuals disqualified under the Corporations Act from holding company directorships. A certificate must not be granted to

members or associates of prescribed organisations under the Serious and Organised Crime (Control) Act 2008.

I am confident that these amendments strive and attempt to strike the balance of community safeguards within this newly decriminalised industry whilst importantly and fundamentally maintaining the integrity of this bill for sex workers in the industry. These amendments have arisen because proponents of reform have listened carefully to the concerns of a number of members. These amendments address many of the concerns raised by members and allow for the support of responsible yet meaningful reform. It is for those reasons I will be supporting those amendments.

There is no other way to put it: we need reform. The current system does not work. It fails workers and it fails the community. We need to take responsible steps forward, and the very least we need to do is afford every person in our community the same rights that are fundamental to us all. That is what we stand for as a community. We simply cannot afford to equivocate when it comes to these fundamentals. This is the first step towards that.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:02): This is a very difficult issue that we as legislators are being asked to deal with. Can I say that I often see coming to this place what seems like good and benign broad principle turn into complex questions around particular points of law. No doubt, this bill will be no different; in fact, a lot of the amendments filed seek to have us go down a path point by point, looking at detail.

I believe that members of this chamber need firstly to come to an answer on a fundamental question. Before we get into the complex questions of law, we must ask ourselves a more basic truth. At its heart, parliament needs to decide whether it wants to see more prostitution in our community or less. Do we accept that this is a legitimate career, a legitimate industry? Should it be normalised and accepted? As a father of daughters, I cannot accept this premise. I think the idea that we would get to a point where a sex industry booth would appear at a careers day next to jobs in defence or hospitality or further study is absurd.

The idea that a brothel would set up shop in a country town next to a bakery or the dentist is an eventuality that our community would be horrified by. The idea that selling oneself for sex, to sell that which is most precious instead of giving it freely, I think diminishes the act itself. Far from being alarmist, this is what the bill in its current form seeks to have us contemplate. I think each of us in this place needs to come and answer that fundamental question for themselves. Do we want to see this industry grow, or do we want to see this industry shrink?

Having answered the fundamental question for ourselves, we must then turn to the bill itself. There have been debates about all traditional forms of reform over many decades in this place in relation to prostitution, and all but one have failed: in 1980, 1986, 1991, 1995, 1996, 1998, 1999—when a bill introduced by Trevor Griffin in relation to sexual servitude did pass the parliament—again in 1999, 2000, 2012, 2012 again, 2013, 2014, 2015 and again in 2017.

This is a bill and this is a notion that this parliament has considered or been asked to consider on a huge number of occasions over the past 30 years and every single time—with one exception around sexual servitude that I am sure we can all understand and realise is very important and very fundamental—the parliament has chosen to make the same decision.

This bill in its current form is by no means the most conservative of bills that is presented to this place. In fact, it is one of the more laissez faire, open versions. It is a decriminalisation approach over a more regulated approach, although I do accept that there are amendments that are now, at this late stage, being proposed. It is a bill that, instead of seeking to create safeguards, in its current form leaves things open to the market. This is a bill that would actually see prostitution less regulated than alcohol, gambling, hydroponics, tattoo parlours and even the labour hire industry, an industry that those opposite see the need to regulate to deal with illegal behaviour. This bill, in its current form, does not seek to emulate.

Make no mistake: this bill would see an increase in both legal and illegal prostitution, as has been the case and experience interstate. Wherever we create through law a more heavily taxed approach, as would happen under this bill, we create an incentive to circumvent the law, and in an

industry that already has a high criminal element we would very easily create a two-step industry: a legal and a community-facing one, whilst continuing to have an illegal industry side by side.

In my view, this is not a benign industry. This is not a quiet industry. It is an industry that is often associated with drug abuse, human trafficking and the influence of outlaw motorcycle gangs. It is an industry that people need to escape from, which is something that the bill in its current form is seeking to contemplate. Clause 26AB of the bill inserts a clause providing a positive obligation on the minister to whom the bill is committed to provide assistance to persons leaving sex work.

I can understand why this clause would be put into the bill, but I ask this fundamental question of the chamber: if this is an industry that people need to seek assistance to leave, how bad is this industry in the first place? The fact that we are creating a positive obligation on a minister to provide assistance to people who are in the sex work industry says to me that there is a fundamental and explicit admission that this industry is not quiet and benign.

There are proposed amendments to define where a brothel cannot go. These have just been tabled today in the chamber, but what that amendment fails to do, though, is suggest where brothels should go—a question that communities would be forced to answer. I think this amendment is a tacit admission that people do not want to see brothels in their community.

Whether we confine that to being within close proximity to schools or churches or other institutions, the fundamental issue still needs to be addressed and that is: if we define where these businesses should not go—again, an admission that there is an issue with the fact that these businesses exist in the first place—we still have not come to a landing on where they should go, and I think that is a conversation that the community does not want to have. In fact, just last night, the Playford city council passed a motion to that effect.

I agree that there are issues with the current legislation, and the member for Cheltenham raises some extremely important issues—issues that see women exploited—and we need to change the law, but this is not the bill to fix those problems. I think that there is some common ground on this issue from all sides. The idea that we need to do more to deal with the nefarious elements of this industry is something that we all in this place can come together on, but so often it is on how we deal with this issue that this parliament so often disagrees. I think, though, that it is around this common ground of wanting to clean up and deal with those illegal elements within this industry, which result in the adverse outcomes that the police have so often talked to us about, that we as a parliament should head.

I believe that any discussion of new approaches by this parliament should consider a Nordic model. In my view, this model seeks to empower women to bring them back inside the law and give them the opportunity to look after their own fate, essentially to empower them and have the police help them to deal with some of the difficult situations that they find themselves in. But I believe this parliament should and can only consider new approaches like that after this bill has been defeated.

There are proponents who are looking to decriminalisation as a way to solve the adverse outcomes that happen in the sex work industry, which is the approach they would like to see, but I think if this parliament and this chamber make the decision that decriminalisation is not the way to go then we can actually build a broader consensus about the way that we should go and use some of these new reform approaches to deal with this issue.

As somebody who quite often falls on the conservative side of the political spectrum, I do agree in this instance that the status quo is not the way to go. I do agree that the status quo is something that we should not accept. As conservatives, I think it is incumbent upon us to put new ideas and new solutions on the table. I look forward to a number of people in both chambers of this parliament looking at these ideas so that we can actually bring forward a resolution on this issue, one that would be acceptable to the parliament and one that would be suitable to the community. I look forward to being able to work with members of all persuasions right across the spectrum to deal with the very difficult and very poor and adverse situations that are so often characterised by this industry.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:11): Unsurprisingly, I am speaking in support of this really important progressive legislative reform. I do not want to dwell on all the old arguments for or against decriminalisation of sex work; instead, I am going to focus on this argument from a human rights and

a health perspective. To borrow some words from the Attorney-General in a recent briefing, 'I am not a sex worker and I have never been a sex worker,' but I am a health practitioner and a legislator. As a health practitioner, I know the importance of evidence-based practice and how this can intersect with traditionally held views, particularly public health initiatives, where we work to promote health and prevent disease in the whole community.

Historically, around the world health professionals have worked very hard at changing minds and often hearts of individuals when what is healthiest for the community intersects individuals' religious views, historical practices or even the interests of big business. In 2018, a global systematic review, led by the London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, found that any criminalisation, repressive policing of sex workers, their clients and/or sex work, increased the risk of condomless sex, increased the risk of infection with HIV and STI, and disrupted support networks and safety and risk reduction strategies. This systematic review called for urgent sex worker law reform as a public health priority.

While some people in this place may have personal feelings that this bill seems a little radical, in fact the scientific evidence is now in and both our national and state health departments have already recognised that decriminalisation is essential to achieving STI infection reduction targets. As health professionals committed to doing no harm, in light of this evidence decriminalisation is now the most ethical and evidence-based legislative response. As a health professional myself, I know that in areas of sexual health and reproductive health and reducing HIV infection, some individuals will have particular moral views that will bump up against the scientific evidence.

This bill is one of those pivotal times when we are asking those who have a particular individual view to put that aside in favour of the evidence base, the position that we now know is best for the whole community and one that the science now says is not actually radical. In fact, given the strength of the international scientific evidence, this bill is a guaranteed health and economic benefit for our community.

There is another important reason I support this legislation, that is, the right of every person to enjoy emotional and physical contact no matter their emotional, physical or mental abilities. What does this mean? Intimacy is something that is not only desired by every person but desperately needed. Instead of imagining that clients are sleazy blokes cruising along the street, let's think about the disabled, perhaps someone who has lived with a physical disability all their life, somebody who has not even slept alongside a person.

It is a huge misnomer that sex work is just intercourse. After speaking to many workers in the industry and the clients who utilise the services, I can tell you that, while this is the case clearly in some situations, for many, many South Australians sex work is about providing much-needed emotional and physical contact that would otherwise be unavailable to them. For whatever reason, company and comfort are missing from some people's lives. Who are we to deny this essential need, which is so easily taken for granted by those of us who are in relationships?

In undertaking extensive research in relation to sex work in South Australia, I have met with and heard many true stories from sex workers and their clients. It is an industry that can help cure loneliness and fill voids in lives that may be affected by physical disability and the related isolation. In this context, the sexual component of such services may not even be the point. Whatever the reason a person is seeking these services, it is really none of our business.

I would like to tell you the story of Anthony, a South Australian man who sustained a spinal cord injury in his early 20s. As part of his treatment he spent a considerable amount of time at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre, where through his friendships with other patients he met husbands, wives and partners of other people with serious disabling injuries. At first, Anthony was jealous because he thought the partners could share sexual experiences together and grow as a couple as they sexually navigated their way through to the next stage of their lives post this disability.

However, Anthony describes that many of these relationships, if not all, did not last and that each day more and more of his friends at Hampstead found themselves single and lonely, as was Anthony. Prior to Anthony's spinal injury, he never had any problems asking girls out on a date. After many years of loneliness, Anthony decided to call a sex worker. He wanted to explore forms of sexual

expression that were still possible for him. Anthony had a wonderful first experience and now utilises the services of sex workers regularly.

Should he be a criminal? He would be under the Nordic model, right? Over many years Anthony has seen a number of escorts. All have been kind, caring and empathetic, in contrast to the rejection he experienced when asking women out on dates. That is not damning women for their views or values. Anthony says:

Sex workers have improved my life in many ways. Sex workers deserve the same rights and protections as workers in any other industry, and I very strongly support the decriminalisation of sex workers in South Australia and elsewhere in Australia and across the world.

Another South Australian client who has a disability but who will remain anonymous describes his various experiences as consenting adults agreeing to spend time together for mutual benefit. These mutual benefits include being nurturing and informative guides to sex and intimacy. Many people with disabilities often do not have the opportunity to explore these feelings. That upsets me.

That is not to say that this is about all people with disabilities, because I have spoken to a lot of them and they want to make it very clear that they are doing fine, but there are some, due to their circumstances, who are not. Should these people with disabilities be criminals? Should they be left without the opportunity to have intimacy? I do not think so. It is obvious that, for Anthony and others, sex workers offer intimacy and connection.

Who are we to judge, particularly in the age of the dating app, when random hook-ups are, for many, pretty normal? Even our daughters and our sons joke about it. Random hook-ups are certainly not illegal, but are they dangerous, more dangerous, or less? Obviously, for reasons I have outlined above—which are, again, none of our business—dating for some in our community can be tough and a varied experience.

Apps, such as Tinder, and online platforms used by many, like Ashley Madison, rely on appearance and snap judgements and, for those people who are physically disabled, it is hard for others to think outside the chair, so to speak. The services of a sex worker are not just about sex. Well, they are sort of, but it depends how you define it, right? In many cases, there is more intimacy than physical activity and more care, education and love. Everyone needs to feel human touch, to feel connected.

From the sex worker's point of view, I just quickly want to talk about Anya, an incredible woman who is well educated and a mother. One of her children has a disability, and sex work gives her time to care for her child while being able to access money for therapy. She is highly skilled and employable outside the sex work, but she chose to be a sex worker. She is making enormous differences in people's lives. I have seen the passion she has for helping those with disabilities live at least a somewhat conventional intimate life, like the rest of us. Her work with those people with disabilities, extreme social anxiety and awkwardness, and sometimes even impotency, which prevents them from dating or having sex in the traditional way, is simply amazing. Anya's job is an extension of the caring person that she is.

Let's be clear: sex work must be decriminalised in order to protect the workers and to provide the availability of loving, comfort and touch in an evidence-based health promotion way. I commend the bill.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:21): I am grateful for the opportunity to rise to speak in relation to this bill at this time. I indicate that I will be supporting the second reading debate for the reasons that I will make some brief observations about. At the outset, there has been acknowledgement of the contribution to this debate by members both presently in this house and former members, and I would like to single out and make reference to the contribution of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw in her summing up of the debate in the upper house back on 14 November 2000.

The Hon. Diana Laidlaw is a woman whom I hold in very high regard. In summing up the debate at that time in the other place, she noted that the bill then before the upper house, firstly, had been deemed a conscience vote for all members, and that is the case presently, nearly 20 years hence, and that there was at that time, indeed, a wide range of views expressed from members on all sides.

She noted then that many members, and even those who supported reform at that time, were not fans of prostitution and did not want to encourage proliferation of the sex business or encourage more people to become prostitutes. She noted her expectation that, at that time, even members who opposed the measure at the second reading would acknowledge considerable unease about the then current state of the law. I expect that that also remains the case nearly 20 years hence. The Hon. Diana Laidlaw then observed, and I adopt:

We are elected as legislators. We are paid as legislators...it is my very strong view...that our responsibility is to advance debate on measures, whether we like the measures or we feel comfortable about the measures before us, and particularly when there is...[widespread] acknowledgment...that the current laws are unworkable, unenforceable...[and] discriminatory in terms of women...

Secondly, I wish to note that I welcome the fact that this Fifty-Fourth Parliament provides an opportunity for debate in this house on this matter. My friend and colleague the member for Schubert has already made reference to the large number of times that this legislation in relation to this matter has been debated previously. Here we are in this House of Assembly debating these important matters.

I made reference in referring to the remarks of the Hon. Diana Laidlaw that bills in this place are termed conscience votes from time to time where they might be deemed to be relevant to an individual member's morals, beliefs or faith. I make the observation that in a very substantial way all pieces of legislation that come before this house I would regard as conscience matters—certainly, that is the way that we proceed on this side of the house, and I am very proud that that is central to my party's tradition. I welcome the fact that there is all the more focus in the context of this debate on the exercise of individual members' consciences.

For my part, I wish to make the observation, so far as references to faith and morals are concerned, that for me debate and reform in this area accord very much with my own personal faith and moral framework. As I observed in my first remarks in this place in May last year in praise of my mother, who had then spoken not long before that at the graduation ceremony at Saint Dominic's Priory College in memory of the great Sister Marianne Holland, my mother quoted Sister Marianne Holland and the ethos by which she lived her entire life and which in turn inspired me and my brothers:

We have a responsibility to serve others, and to welcome others. That is expressed in loving most, the smallest and weakest—the outsider, the vulnerable, the poor. And we do well to remember, that as a community, as Australians, as people in the 21st century world, we are only ever as strong as the weakest among us.

I would include among those vulnerable and weak in our community, at least so far as the law is concerned, those people who are presently the subject of criminalisation in this area. I also bring my perspective as a father of daughters to this debate. I very much respect the perspective of the member for Schubert in the same way. I have no desire to encourage—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, there is a point of order.

Mr TEAGUE: I note the time, and I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

NATIONAL POLICE REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:30): It is my privilege to move:

That this house acknowledges that Sunday 29 September is National Police Remembrance Day and pays particular tribute to the 61 South Australian officers who have given their lives in the service of our community.

I want to make some particular remarks in relation to one of those officers, Senior Constable David Barr, who, at the age of just 31, died in the course of active duty on 26 July 1990. Before I do so, I want to acknowledge the Minister for Police, the Hon. Corey Wingard, who is doing tremendous work in this area, in my observation, and would have been pleased to participate in this debate. I understand he is unable to do so for the reason that he is presently attending a South Australian police community constable graduation at the Police Academy.

National Police Remembrance Day was first held on 29 September 1989, arising out of the previous year's Australasian and South West Pacific Commissioners Conference. It holds great significance throughout the Asia Pacific as a day of solemn tribute throughout Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and the Solomon Islands. National Police Remembrance Day is a time for police officers, police staff and the broader community to honour the dedicated men and women who have made the ultimate sacrifice to protect the community.

This is also a day for police officers to remember colleagues who have lost their lives through other circumstances. On this day, I am sure that police and the community will also be thinking of our international police, who face terrible dangers arising from terrorists and terrorism incidents across the world. Locally, I am sure members of South Australia Police will be thinking of those 61 South Australian police officers who have tragically lost their lives while in the line of duty.

I am advised that in the lead-up to National Police Remembrance Day the Police Federation of Australia holds Police Week, a time for the community to engage with police and give thanks for their service. Police Week includes two events of particular note: the National Police Bravery Awards and the Wall to Wall Ride for Remembrance. The National Police Bravery Awards were held for the first time in 2018, and this year two South Australians, Brevet Sergeant Bill Fettes and Senior Constable First Class Paul Finnie, were nominated for their acts of courage while off duty.

While on holiday in New Zealand, Sergeant Fettes came across a car accident where oil had spilled onto the roadway and the vehicle and the road itself were on fire. Sergeant Fettes approached the car to find a woman trapped between the airbag and the driver's seat. Sergeant Fettes freed the woman, dragging her from the vehicle moments before the car was completely engulfed in flames.

While off duty, Senior Constable Finnie noticed a house fire and, with other passers-by, realised that urgent action was needed to save the occupant's life from the rapidly encroaching fire. With other willing volunteers, Senior Constable Finnie created a human chain to search within the house for the occupant. While they had to withdraw due to intense heat and smoke, the MFS soon arrived and proceeded to rescue the victim.

I take this opportunity at this time to thank and acknowledge Sergeant Fettes and Senior Constable Finnie for their courageous efforts while off duty. From the time that I have been in this place—I am sure that I can speak with confidence for the Minister for Police in this regard as well—there comes a realisation that this attitude of always putting others first is widespread throughout SAPOL.

Another event held as part of Police Week is the Wall to Wall Ride for Remembrance. From all across Australia, police officers and their families, friends and supporters ride their motorcycles to Canberra for a memorial service at the National Police Memorial. The minister was able to see off the South Australian contingent when it left Adelaide Oval this year on its journey, and it is a tradition that I very much hope will continue as part of the remembrance of this special time.

I said at the outset that I would like to refer in particular to Senior Constable David Barr. In this context, I make particular reference to his colleague all those long years ago, Senior Constable Mick Klose. Senior Constable Mick Klose has continued to honour and recognise the memory of Senior Constable David Barr and to ensure that the great tragedy of his passing too young is remembered.

There is a special personal connection for me in relation to Senior Constable David Barr because, following Senior Constable Barr's passing in the line of duty in 1990, a memorial medal was struck in his honour. I was honoured to receive that medal in 1993, a reminder to me in the years since that the day-to-day work of those who take up duties as part of South Australia Police might include many of the routine aspects of work that we all take for granted but also, in a very real way, involve the risk of these most disastrous of outcomes.

My memory at the time that I was presented with the memorial medal by Senior Constable David Barr's widow in 1993 was that he was an adult of seniority and seemed to have been considerably down the track. At this stage, as I reflect on that nearly 30 years later with the realisation that Senior Constable Barr was just 31 years old when he lost his life in the line of duty, I am reminded as well that the risks that are faced by police are very much faced by young men and women in the

prime of their life, and they are truly to be honoured and recognised for the risks they take on behalf of all of us in the community.

I am proud to move this motion and I sincerely trust that this coming Sunday members of this place will take their own steps to recognise this important occasion. I commend the motion.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:40): I rise to support the motion. I thank the member for Heysen for bringing it to the house and, as always, for his thoughtful and interesting contribution. I have made many contributions of this sort to this house. I think perhaps this is the ninth time I have spoken on such a motion in this house, so I will make my comments today necessarily brief. I will not delay the house, as I am sure there are others who wish to speak and there are other important motions to debate.

It is important for us at least once a year to reflect on the dangers that our police officers and other emergency workers face by choice. Every day, they go out and take risks to protect the rest of us. I am not talking about the very highly trained members of the STAR Group, particularly, or other groups. I am talking about, in the vast majority of cases, those ordinary patrol officers who go out every day. They are men and women who do not know what they are going to face. They get to work every day, put on their uniform and, literally, anything could happen.

It is worth remembering that danger, as well as those police officers who have died over the years and, thankfully, by world standards, it is not many. We live in a very safe community. As well as remembering those who have died, it is worth remembering the dangers faced by those who are injured, those who deliberately and of their own free will take these risks in order to keep the rest of us safe.

That is why throughout this year we have debated measures to keep police officers safe. While I will not go over the politics of it again, I am glad that we have arrived at a point where I think police officers are now being afforded better protection by the courts, or should be. We can expect that they will be afforded better protection by the courts and, hopefully, that will serve to deter people from deliberately injuring police officers and also other emergency workers.

The next steps, of course, if you talk to the Police Association and the Police Federation, are to address the significant mental health stressors of police work. As well as the physical danger they face every day, police officers carry with them an enormous amount of mental stress from the sights they see, the situations they deal with and the sometimes difficult people they have to encounter. It is no exaggeration to say that post-traumatic stress disorder and like conditions are under-recognised in our police and it is good to see that they are coming to the fore.

I want to acknowledge the work of Mark Carroll, who, as well as being the President of the Police Association here, is also the President of the national Police Federation. The federation commissioned a very good film, made by South Australian filmmakers, called *Dark Blue*. I saw the premiere of the movie—the Hon. Frank Pangallo from another place was also there—and I have been lucky enough to see it a couple of times since. The film spoke about the dangers of mental health injuries particularly and the ongoing dangers that police officers face from undiagnosed, untreated and unrecognised mental health injuries.

Obviously, it is difficult for police officers to talk about. Traditionally, there have been cultural barriers to police officers talking to each other and to their families about the stressors they face. In that past, it has been the type of culture that does not really discuss these things in the open. Thankfully, that is changing, and the association here and the federation nationally, and other associations nationally, are really recognising that these things need to be confronted head on. So I urge all members to seek out this movie *Dark Blue*. It is on the web and you can find it on the Police Federation website.

I know that the Hon. Frank Pangallo is doing some work in this area, and I plan to talk to him more over the coming months about what we can do to address this in a legislative way. I also know that people like Mark Carroll and the association here are doing things industrially in terms of these mental health injuries, and I want to give them all the help I can.

I will not say anything more about this motion. As I said, I hope it causes members to reflect not only on the deaths of police officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice for the rest of the

community but also on the ongoing sacrifices that police officers make who go to work every day not knowing what they will confront but doing it in order to keep the rest of us safe. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:45): It is my pleasure to stand to speak on behalf of the people of Stuart in support of this motion by the member for Heysen, and I appreciate the words of the shadow minister on this. This is a day I have spoken about many times, most often when I used to be the shadow minister for police, and I want to acknowledge the member for Elizabeth as a former police officer himself. While he found that work was not right for him from a lifelong, ongoing career perspective, he has certainly remained focused with regard to what we can do in this place for police officers.

One of the things we in this parliament can do for police officers right now is support the Minister for Police, the member for Gibson, who is doing an outstanding job in that area. He is a truly focused, genuine and hardworking minister doing everything he possibly can to support police as an organisation, SAPOL, support individual officers and, of course, support the public of South Australia who are the beneficiaries of the work police officers do.

I am ashamed to say that I do not remember all the 61, I think, officers who have lost their lives in the course of their duty, as I was quite familiar with that list a few years ago. However, it should not be forgotten that, while different from a serving military man or woman going into a conflict zone, police officers still have their lives at risk. I often think about how hard it must be mentally to leave your house in the morning for a day's work or in the afternoon for a night's work knowing that it might be a fairly routine, mundane day at work or it might be incredibly confronting or it might be incredibly dangerous.

Most of us can plan what is ahead in the day, but police officers have no idea. It is possible that any day they go to work they might be confronted with a situation in which their life is genuinely at risk. Then you add to that exactly the same issue understood by their husbands or wives or partners, children or parents thinking, 'Let's hope not, but today might be the day that my son or daughter,' or husband or wife or whoever it is, 'faces a genuinely life-threatening situation'. I thank police from the bottom of my heart and on behalf of the people of Stuart for the work they put in.

I am blessed in my electorate office to have a former serving police officer of 37 years' standing—who is, by the way, a truly outstanding electorate officer. She has been with us for just over a year, but she is extremely well known around our electorate for her work as a police officer. In fact, around 12 or 15 years ago she was the South Australian Police Officer of the Year. Michele Smith still contributes to our community in many, many ways. Unfortunately, I will not be able to attend the memorial service in Port Augusta on Monday, but I could think of absolutely no-one better than former police officer Michele Smith to represent me at that event, as she will do.

A few months ago, I was very grateful to be invited by the Port Augusta Police Station to come to watch, with serving officers from the district, the movie *Dark Blue*. There was a premiere, as I understand it, in Adelaide, Port Augusta and Mount Gambier. (I apologise if it happened anywhere else that I am not aware of.) The movie was shown for the first time, simultaneously, in those three places. It was outstanding of police officer Russell Morgan to invite me along, as local MP and friend, to see that movie. It was especially touching to be invited to see it at the same time as serving police officers and their families who were seeing it for the first time.

It had an impact on me and it had an impact on those officers I know. Most likely, thousands of the approximately 4,500 serving police officers we have in South Australia have seen that movie since. In a very helpful way, it does describe the type of mental health pressure police officers and their families can be placed under. It really was a tremendous initiative. I acknowledge Mark Carroll, the president of both the South Australian and the federal police associations, for being one of the key people who made that happen.

In our electorate of Stuart, we have a wide range of communities. Some are very, very small and remote communities, the largest being Port Augusta. It is fair to say that people in these different communities view policing in different ways. If you are in a very small remote town, or even just a small country town, your police officer becomes a friend and a member of the community, as well as the person who is enforcing the law, and it is exactly the same for his or her family. They are almost

always incredibly valuable members of the community and are made very welcome. They contribute in many ways, just like everybody else in the community does.

At the other end of the spectrum, population wise, in Port Augusta police officers are valued incredibly highly as well, but they have a different type of work to do. Policing in a regional centre, such as Port Augusta, is different work from what it would be in a small place like Oodnadatta or Maree or Booleroo, for example. So it is tremendous that throughout their careers so many officers are able to move from place to place.

I have known officers, and have had good friends who have been officers, who, over 20 and 30 years, have worked in various parts of metropolitan Adelaide and in various parts of regional South Australia. I think that has been outstanding for their careers and for their families, but it has also been outstanding for their communities, who have had the benefit of police officers with a different range of experience coming into the different communities.

I know that Commissioner Grant Stevens has a real focus on diversity at the moment. He is a person who has worked incredibly hard as a deputy commissioner, and now as the commissioner, to increase the diversity of SAPOL across the state. As I said before, there are about 4,500—I think it might be about 4,700—sworn police officers in South Australia. He has a real focus on ensuring that there are more and more women in the force and more and more men and women from diverse ethnic backgrounds—and, in fact, from a broader age range as well.

I remember going to the Police Academy for a graduation. There was a 50-year-old man who had just graduated from the academy, so presumably he had been accepted when he was 49, and about to go out to the work world officially as one of the lowest ranking officers around. I am sure that with the experience that comes with being 50 years old, that person would move through the ranks very quickly. Policing these days is not about the traditional, young or middle-aged white male dealing with crime.

The world has moved on, and there are so many high-tech, intuitive, digitally-based ways of fighting crime these days. It is not just about people on foot or in patrol vehicles. It is a whole new world these days, compared to what it was 20, 30, 40 years ago, and a whole new SAPOL enforcing laws, doing everything they can to prevent crimes from happening, but when they do, to do everything they can to apprehend the perpetrators. I honour SAPOL-serving active officers and I support this motion wholeheartedly.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:55): I would like to rise in support of the motion by the member for Heysen and thank him for bringing this important motion to the house. I would like to take the time to acknowledge that Sunday 29 September, as well as being my birthday, is National Police Remembrance Day. Sunday 29 September 2019 will be the 30th anniversary of National Police Remembrance Day, commemorating Australia's police officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice in the line of duty. I would also like to pay my respects to the 61 South Australian officers who have given their lives in service to our community. Thank you from the bottom of my heart and the hearts of people living in King for your service and sacrifice.

Many of the local police serving King actually live in King. They are King residents, and they have been an amazing support both giving me feedback on many community matters and working on projects broader than their roles in the community as well as serving the community. Locally in King, we have the Golden Grove Police Station on The Golden Way, the Salisbury Police Station in Mary Street and the Elizabeth Police Station in Frobisher Road in Elizabeth.

I would like to thank the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, minister Wingard, for joining me in our local community recently for a visit to a variety of our police stations and emergency services groups. Part of this visit included the Golden Grove Police Station and the Elizabeth Police Station to meet with the Officer in Charge of the Northern Policing District Model, Guy Buckley. Guy took us on a tour of the facilities and provided us with an understanding of how operations work in the police stations and what the police officers face on a daily basis in their line of duty.

I was really impressed with what I saw, by the people we met, and I was amazed at the work that police do to keep our community the safest it possibly can be. Thank you once again from the

bottom of my heart to our local police officers who go to work each day to serve us and keep us safe. I will be forever grateful for the work our police force do to serve our community to the very best of their ability. Without you our community would not have the peace of mind it has today.

The recent visits gave me a very different perspective on what a day in the life of a police officer looks like. I was surprised and disturbed to see a wall of bats, knives, guns and other sorts of instruments which have been confiscated from people living in our local community. I am regularly inspired by the work that police do in the community beyond simply being one of the first points of call in an emergency. For example, the police play an active role in our local Golden Grove, Wynn Vale and Greenwith Neighbourhood Watch group. The Golden Grove, Wynn Vale and Greenwith Neighbourhood Watch group, which I have been part of for a very long time now, regularly meet at the Dame Roma Mitchell Centre and the Golden Grove High School on Adey Place in Golden Grove.

Councillor Sandy Keane from the City of Tea Tree Gully does an outstanding job as chairperson of this group. These meetings provide a great platform for the community to come together and work on ideas to improve the safety of our local area. The police officers who attend our meetings do a great job of listening to the community's feedback and taking it all on board and working with us on projects in our local community.

For example, we have currently been working on implementing a free mobile library in our community. The police officers who attend are excellent community role models and do a great job in engaging with the group to come up with solutions together to address these issues. I have also been to a similar group in Hillbank, proactively started up by some Hillbank residents. On top of this, I have been amazed at the efforts of police officers who attend our meetings and who bring forward issues that we are usually not aware of, ask for our feedback and respond accordingly.

Keeping our community safe and providing better services is one of the top priorities of our Marshall Liberal government. The Marshall Liberal government believes that protecting our police and emergency service workers and providing them with a safe environment to work in is essential. This is why recently we passed tough new laws through state parliament to protect our police and emergency service workers. A few examples of how the Marshall Liberal government is protecting our police and emergency service workers and providing them with extra resources include:

- the strongest penalties in South Australia's history for assaults on police and emergency service workers;
- a new offence for spitting or throwing other bodily materials on to our police and emergency services workers;
- a new South Australia Police rapid response section, which provides an enhanced operational capability to support both first responders and STAR operations to better manage violent incidents; and
- a fixated threat assessment team to work with SA Police to mitigate the threat of mass casualty terrorism by providing advice and accompanying police when assessing potential extremists.

The 2019-20 state budget provides more than \$3 million over the next four years to build the elite fixated threat assessment team, which is expected to include SA Health specialists, including mental health workers, a psychiatrist, a psychologist and a data analyst. An enhanced financial and cybercrime investigation branch has also been launched to combat the rising threat in our community. The branch, which includes the major fraud investigation section, has been renamed the Serious and Organised Financial Crime Investigation Section and boosted by 13 staff, taking the total people working in the section to 90.

In November last year, a potentially life-saving new state government-funded mobile phone app linking at-risk women directly to police and domestic violence services with the touch of a button was also launched. Along with this, the SA Domestic Violence Crisis Line was also moved to be staffed 24 hours a day, seven days a week by specialist domestic violence counsellors. When a duress alarm is raised, police officers are immediately dispatched. The state government paid \$150,000 to an Adelaide-based company to develop this app, which is now monitored 24/7 and directly connects users to police and domestic violence support services.

My King electorate officer and I have been very grateful for the support of local SA police officers and the assistance of the head of the northern police district model, Guy Buckley, when my local community have raised any issues of concern. Those in my office have been very grateful for the professionalism of local SA police officers and Guy Buckley in handling a variety of concerns in our community. Some examples of where assistance has been provided to our community by local SA police officers and Guy include:

- a case and concern of identity theft;
- hoon driving in Golden Grove;
- dirt bike riders in Hillbank and Salisbury East;
- mental health matters;
- intervention order matters and breaches;
- damaged letterboxes in Salisbury Park;
- neighbourhood disputes;
- loss of a licence and reinstatement; and
- stalking.

These are just some recent examples where local police officers and Guy Buckley have provided us with excellent assistance on behalf of the King community. National Police Remembrance Day, on Sunday 29 September, provides all of us in our local community and right across the state with an opportunity to pay tribute to the 61 South Australian officers who gave their lives in service to our community. On National Police Remembrance Day this Sunday, I will spend some time to reflect and thank those who gave the ultimate sacrifice with their lives in the line of duty. I will also be spending some time to thank local SA Police officers for the work that they do on a daily basis to serve and protect our community.

I will also be using the time to pray that our local police officers and their families are looked after and kept safe. Our local police officers deserve our respect for what they do to serve our community and what they are faced with every day. Again, I thank the member for Heysen for bringing this important motion to our attention, and I fully support and endorse this motion.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (12:05): I, too, rise to support this motion put forward by the good member for Heysen to recognise National Police Remembrance Day on 29 September and acknowledge the dedicated roles of South Australia Police and the Australian Federal Police in our communities.

National Police Remembrance Day is held in remembrance of those officers who lost their lives or were seriously injured while on duty and to express sadness and gratitude to the families of those officers. A motion such as this gives us the opportunity to reflect on their service and their sacrifice. By doing so, we also honour those who continue to dutifully put themselves in harm's way every day to give us the life that we enjoy.

By way of background, the National Police Remembrance Day is an opportunity to recognise the dangers of the policing profession, reflect on the sacrifices made by dedicated officers and focus on the challenges that lie ahead. The day was first held in 1989 and is seen as one of the most important days on the police calendar. Right across South Australia, and in my electorate of Chaffey, the police and the community will join to honour the men and women whose lives were lost while performing their duties as police officers. I would also like to acknowledge my appreciation for the important work that police officers do in the community, particularly in the Riverland and Mallee. I hold them in exceptionally high regard.

On Friday, I will attend the local National Police Remembrance Memorial Service held on the banks of the River Murray at the front of Banrock Station. I have attended this event in previous years. The location is of significance to both the Murray Mallee local service area and South Australia, as it is where the first two police officers, Mounted Constable Carter and Lance Corporal Wickham, were killed while serving as policemen in South Australia in 1847.

Mounted Constable Carter and Lance Corporal Wickham drowned after tumbling out of a bark canoe while trying to cross the River Murray. Conflicts had arisen between Aborigines and colonists over the movement of sheep and cattle, and Wickham and Carter were ordered to travel to Overland Corner and respond to the disturbances. Despite the risk, the officers attempted to cross the river near the station of Mr J.H. Wigley, where sadly the canoe capsized and the two officers drowned.

This important day reminds us that we must never underrate the important role that the police play in our communities and the real risk those officers take to protect the community. Sadly, 61 dedicated South Australian police officers have lost their lives in the performance of their duty since 1838, when South Australia Police was formed. Mercifully, we have not seen the death of a South Australian officer on duty since 2002. It is also important to remember the families, friends and loved ones left behind. These officers were doing nothing more than their job and they paid the ultimate price.

While we are speaking about the important role of the police in our communities, we need to thank them for their important work across South Australia. We know that police are always there to stand in harm's way to protect those innocent people. It is also a reflection on what the police force means to regional and country communities, as more often than not members are a part of a sporting team and part of a community. They are there as great custodians who not only serve the community but also are part of the community.

I want to pay tribute to all the police officers and the senior management in the Riverland and in the Mallee with whom I have a very good working relationship, which is ongoing. We have an open dialogue policy, which gives me the opportunity to knock on a door, make a phone call and have them accessible at any point in time. It is a vitally important relationship I have as the local member with the police who travel our roads so often and keep us protected.

I commend the motion to the house. It is a very important day on the police calendar. It is a very important day to commemorate the great work that our police officers do to keep us safe.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:10): I rise to make a few brief comments on National Police Remembrance Day, of course being commemorated on 29 September each year. I would like to give thanks to every current and former serving South Australian police officer in what is often a very tough role. Police in regional areas often work alone in difficult situations, and I believe that we need to do everything we can to support our police and keep their workplaces as safe as possible. They also make strong connections into local communities, and I believe that one of the best things we can do is to raise community understanding and forge connections with our local police.

I would like to make mention of Superintendent Phil Hoff and Sergeant Andrew Stott, Manager of the Crime Prevention Section, and all the men and women who work within the Limestone Coast Local Service Area. It takes a considerable skill set to be a regional police officer. Often you go into a community you are unfamiliar with and it takes time to integrate and to learn the ways of the locals while still performing your job as an officer.

Many solo police officers become multiskilled: both keepers of the peace and community leaders. Sergeant Stott has done a lot of work recently on recognising the contribution that local Aboriginal trackers played in South Australia's policing history. Since 1838, SA Police have worked with 64 Aboriginal trackers across all the regions of South Australia. Long before forensics and DNA technology came into play, Indigenous Australians with their ability to read the land were called in to help police. They were able to see things virtually invisible to their police colleagues, following a trail because of foliage or grass near the scene of the crime because of how it might have been broken in a particular way.

At this year's Foundation Day, SA Police honoured the wider work of Aboriginal trackers and police aids, who were later renamed community constables. There are two Limestone Coast trackers I would like to mention, Alf Ryan and Lanky Kana. Alf Ryan was a tracker from Port Augusta who came to the Mount Gambier Police Station in 1919. He was known for his tremendous ability to solve a case quickly and efficiently. In 1928, he was responsible for tracking down two prison inmates who escaped from Adelaide's Yatala Labour Prison—they actually escaped twice—and were found in Mount Gambier. He was also called in for one of the state's biggest and most intensive searches for

a missing child, a little girl called Elaine Long, at Bordertown. Four days after she went missing, Alf headed a team of trackers to locate her through eight miles of bushland and return her to her family.

For many years, Indigenous trackers faced plenty of discrimination in their day-to-day work. Although they often did the same work as regular police officers, they were not officially sworn in, so they did not have the same authority. Although they were often responsible for solving crimes, they were rarely given recognition in newspaper reports and were referred to as 'trackers', not even by their own names. Trackers were also paid less than regular police officers, at around £25 per year in the early 1900s.

As was the custom at the time, Indigenous people were buried in unmarked gravesites. Tracker Ryan died in 1966 and was buried in an unmarked gravesite in the Penola South Cemetery. In recent years, there has been a push to recognise the services of the state's Indigenous trackers by the South Australia Police Historical Society. In 2004, on Police Foundation Day, a plaque commemorating his service was unveiled at his gravesite at the Penola Cemetery, with relatives travelling from Port Augusta to witness the ceremony.

Lanky Kana was a Boandik man who was a legend in the region for his skills at tracking. He would be brought in to help locate stolen cattle and missing criminals and to uncover clues missed by police. He also looked after the police horses and used to walk them to a well at Beachport to water them. When Lanky died in 1904, he was buried at the back of the Beachport Cemetery in the so-called 'disadvantaged section' right away from the other graves, as was the custom at the time.

Thanks to the work of Robyn Campbell from the South East Aboriginal Focus Group, who has family ties to Lanky, the grave has been restored and a memorial garden put in place. This year, the final resting place of Lanky was officially recognised with a plaque placed at his grave at the Beachport Cemetery by SAPOL as part of their NAIDOC Week. Sergeant Andy Stott was there to see the plaque unveiled, as was the Commissioner of Police, Grant Stevens.

The arrival of police dogs in the 1970s ended the official role of many Indigenous trackers, although they were still called in for major cases. It was only five years ago, in 2014, that Australia's last police tracker retired from service, ending a 200-year-old tradition. I commend the incredible service of Alf and Lanky today as I commend every former and currently serving South Australian police officer.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:16): In closing the debate, I thank and recognise members who have spoken in support of the motion: the members for Elizabeth, Stuart, King, Chaffey and Mount Gambier. I thank you all for your contributions on this motion. In closing the debate, I reflect upon again and make particular mention of those within my local community in the Hills who are serving with South Australia Police.

I count among my closest friends a number of people, both retired, mid career and early in their career, who have chosen to dedicate their life's work to a community contribution within SAPOL. There are a number of these individuals who are very close to me, and I wish to emphasise that I hold them in the highest regard. I do not single them out by name, in part for the reason that the work that they do is often necessarily behind the scenes, but I do emphasise that they are just like so many of us with families at home. They are members of the community in every regular respect, except with that very important special exception that they, in a very real way when they go out to work, put their lives on the line in the service of our community. With those words, I close debate and commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

STOMAL THERAPY

Private Members Business, Notices of Motion, No. 2: Mr Bell to move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the valuable work of members of the Australian Association of Stomal Therapy Nurses; and
- (b) calls on the state government to investigate the need for a regional stoma association.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:19): I move:

That this notice of motion be withdrawn.

Motion carried; notice of motion withdrawn.

DEMENTIA AWARENESS

Mrs POWER (Elder) (12:19): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that Dementia Awareness Month runs throughout the month of September;
- (b) commends Dementia Australia for raising awareness and understanding of what it is like to live with dementia; and
- (c) acknowledges people living with dementia require support and understanding.

This year Dementia Australia is calling on all Australians to consider how discrimination and a lack of understanding of the disease can impact people living with dementia, their families and carers. Their message is that nobody chooses to have dementia, but we can choose how we respond to the people in our lives and in our community who are living with dementia.

Dementia can happen to anybody. It is more common after the age of 65, and up to 30 per cent of 85 year olds suffer some form of the disease. Dementia is the second leading cause of disability in our community. Formerly known as Dementia Awareness Month, this year Dementia Australia focused their attention on Dementia Action Week, which took place from 16 to 22 September.

Dementia Action Week provides the opportunity to raise awareness about what dementia is and how it affects us. As an illness that usually affects short-term memory, it can also cause a loss of judgement, the ability to carry out day-to-day tasks and even the ability to speak. In its later stages, dementia can affect the ability to walk safely and to swallow. It can be caused by a disease such as Alzheimer's disease or by multiple small strokes. However, like all chronic diseases, it can be managed successfully, and there are ways we can assist our family, friends and those in the community to live better with dementia.

Dementia does affect everybody differently. As people with the disease grapple with memory loss, and the loss of other mental faculties, it can cause a range of emotions with behavioural and psychological symptoms. It is not uncommon for people with dementia to be angry or fearful. Imagine if you did not know where you were or why you were there, or who all the people were around you. Imagine if you felt alone and you did not even know what your name was. Wouldn't you, too, feel frustrated and perhaps fearful?

Understandably, this can make caring for people with dementia challenging at times. In some cases, people can feel relatively content, applying scenarios from the past to explain their current circumstances, but that can make comprehending their train of thought difficult for others. In one case I know of, a gentleman who was suffering dementia would struggle to recognise the people in front of him, and his ability to speak had been reduced. However, still being able to recall memories of people and places in the past, he told stories from long ago and would often have a little chuckle. While it was not possible for people around him to comprehend or even follow everything he was saying, his family was able to engage him in a way that supported him.

I think that one the best things about Dementia Awareness Month or Dementia Action Week is that it provides an opportunity to tune into how we can best support those around us who are living with dementia, and, importantly, how we can become a dementia-friendly community. Dementia Australia provides tips on how we can do that for any of our friends or family with the disease. They suggest:

- Help your friend maintain independence. Support your friend or family member with dementia so that they can do as much as they can for as long as possible, giving them the time and space they need. I know my grandmother in Alice Springs, Nanny Anna, would often say, 'If you don't use it, you lose it,' and I think that applies to both our bodies and our minds.

- Listen openly to people living with dementia and give them time to search their brain for the words that they want to use. Try not to let them feel embarrassed if they lose the thread of what they were saying.
- Communicate clearly by keeping to closed-ended questions or ones with obvious answers, because open-ended questions can be confusing for a person with dementia.
- Be realistic about memory loss. Someone with dementia will not remember everything, even recent events. Do not be offended if they do not remember something that is very special to you.
- Try not to argue or order a person around, because this can make the situation worse.

Focusing on being kind, clear, patient and empathetic with those who have dementia appears to be the key. Having a family member or friend with dementia can be difficult for all involved, but the more we are aware of the disease and how to support those with it, the more we can help as a community. Becoming a more dementia-friendly community is beneficial for everyone.

As a local member, I am pleased to be involved in supporting people to understand about dementia and promote a dementia-friendly community and, as a part of the government, delivering health care for people with the disease. To this end, the topic of my first seniors' forum within my electorate was 'Understanding Dementia'. More than 100 people came along to hear guest speaker Jenny Adams from Dementia Australia.

Jenny was absolutely amazing. She was able to provide some really helpful information on what is normal with memory and ageing as we get older and what is not. She also spoke about how we can reduce our own risk of dementia I recall one of her key tips was that we should brush our teeth with the hand that we do not normally use—so, our opposite hand—as a way to keep our minds active. I hope everyone in the chamber goes home and does this tonight.

Mr Pederick: That's a challenge.

Mrs POWER: Yes. Of course, as with all of my seniors' forums, it was also great to have a chat and a cuppa with some of the locals after listening to the presentation. Absolutely key to my electorate, to all South Australians and to the healthcare system more broadly is our government's work to deliver a reactivated Repat.

As the house is aware, the Marshall Liberal government recently announced \$70 million in funding to revitalise the site. This includes funding for an 18-bed specialised facility to care for some of our most vulnerable South Australians suffering from extreme behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia. In addition, the funding also provides for an eight-bed specialised dementia care unit. Special acknowledgement goes to the federal member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, who has secured over \$1.3 million of federal funding per year to fund the operation of the eight-bed specialised dementia care unit, in addition to the 18-bed Ward 18.

The specialist dementia care unit will focus on reducing or stabilising people's symptoms over time, with the aim of helping them to move to less intensive care settings. As part of the design process for the project, the Marshall Liberal government has worked closely with people with lived experience of this type of dementia.

SA Health is currently in negotiation to partner with a non-government organisation to deliver the state's dementia hub, a dedicated dementia village including 60 places for people who have complex care needs. We are making the Repat health precinct a dementia-friendly community. As a government, a reactivated and revitalised Repat is just one of the ways we are supporting those in the community living with dementia. We will continue to innovate with our healthcare system to provide better care for people living with the disease and for their families.

Dementia Australia also has some great resources for understanding how best to support people living with dementia within our communities, and tips for families and friends, and I commend them for their work. By raising awareness about the disease and people who live with it, we can all play a role in becoming a more dementia-friendly community.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:27): I rise to support this motion and note the importance of Dementia Awareness Month, which has been running throughout September. I also commend the work of Dementia Australia for raising awareness and understanding of what life is like with dementia and acknowledge that people with dementia require support and understanding.

Unfortunately, a very large number of people in South Australia suffer from dementia, and the fact is that the number is increasing all the time. Not only is it increasing but there are more and more younger people with early-onset dementia as well. This is only going to increase into the future. More and more, we need to think about how we as policymakers and lawmakers can devise our community to be dementia friendly. Everybody in the community will need to think about this.

We need to make sure, in determining how our societies and communities are organised, we are thinking about how people with dementia can live in these communities. It is as simple as thinking about the layout and design of shopping centres and community facilities, and making sure that there is clear signage. These are all very important issues. Dementia Australia has been raising awareness on this issue for some time. We have held a number of functions at Parliament House over my 5½ years here to raise awareness. A number of us have said to Dementia Australia that we are happy to be champions for that here in this house.

Dementia Australia (or Alzheimer's Australia, as it used to be known) have run a number of community forums out in the community. A few years ago, we did one in my electorate, in Kaurna, which was very well attended. It was excellent to hear from people who suffer from dementia and also people who care for those with dementia on how we can best reshape our society to be dementia-friendly. I know that the member for Reynell is about to have a similar forum in her electorate, and I would encourage other members to do it in their electorates as well.

It is not just an important thing for policymakers and lawmakers to think about; our whole community needs to think about this as well. As I mentioned, we have an increasing issue in terms of younger onset dementia. I have spoken to a number of family members about their concerns around this. When someone has younger onset dementia at a serious level, we do not have the proper facilities for that here in South Australia. We urgently need to look at how we can make sure those people are better cared for in our society. I am sure it is something we can work on with non-government organisations and community organisations.

It is difficult for somebody in that situation to have to be in homes designed for people who are much older than them. That is not an appropriate place for them to be cared for. I think we need to improve our work to make sure we care for those people because, sadly, the number of younger onset dementia sufferers is increasing as well. At present, there are nearly 450,000 Australians living with dementia and 1.5 million Australians involved in their care, so we are talking about very large numbers of people. As the member for Elder was talking about, while it is important to have specialised centres, we need to realise that all our aged-care facilities are progressively going to have to improve their dementia care.

There are many hundreds of them across South Australia. I think it is unfortunate that, about six or seven years ago, the federal government pulled back a lot of funding in terms of specialised dementia care. You can imagine, particularly when we look at the pressures on our nurses and carers in aged care, if there are a few sufferers of dementia in an aged-care facility, they are obviously going to take a lot more time to care for. You might not have that much time because you might be a registered nurse who is in charge of 80 people. That does not give you many minutes in the hour to care for somebody with dementia.

There is a need for specialised care. I hope this is something that the royal commission currently underway is looking at seriously because I think that it is going to be an increasing need, an increasing problem. It is not only about care for people with dementia: if we do not have proper support in aged-care facilities, everybody else will also not get the attention they need in aged care. Hopefully, that is something that we will see the royal commission currently underway take very seriously and have strong recommendations on.

I congratulate Dementia Australia and all the volunteers who support them on their work, particularly all the carers for people who have dementia. This is a disease that is not only very difficult to go through but also very sad for so many people who obviously love their family members and

friends who are suffering with it. It can be heartbreaking when those people are losing their memory and cannot remember particular things or particular people. To the people who care for them—the 1.5 million Australians and no doubt well over 100,000 South Australians who care for a loved one with dementia—thank you. Thank you for your hard work that can never be properly accounted or paid for. Our community would be at a significant loss without your dedication to your loved ones.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (12:34): I rise today to support the member for Elder's motion to recognise September as Dementia Awareness Month. I commend Dementia Australia for raising awareness about dementia and also acknowledge the importance of our community in supporting people living with dementia and their families.

I very recently held a forum in my electorate about understanding dementia. It was presented by Liz from Dementia Australia and I have to say it was a fantastic presentation that covered quite a lot of very important areas. The presentation covered many of the facts around dementia and dispelled some of the myths and misunderstandings about it. It also highlighted some of those, such as what is normal forgetfulness versus other things that are perhaps more concerning. An example I certainly remember of that is this: if you are going to shops, it is not abnormal to forget where you parked your car, but it is concerning if you forget that you drove and start walking home. There were a whole number of other examples like that.

Also, and I think importantly, the presentation highlighted some of the things that we can do as a community to support those living with dementia to make their lives easier. I certainly learnt a lot and I think the enormous turnout from the community highlights how important an issue dementia is and the fact that it touches so many people—I suspect almost everybody—in some way. I think a lot of people were able to learn a lot through the forum, either learning about how they may deal with it if it was to be an issue that would affect them themselves, or also how they could help their loved ones.

Dementia is a significant condition that affects many people in South Australia and indeed across our country, and in fact I think across the industrialised world. It is the second leading cause of death in Australia, with almost half a million people living with dementia in Australia at the moment, and this number is set to increase over time as our population continues to age. Dementia is an age-related condition with about one in 10 people suffering from this over the age of 65, up to three in 10 over 85. It is much less common in younger people, but it does occur. There are approximately 27,000 people with younger onset dementia living in Australia.

Dementia is a term used to describe the symptoms of a large range of conditions that are responsible for a progressive decline in a person's functioning. It is a broad term used to describe a loss of memory, intellect, rationality, social skills and physical functioning. There are many different types of dementia, including Alzheimer's disease, which is the most common, vascular dementia, frontotemporal dementia, and Lewy body disease.

In South Australia, the Marshall Liberal government is implementing a number of different strategies to help address the care needs of people living with dementia. We are working with residential aged-care providers to build their confidence and capacity to care for people with dementia. This is being achieved through the provision of an in-reach clinical specialist service to assist in managing the care of people with behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia, and through the provision of wraparound support to assist in the transition of residents back to aged care after a stay in an acute older persons' mental health unit.

The Marshall Liberal government is working with the commonwealth Department of Health on the rollout of the specialist dementia care units in South Australia. These will be places of care for people with behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia where the symptoms are significant enough that the person with dementia cannot be cared for in mainstream residential aged care.

As the member for Elder also mentioned, the Marshall Liberal government will be opening a neurobehavioural unit at the Repat Health Precinct in the middle of next year. This will be an 18-bed facility designed to care for people with the most extreme behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia. Symptoms of dementia of this severity are rare but can certainly cause great distress to the person with the condition, as well as to their loved ones. As part of the design process for this

project, the Marshall Liberal government has worked closely with people with lived experience of this type of dementia and this has really helped us to understand how we can ensure that people are able to live their best life in the unit despite the limitations of their disease.

There is a lot that is not understood about dementia as a disease. There are certainly a number of risk factors related to it, such as cardiovascular disease, diabetes and high cholesterol, which some people might classify as being related to lifestyle or environmental factors, but there is also a suspected genetic component. Ultimately, dealing with this disease and the burden of disease within our community will require breakthroughs in medical research.

It is worth acknowledging that Dementia Australia plays a significant role in funding dementia research, offering about \$1 million worth of project grants, travel grants, postdoctoral fellowships and postgraduate scholarships each year. Many of their research priorities include better understanding the causes of dementia, developing strategies to reduce dementia risk and slow the progression of disease and also to provide accurate and timely diagnosis, improve treatment and care options for people living with dementia and ultimately to find a cure, however that might look.

Importantly, though, I think that Dementia Australia's research support does provide a particular focus on supporting early and mid-career researchers in the field, which is critical for increasing the research capacity in this area but also in sustaining it and preventing its loss. That is critical at that stage of a research career, when the career can be quite vulnerable, and losing expertise is something that is very hard to get back.

It is also worth noting that in 2015 the federal government announced what was then an additional \$200 million over five years, significantly boosting funding for dementia research. This is obviously a very key component in dealing with this condition. As the member for Elder mentioned, as did Liz from Dementia Australia at my forum, there is certainly a lot we can do as a community to make our community more friendly for those people with dementia.

A key part of that is understanding what it is like to live with dementia, to have greater empathy for what people go through and some of the challenges they face. For example, I certainly did not know that a black mat can look like a hole in the ground to some people with dementia. There are many other examples like that and, as the member for Kaurua alluded to, this does provide opportunities for public places, shopping centres and so forth, to adjust or consider how they might be able to adapt to make those environments more friendly for people living with dementia.

There were some examples we were shown at the forum of people who were living with dementia, who were telling some of their own stories. One of the stories I remember the most, and probably the most touching, was from a gentleman who made the point that inside he is still the same person, and I think everyone else who sees him makes that point. It is quite upsetting to see that decline in someone who was incredibly capable, and to see within themselves that decline is quite a sad thing. So it is important for us all to respect, to have patience and to be aware of what it might be like if we were in that position and how we can make someone's life better through our own actions.

There is no question that dementia is a serious and significant problem in our community. While we will continue to support and hope for better treatments, preventative strategies and even a cure from our scientists to come along and make this situation a lot better, there is a lot we can do ourselves to improve the lives of those in our community who are living with dementia. I commend the member for Elder for bringing this motion to this place and I commend it to the house.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (12:44): I want to make a few comments in support of this motion, and I acknowledge the comments made by others. I will not repeat all the facts and figures and contributions other members have made, but what I would like to do is to focus on one part of the motion, which I support, and suggest that I think that the motion should actually go further.

The motion acknowledges that people living with dementia require support and understanding, which is certainly true, but I would add that the carers of people with dementia also require support and understanding. The reality is that a lot of people who have the disease are being cared for by family members or carers in their homes, and it is hard work for those people to care for family members and other people they are caring for who have dementia.

Clearly, the quality of life of the person suffering from dementia is diminished but, for those people—particularly family members—who care for a person in their home 24/7, it is also often very hard work. It can be quite distressing to see a family member who was once very active but is now less active because of this disease. The fact that we are living longer is probably part of the reason that there are more people being diagnosed with dementia. We are just getting to that age where the disease kicks in for an increasing number. Although, as the member for Kaurna said, there is an increasing number of people with young onset dementia as well.

It is very important that, while we have specialised beds and specialised services in a number of facilities, they need to be funded. As the member for Kaurna noted, sadly, additional funding for specialist support in nursing environments has been cut back by the federal government, which is sad because it makes it very hard for those people suffering from dementia to get the quality care they require. It also puts pressure on those people who work in those institutions and those facilities to care for them.

Another thing I would like to highlight—and I am disappointed that it has not been mentioned already—particularly for people who are aged and who have actually received some sort of aged-care package to receive support in their home, is that a lot of people (and I think it is worse for people with dementia and their carers) may be assessed and approved for aged-care funding with respect to some sort of package at home, but it can be nine months, 12 months or two years before the funding comes on.

In that nine months, 12 months or two years those family members have to care for those people out of their own resources, which makes it very difficult not only financially but also in terms of stress for those family members. It is sad in this day and age that governments do not make this a priority in terms of resourcing those sorts of services.

If we can afford to cut taxes for the top end of the market and cut taxes for corporations and multinationals, one would think that we have the resources to provide funding for those people who are being cared for in their family home not only to make sure that they get quality care themselves but also to support those families, because in the end those families do two things: first, they provide very strong care in the sense that there is a family bond and, secondly, they actually save the state and the community quite a bit of money as well, because quite often their work is unpaid.

For the small investment that the commonwealth and federal governments would make in this area the outcomes would be very positive. Apart from commending the member for moving the motion, one thing I would like to identify is that additional funding is required to support people with dementia living in their home or in aged care, as well as those carers who look after them.

I think it is important that we need to make sure that governments at both state and federal level, of any persuasion, get that message that this is not an area that can be prioritised at some later date. There are hundreds and probably thousands of families in this state who require funding for those sorts of basic services. I have known families where they have applied for funding through the aged-care system, which was approved, but the family member has died before the funding was approved and came through.

In essence, that is quite disgraceful in today's society. We are quite a wealthy society, and we should be able to care for those people who are most vulnerable in a better way and support those who care for them. With those comments, I commend the member for the motion.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (12:49): I would like to thank the members for Kaurna, Newland and Light for their contributions to this motion. Once again, in closing the debate I really want to acknowledge and commend Dementia Australia for all its work in this space, with a very, very special acknowledgment to everybody out there in South Australia, all South Australians, who have a family member or who know someone or who care for somebody who is living with dementia.

As I mentioned in my earlier remarks, it can be quite challenging at times, and the love that they offer in the face of what could be a challenging circumstance should really be acknowledged. So I pay my respects to them and acknowledge the member for Light's comments around the important role of carers and the contribution they make in our community. We should never take that for granted. In closing, I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

WORLD TOURISM DAY

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:50): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 27 September is World Tourism Day; and
- (b) acknowledges the importance of tourism for the culture and economy of South Australia.

Today, I rise to celebrate the United Nations World Tourism Day. It is recognised each year on 27 September. The date is there to recognise and celebrate the enormous benefits of tourism globally.

The theme for this year is 'Tourism and jobs—a better future for all'. This is an appropriate theme, as tourism generates 10 per cent of jobs globally. We can reflect this locally in South Australia, where 39,000 people are directly employed within the visitor economy. We have 18,000 tourism businesses operating in our state and more than 13,000 hotel rooms across 269 properties.

Often called the 'visitor economy', tourism is worth \$7.2 billion to the South Australian economy. What is most important to me is this is a significant industry across all of South Australia; 43 per cent is spent in regional South Australia, providing an invaluable boost and diversity in the economy throughout the regions. Since the creation of the South Australian Tourism Plan 2020, launched in 2014 by the then state Labor government, the value of tourism to our state has grown from \$5.1 billion to the current \$7.2 billion.

We are incredibly fortunate to enjoy picturesque scenery, diverse regions, amazing food and wine and the increasing distillery sector, and, of course, we have a jam-packed calendar full of festivals and events that drive tourism. South Australia has unique experiences such as shark diving in Port Lincoln, mountain biking in the Flinders Ranges, sandboarding on Kangaroo Island, cave exploration in Naracoorte and wine tasting in McLaren Vale and throughout the Adelaide Hills and many other regions.

More than 450,000 international visitors arrive in South Australia every year, and that is alongside nearly 85,000 domestic airlines seats that we fill weekly. We know that tourism has great benefits for South Australia, and it is clear that tourism equals jobs. At the moment, we are hosting a very special event in South Australia. It is the World Routes Conference, a major airline industry conference that has attracted nearly 3,000 delegates from around the world. They send representatives from airlines, airports and tourism authorities to discuss the potential of new air services, and we are hosting them right here in Adelaide.

In 2016, the Weatherill Labor government made a successful bid for Adelaide to host the first World Routes Conference in Australia for this year. It is disappointing, though, because the Premier said, when asked about World Routes in January this year, that it would be wonderful to have something to announce at the World Routes Conference. Unfortunately, there have been no announcements.

This is a further missed opportunity, with no new flights secured at this conference, and it comes at a time when we have had recent announcements of the closure of the Adelaide offices of Emirates and Singapore Airlines. An operator recently shared with me their concerns that tourism appears to be undervalued by the current Liberal government, that with all the focus on new and admittedly exciting sectors such as space, creative industries and defence, tourism is being passed by.

This is despite the fact that every government dollar invested in tourism creates reliable, sustainable and regional stimulus to the economy and increases jobs throughout South Australia. We know that other states are increasing their investment rather than withdrawing at this critical time. What we have seen the Marshall Liberal government do is slug the tourism industry with increased taxes and cuts to marketing and sector development.

Tourism is global, and tourism is very competitive. It is made up of literally hundreds and thousands of small to medium-sized businesses that work hard, invest their own dollars and have a

passion for this sector. They are increasingly feeling left out of the equation. The Marshall Liberal government plan to cut \$23 million from the tourism budget over five years hurts.

In the first budget, it was an \$11 million cut, and this year the government announced \$12 million more in cuts over the next four years, reducing tourism marketing to a five-year low. This is having a real and measurable impact on the visitor economy. In recent information from Tourism Research Australia, we know there are negative growth forecasts, and this reflects how poorly this government has performed in the tourism portfolio. We need to better market South Australia, locally, nationally and to the world.

We have had some positive announcements recently. It is great that the 2020 Adventure Travel World Summit is going to be held in Adelaide. I think we are an ideal location. We have some exciting opportunities for people to experience adventures here. And, of course, as of last week there is Monarto zoo's new name—Monarto Safari Park—and the \$40 million upgrade will be fantastic. Here in South Australia, you can enjoy the largest safari experience outside of Africa. These are fantastic opportunities. However, for the growth to be realised, there has to be meaningful and genuine commitment from the state government to support this sector, and that commitment is currently lacking.

Members, I ask you to support this motion, because here we are celebrating United Nations World Tourism Day. It is an industry that has experienced global success, growth upon growth every year. We love to welcome international visitors to Australia. We know that they have very high intentions of coming to Australia; what we need to do is convert them to actual visitation. Often, people have us on their bucket list. We want to say you can come at every stage of your life: come and do a backpacking opportunity, come to Australia when you have your honeymoon, come again and bring the kids, and come again when you retire. What we need, though, in this super growth industry is investment and commitment to growth.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:58): I have only a few short minutes to comment on World Tourism Day, so I will make it brief, noticing that the focus this year is on tourism and jobs. Certainly, that is very important for the Marshall government. Growing tourism is very important here in South Australia, particularly in Morphett, in Glenelg. You will have noticed, maybe, the recent announcement, the welcome news that the government has launched a feasibility study into the options, looking at the redevelopment of the Glenelg jetty, to activate it and make it a tourism drawcard.

Specifically, it will consider all options, and certainly of interest from my point of view is looking into potentially having a jetty that is activated via a ferry, that allows a ferry service between Glenelg and Kangaroo Island, and potentially also looking at connecting up Glenelg to the Yorke Peninsula. There are certainly opportunities there for a ferry service. We could also look at having a tender service, where cruise ships could tender their cruise line passengers into Glenelg, which is very accessible, with the tram into the city. This would not only activate Glenelg and South Australia but also help grow businesses in Morphett. Looking at that, I think there is a really worthwhile prospect there. I commend the minister, who is here in the house at the moment, for progressing this initiative, and I look forward to working with the Marshall government to progress tourism in this state.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we ring the bell, I would like to welcome international students, teachers and the principal from Treviso, Italy, visiting Loreto College, and also Mr Alex McKinnon, a teacher from Loreto College, all hosted by the member for Bragg. Welcome to Parliament House today.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

*Petitions***O'SULLIVAN BEACH BOAT RAMP**

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell): Presented a petition signed by 547 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to commit to funding an upgrade of the O'Sullivan Beach boat ramp.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Government Boards and Committees Information, South Australian—
Annual Report 30 June 2019

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:04): I bring up the report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) (Remote Area Attendance) Variation Regulations 2019 (SA).

Report received.

Mr TEAGUE: I bring up the 25th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr TEAGUE: I bring up the 26th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Question Time***BUSINESS CONFIDENCE**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier take responsibility for business confidence plummeting in the state's economy according to the BDO State Business Survey released this morning?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): Obviously, we take any advice from the business sector very seriously. We look at the results of the BDO survey, which was taken in the month of August before we released our full land tax package. It was a survey of I think 177 firms in South Australia of the 140,000 small businesses in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It does provide some commentary, which we are happy to look at, but it does contrast with surveys also conducted around that time by the National Australia Bank, by BankSA and by ANZ that still say that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The ANZ Stateometer made it very clear that we were the only state in the entire country which has above-trend growth accelerating and so, whilst that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is good news, there is plenty of work to be done and that's precisely what we are up for on this side of the chamber. We are going to be working every single day. We are not going to be talking down the state. Some people are now unfairly calling the Leader of the Opposition 'Pessimistic Pete'. We prefer just to get on with it on this side of the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. The point of order, member for West Torrens, is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How about name-calling, sir?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order on the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: It is, sir. Speaker Atkinson made it very clear that there is an order for which points of order may be taken, and he went so far as to throw members out for not obliging with that.

The SPEAKER: For much worse than I would, absolutely.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Or less, yes.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Is there a standing order or just a history lesson?

The SPEAKER: Yes, yes. I am going to deal with this, member for Lee. Members on my left and right are, quite frankly, as guilty as each other. I am going to ask that the decorum please settle down. I am going to call to order a number of members on my left and right: the members for Playford, Light, Lee, Ramsay, West Torrens, Mawson, Hurtle Vale, the member for Hammond and the Minister for Education.

I ask that the temperature drop just a little bit. I would like to hear the questions and the answers clearly. I believe that the Premier made a good attempt to stick to the substance of the question. Where he starts referring to members in such a way—I won't repeat the term—I think that is arguably a little bit of a deviation, and I ask him to come back to the substance of the question. He has finished his answer. Leader.

STATE ECONOMY

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier take responsibility for the number of businesses believing that the state's economy is going backwards nearly quadrupling over the last year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): The Leader of the Opposition asks an interesting question about who should take responsibility.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have looked at a number of—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The deputy leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —different opinions on who should take responsibility for this, and there is one that I would like to refer to today, and I am happy to read—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —it into *Hansard*. It says here, and this is a quote from the Leader of the Opposition in the foreword to the survey:

In recent months we have seen the impact that trade wars and global pressures can have on national economies.

Much of that is felt in local business conditions, driving right through to the take home pay of thousands of workers.

The challenge for us as State leaders, is to create opportunities and conditions that buffer against the headwinds.

So, when given an opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member on my left!

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to talk to the business community, he says there are global headwinds—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —global headwinds—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but at the press conference he says it is a disaster because he is talking down the state again, saying one thing to the business community, another thing to the press in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He is reminding me more and more of Bill Shorten every day— Bill Shorten with a slightly better running style, but nevertheless Bill Shorten.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. The point of order is for?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: Debate. I uphold the point of order, but let me say this: I am trying to listen to the answers and it is a bit hard when members on my left and right are shouting. Consequently, I warn for a second and final time the members for Badcoe and Playford. Is the Premier finished? Leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: There's only one of us promising a tax increase. My question is to the Premier—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is there a question on my right? We will take that one. The member for MacKillop. I will come back to the leader.

ROAD UPGRADES

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:12): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house about the Marshall government's congestion-busting projects and how they will create jobs?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:13): Can I thank the member for MacKillop for his question, noting that yesterday we did discuss the things in his electorate that the Marshall Liberal government is doing to help improve productivity and grow jobs in the beautiful South-East of our state. The member asks a question about congestion-busting infrastructure right here in Adelaide, and can I say that this government is getting on with the job and is able to deliver hundreds of jobs in this space underpinned by improving our road infrastructure, and not only those direct jobs but also the flow-on productivity benefits that come from upgrading our road network.

In the electorates of Elder and Waite, we have a \$60 million project to upgrade the Goodwood Road, Springbank Road and Daws Road intersection that is going to support 48 jobs per year over the life of that project. We then move out north to the electorates of Playford and Wright and the Main Road, Kings Road and McIntyre Road upgrade, one that will support 16 jobs over the course of that project.

We then move, Mr Speaker, over to your electorate, or at least I think you are trying to claim it as your electorate, and also the electorates of Bragg and Dunstan—you can argue with the Premier and Deputy Premier about that—and 78 jobs are being supported after the Morrison and Marshall governments' \$98 million commitment to upgrade what is one of the most congested intersections in our state along what is a very important freight corridor.

In the member for Unley's electorate—and I think he has to argue with the member for Waite, who isn't able to defend himself—with the Cross Road-Fullarton Road intersection upgrade, 49 jobs are being delivered over the life of that project in a very beautiful and important part of our city. Also in the member for Unley's electorate—I think he owes me a decent bottle of red—28 jobs for the Glenn Osmond Road-Fullarton Road intersection upgrade, again a key corridor that the people from the member for MacKillop's electorate and the member for Hammond's electorate driving down the South Eastern Freeway will use on a daily basis and a key choke point for people to get around not only in terms of light vehicle but also heavy vehicle usage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Out in the electorates of Florey, Enfield and Port Adelaide is the Grand Junction Road-Hampstead Road upgrade, again a key pinch point on our freight route that will help to unlock productivity and not only the 15 jobs directly involved over the life of that project but also the flow-on effects from productivity improvements, from getting our produce to market that much more quickly and helping to grow the broader economic story, the good story that it is, here in South Australia.

In the electorate of Adelaide, the upgrade to Nottage Terrace-Main North Road is a hugely important intersection upgrade and again a key productivity benefit for those people who should otherwise and can otherwise be at work, being productive, rather than sitting at the intersection, getting frustrated with the transport minister: 15 jobs over the life of that project.

Then there is the upgrade to the Mitcham Hills corridor, a very congested part of our city, a part of our city that has been left neglected for a long period of time. The member for Waite along with the member for Boothby has been advocating for that upgrade and, again in conjunction with our friends in the federal government, 24 jobs are going to be delivered over the life of that project.

We highlight these things because there are two ways that infrastructure upgrades can help grow our economy. The first of those is direct jobs. So the \$11.9 billion over the forward estimates that the Marshall Liberal government is putting in to help grow jobs in the civil and commercial infrastructure space is hugely important, but what we cannot forget are the indirect jobs and the productivity benefits that come from making these investments, that really help to drive our economy, that help to drive consumer confidence and business confidence and will overall help to grow the pie, create jobs and create wealth and prosperity for all South Australians.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I welcome international students from the University of Adelaide, who are hosted by the member for Adelaide this morning. I also welcome exchange students from Italy from Loreto College, hosted by the member for Bragg; Eudunda Area School year 4, 5 and 6 students, who are hosted by the member for Stuart; and John and Bev Trueman, celebrating their 60th wedding anniversary, who are being hosted by the member for King. Of course, I also welcome the former member for Davenport, the Hon. Iain Evans. Welcome to parliament.

Mr Odenwalder: Save Crime Stoppers!

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is called to order and the leader has the call.

*Question Time***UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe that a 7.3 per cent unemployment rate, the highest in the nation, is no problem whatsoever?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:17): This is like a Dorothy Dixier. This is exactly the same question the Leader of the Opposition asked last week. They have completely and utterly run out of questions. But every single day that I'm talking about the economy and jobs in this house is a happy day as far as I'm concerned—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —because we are now at peak employment in the history of the state. Jobs are growing.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You may be interested to know, sir—not everybody is interested in good news, but you will be interested to know—that there are new statistics out today which look at job vacancies and compare our jurisdiction with the rest of the country. What does it show?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Does it show what the naysayers have been putting out there? Absolutely not. In fact it shows exactly the opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford can leave for 20 minutes.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It shows exactly the opposite, and that is that we are growing the economy and, importantly, we are growing jobs in South Australia. Let's have a look at what the federal department of employment, skills, small business and family business have put out today, looking at job vacancies in South Australia. They were up 0.6 of a per cent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They were up 0.6 of a per cent in August, 3 per cent higher than a year ago—the strongest annual growth of any mainland state in the country. And they hate it! They hate good news.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Any good news they absolutely hate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: The question was about—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Talking about the opposition is debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order: 7.3 per cent unemployment rate. When we start accusing the opposition of hating things we could be deviating, Premier, and I ask you to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir, it's just an observation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's just an observation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I would like to hear the answer. Members on my left, be quiet.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I have been studying the opposition and some of their positions on policies. Some may even arrive at a position on a policy every now and again. At the moment, the leader is floating around like a feather on the wind, trying to work out whether he wants to actually support a land tax cut in South Australia.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: There's a point of order for debate.

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

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The Premier has the call. I would like to hear his answer, if the interjections could cease on my left, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. The heart of this question was really about employment in South Australia and what I was doing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —was providing some information to the house on the surge in terms of job vacancies in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Those opposite, whilst I was making my response, said, 'What about the ABS?'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I quickly looked at what the ABS job vacancy figures were, and I'm happy to update the house because they, too, are good news for South Australia. According to the ABS, there were 10,900 job vacancies on average over the year to the end of May 2019.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is 9 per cent higher than the previous year and—are you ready for this—46.3 per cent higher than five years ago. Who was in government five years ago? The reality is that we are going to work hard every single day that we are in government to create jobs, and the job vacancy figures published last month by the ABS show that we are creating more jobs. Employment in South Australia is now at the highest level in the history of the state. Our participation rate in South Australia is now just a smidge—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —off the highest in the history of this state. This is very good news that more people are wanting to participate in our economy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe can leave for 25 minutes under 137A.

The honourable member for Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: This participation rate is on the increase and this is very, very positive for our state.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): If a 7.3 per cent unemployment rate is no problem whatsoever, what level of unemployment constitutes a problem?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22): We are going to do everything we can to create more jobs in South Australia. We don't accept the current unemployment rate, but it is a function—

Mr Malinauskas: So it is a problem?

The SPEAKER: Leader, we have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of a significantly higher participation rate in South Australia. I'm glad the Leader of the Opposition has continued with this line of questioning because it provides me with the opportunity to provide the house with some more information regarding this surge in participation rate that we have had in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If we look at the increases across the country in terms of participation rate, we see that from April 2018 to August 2019 the statistics show that we have had the second largest surge in participation rate in the country, only just behind New South Wales. The third is Victoria—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and every other jurisdiction in the country has had a contraction in their participation rate. We have worked hard to create the opportunities for the next generation here in our state. We have been doing everything we can to create more jobs, and I'm

pleased to show that what we are now delivering are more jobs in South Australia than at any time in the history of this state. Let's look at a comparison, because I always think comparisons are useful to provide some colour and information to the house. If we look at the last six months in South Australia—

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is on the board.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we have created 5,000 jobs in South Australia. When I say 'we' have created it, the state has created it, the private sector has created it, employers have created this, and that is something to celebrate—5,000 jobs in the last six months. Compare that with the first six months of the returned Weatherill government. They lost 5,000 jobs in a six-month period.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They lost 5,000 jobs, and at exactly the same time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, the Premier has the call.

Mr Malinauskas: Tell the full story.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The leader is saying, 'Tell the full story.' Ask another question and I can go into more information that demonstrates that we are moving this state in the right direction. This is exactly and precisely what we are focused on doing—that is, creating more jobs in South Australia. We are doing that by creating a more attractive environment for businesses to be successful in this state.

When we are talking to businesses, they are saying that skills are really important. That is why the Minister for Innovation and Skills is working hard to create 20,800 new apprenticeship places in South Australia to provide that future workforce. We see many other—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —jurisdictions in Australia in freefall in terms of commencements in terms of apprenticeships and traineeships, exactly the same place we were at when we took over government—an absolute freefall. TAFE was an absolute debacle. What have we done? We have put—

Dr Close interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Deputy Leader of the Opposition says that is not true. When we look at TAFE, if she could only ask a question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister for industry is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we would be able to answer a question on TAFE. When is the deputy leader going to be allowed to ask a question in question time?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is the Premier finished?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, not at all, sir; I'm still talking about TAFE.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Personal reflections on members are completely out of order, sir, and beneath the Premier.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I would ask the deputy leader, respectfully, to stop interjecting. I remind the leader that supps are a right, not an obligation for me to award. I have awarded the supplementary in good faith. I would like to hear the Premier's answer. Premier, I ask you not to reflect on other members, if possible, and to come back to the substance of the question. Thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not reflecting on members.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What I am doing is making it very clear that what we inherited in terms of TAFE was nothing short of a debacle.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Since then, we have put more than \$100 million back into the TAFE system and \$200 million back into skills in South Australia. These are the things that businesses need us to be doing on this side of the house to create the right business environment for them to employ the workforce of the future. We are up to this task. There is a lot work to be done. Yes, we have made some movements in the right direction: we have the highest level of employment in the history of the state, but we are not stopping there. We are going to be pushing ahead every single month to create more jobs.

MEMORIAL DRIVE REDEVELOPMENT

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister update the house on the Memorial Drive precinct redevelopment and the opportunities it will create with jobs in this state?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:27): I thank the member for Colton for his question. I am sure that the Seaside Tennis Club, where a young Lleyton Hewitt and Alicia Molik began their careers, the West Beach Tennis Club and also 2018's most outstanding tennis club, the Henley South Tennis Club, will be very excited by the news of what the Marshall government is delivering and its investment here in South Australia. No doubt, they will be singing the praises of this government and the member for Colton for delivering exciting tennis facilities here to South Australia.

Just a few moments ago, the Premier; the CE of Tennis SA, Steve Baldas; the President of Tennis SA, Kent Thiele; and I were down at Memorial Drive having a look at the first north-south canoe trusses going into place. About 39,000-odd people were at Adelaide Oval over the weekend seeing the first trusses going in, and now we have the north-south ones going in.

There are going to be six of these and, watching them go in today, it was very impressive to see. Each one is about 50 tonnes and 78.5 metres in length. As we were standing there, just watching the workers go about their business, people were stopping and taking photographs. They are very excited about this and I must say it looks fantastic. Nine of the 24 pieces of the roof are now on site, with the remaining 15 pieces to be transported to the site over the coming months.

I will take this opportunity to congratulate Cox Architecture as well, who designed the new canopy and new roof for Memorial Drive, and Kennett, who are the builders doing the work and employing South Australians, which is great to see. I was at the Convention Centre this morning for the start of the road safety conference. Looking across the Convention Centre at Memorial Drive and the Adelaide Oval complex, it looks a picture. It is going to be a great addition to that Riverbank Precinct.

This development will, of course, create a world-class facility, whereby we will be having an international tennis event, the Adelaide International, a WTA event and an ATP event. We haven't had women playing tennis here at that level before, so everyone is excited by that. We know that

Simona Halep, the reigning Wimbledon champion, will be here for that tournament—she is a former world number one—and we will announce more names in the coming weeks as well.

It is a \$10 million investment from this state government in sporting infrastructure that will benefit the entire state, not only for the event in January but also we now have an undercover venue in Adelaide for tennis players, young tennis players and emerging tennis players, to train in out of the weather. Adelaide didn't have such a facility and now we do, so that's great to see. Again, hopefully, we can unearth the next Alicia Molik, the next Lleyton Hewitt, the next Thanasi Kokkinakis, and that would be wonderful for South Australia.

The member for Colton asked about jobs, and I mentioned Cox Architecture and Kennett Builders. Eighty people have been employed as part of the construction of this project, which is absolutely wonderful. As a spin-off in the growth of tennis from this, 10 extra full-time positions have been created at Tennis SA to develop tennis right across South Australia. That is another win, that we are investing back in sport and creating some jobs in the sporting sector. It is very exciting.

Not only will this event bring visitors to South Australia, grow our tourism economy as well of course, but it will also allow for young people to play. As you watch this go up, Mr Speaker, the trusses are falling into place and it is marvellous to see the engineers at work at something that is way above my skill of expertise. Very soon, you will see go on top the new woven fibreglass membrane, which is the roof fabric that covers the existing stands.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I hear those on the other side are not very happy about this.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It's going to be exciting for all South Australians. We have a refurbished ITF stand at centre court, as well as the LED lighting on the court. It's going to be wonderful and it will be great for tennis and great for other opportunities for South Australia. I look forward to working with the Fringe and other sporting events that may well utilise this facility and create more jobs and grow tourism in South Australia. It's wonderful to see and it's disappointing that on that side they are not so happy about this. But we are very happy and we look forward to delivering more for South Australia.

Time expired.

LAND TAX

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is to the Premier. How does the Premier's land tax increase and combined \$500 million worth of new fees, charges and taxes on South Australian households generate jobs growth in South Australia?

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

The SPEAKER: I hear the minister. I am going to allow the question in this instance. Would you like to repeat the question? I am going to allow the Premier a go.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: How does the Premier's land tax increase and combined \$500 million worth of new taxes, charges and fees on South Australian businesses and households generate jobs in this state?

The SPEAKER: There's a fair bit in that. I will not be taking debate points unless they are very good ones. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:32): Thank you very much, sir. This provides me with another opportunity to talk about the substantial reduction in taxes that we put in place since coming to government. And they hate it opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They absolutely hate it. They wouldn't know a tax cut if they fell over it. They wouldn't have a clue about what a land tax cut or any cut was.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: When they were in government, they routinely wanted to tax you on everything: go into a car park and they wanted to tax you. They wanted to put taxes on bank deposits—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —here in South Australia—every single opportunity. We know that without any warning to the people of South Australia those opposite massively increased the tax on every household, every business in South Australia, by wrenching away that remission on the emergency services levy, costing taxpayers \$360 million until we could get back in to fix the mess that they created. So we were very happy when we were elected to get on with lowering taxes in South Australia, freeing up the economy and, most importantly, creating jobs. That's exactly what we said we would do and that's precisely what has happened—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —since we came to power. They hate it. They want to talk about everything—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —other than the fact that we have the highest level of employment in the history of the state. Let's take a look at tax and what we have done since we came to power: (1) we returned the emergency services levy remission and we are putting \$90 million each and every year back into the economy here in South Australia. People were relieved. Every time they receive that bill now they say, 'Thank goodness. Thank goodness we've got a Liberal government in South Australia lowering costs on households and businesses in South Australia.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have put through the third tranche of the stamp duty reduction—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

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

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We also, and very importantly, removed all payroll tax on small business in South Australia as of 1 January this year. Any small business—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —now in this state with a payroll of up to \$1½ million does not pay a cent. Of course, now what we are doing is pushing ahead with \$70 million worth of land tax cuts to come into effect on 1 July next year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They wouldn't know a tax cut if they fell over it because they have never, ever been near one—never been near one. We're very happy to be raising the threshold—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —at which people pay land tax in South Australia. This will take—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —thousands and thousands of people who are currently subject to the unacceptably high land tax rates in South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It will take thousands from having to pay land tax in South Australia going forward. But we haven't stopped there—because we have dealt with the issue which has created an exodus of capital out of our state and repelled capital coming into our state for property, and that is the unacceptably high 3.7 per cent marginal tax rate for land tax in South Australia. For some reason, there are people on the other side of the chamber who want to defend the fact that we were the highest in the country. They don't want to accept the fact that the reality is that this was driving money out of our state into other jurisdictions.

South Australian investors were investing interstate, some of them quite close to you guys over there actually, I seem to remember in the paper. The reality is that they were investing interstate because they weren't having to pay 3.7 per cent. We are very proud of the fact that we are going to be driving that down to 2.4 per cent on 1 July next year. It's the average of the mainland states of Australia. It's an important reform. It's about time the Labor Party actually formed an opinion on the largest land tax cuts in the history of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired. Member for Lee, then the member for Mount Gambier who has been patiently waiting. Member for Lee.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:36): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Does the Deputy Premier unequivocally support the government's latest land tax reforms?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:36): Absolutely.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Does the minister unequivocally support the government's latest land tax reforms?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:36): Absolutely.

MOUNT GAMBIER HOSPITAL

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure. Can the minister guarantee my community that the Mount Gambier hospital is safe? With your leave and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BELL: There is a report in *The Advertiser* that cladding used in the Mount Gambier hospital upgrade may in actual fact be flammable.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:37): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his

question. The answer to his question is unequivocally, yes, the hospital is safe to use. We are working through a difficult issue. To unpack a little bit for the house some of the complexities around this issue, we have seen both in Melbourne, with the Lacrosse fire, and in London, with the Grenfell Tower fire, some very devastating circumstances around the use of aluminium composite panelling (ACP), or cladding as it is more commonly known, that has a higher level of combustibility than it should do.

To make things quite plain, not all cladding is bad. In fact, all cladding that should be on the sides of buildings should all be good. The point is that there are existing provisions in place both through the Building Code and the planning act that make sure that the products that are used on buildings are safe. The difficulty we've got at the moment is the fact that there is some cladding—a lot of it that has been imported—that does not meet the Australian standards and the Australian requirements. Essentially, it's to do with the filling that goes in between the two aluminium panels and the level of flammability of that material.

We have, as have jurisdictions right around the country, gone through a process where we have identified buildings that have any sort of cladding. We then narrow the scope of that to look at which buildings have a heightened level of risk, or could have a heightened level of risk, depending on their size, their structure, their height, a whole series of factors. The department has then gone through—and I will talk now about public buildings—and assessed each one of those buildings as to whether there are any issues in relation to that building that would cause us to need to undertake rectification or other mediation works.

In relation to the Mount Gambier hospital, I can say that that building is safe and that there is no increased risk to life safety as a result of any material that may be on that building. We are going through that process in relation to a whole series of public buildings. Councils, in conjunction with their building fire safety committees, are actually going through this process for private buildings also. Essentially, we are working through building by building to make sure that we are fully apprised of the level of safety in these buildings.

This issue is being characterised in some circles as 'all cladding is bad' and that is not true. In fact, it is nowhere near true. The real difficulty is that the good cladding kind of looks exactly the same as the bad cladding, so there are a number of things that we do around assessing these buildings to help us to identify or mitigate or understand that risk. There are a number of responses that could be put in place around rectification of building, increased response by fire services and other safety measures that could be in place that could reduce risk further, but I can assure the member and the people of Mount Gambier that their hospital is safe to use. In fact, the assessment that has been done ensures that that is the case.

The government is working through this in a methodical way in conjunction with jurisdictions around the rest of the country that have a far, far larger issue than we are dealing with here in South Australia. Nevertheless, we are working diligently through the issues that exist in South Australia and we will continue to give South Australians comfort that the buildings in this state are safe.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Education. Does the minister unequivocally support the government's latest land tax reforms?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:41): Yes.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the minister unequivocally support the government's latest land tax reforms?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:41): I'm not sure if the member for Lee understands how cabinet works, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I think the answer that he is going to get—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —to this line of questioning—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: No, we understand how the Liberal Party works.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Obviously, the dream factory downstairs was just trying to find some filibuster for the second half hour of question time today. On this side of the house, we believe in structural tax reform. We believe that here is an opportunity to be able to improve investment in our state.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Giles can leave for the remainder of question time. He has been doing it all day.

The honourable member for Giles having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It does seem that there is some confusion in some quarters of this chamber as to what this tax is going to do. Overall, this will deliver \$70 million worth of land tax cuts into the South Australian economy. Of course I support that. Again, there are those who do not understand that sometimes a tax reform package is more complicated than one moving part. When it comes to complexity in tax, we need to deal with all the facts and we need to deal with a package of measures, rather than cherrypicking the things that you like that support your argument. You need to look at this tax package in its entirety.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But what I have not heard from anybody yet is a cogent argument as to why properties should be allowed to disaggregate. When it comes to payroll tax, we do not allow it and the former government did not allow it. Businesses of like directorship and ownership should be aggregated for the purposes of payroll tax and can I tell you that that legislation is watertight.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In relation to land tax, nobody has made a cogent argument about why there should be a two-step system, one that provides advantage to a certain set of people who structure their operations in a certain way and a disadvantage to other people who cannot take advantage of that structure. As somebody who deals every day with the property sector, I have spoken to a number of people, especially large and institutional investors, who will for the first time be able to compete when buying property in our state—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and actually be able to buy property in our state because they are not faced with the prospect of having to compete with people who are able to structure their tax operations differently.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: This will drive investment to South Australia. This is a brilliant set of tax reforms taken in their entirety, which is the way you need to look at tax reform, rather than just cherrypicking the bits—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that you want to talk about and forgetting about the bits that you don't want to talk about.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The idea here is that we are increasing the threshold, which is point number one. Point No. 2 is that we are aggregating.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We haven't hidden that fact from anybody. No. 3 is that we are bringing down the top marginal tax rate. So do I support this measure? You bet I do and you bet the entire cabinet does. This is something that is going to drive jobs growth in South Australia and the opposition should either get onboard or get out of the way.

QUAD BIKES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. As Minister for Primary Industries, what is your view on the farm safety initiative now seeing state governments in New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania providing rebates for the fitting of rollover protection bars to new and old quad bikes, an initiative now supported by the federal government's mandating the fitting of rollover protection bars to all new quad bikes?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:45): As the minister in respect of consumer protection, I can report to the house, and I hope it will assist the member, that at the recent meeting in New Zealand of all ministers responsible for consumer matters, including the jurisdiction in New Zealand, this matter came under discussion.

There was an expectation at that time that the report the member refers to would be published shortly thereafter. There was an expectation, I think, in the meeting that there would be a recommendation in relation to a mandatory roll bar obligation in respect of the production and/or sale in Australia of those vehicles. I think all members would be aware of the significant risks to the safety and, indeed, lives of some who occupy and utilise these vehicles—small quad bikes, as they are frequently referred to. It has attracted attention nationally and at this meeting.

Obviously, there was no resolution at that stage of seeing any detail of the report, but that will be under the review of each of the jurisdictions. We will take back to the next meeting our views in relation to whether that should operate or whether any other recommendations of that report should be implemented. It will obviously require consultation, not just with industries in relation to agriculture but with anyone who uses the vehicles, particularly given the number of child deaths of people who have either ridden as a pillion passenger or on their own and had a fatal accident.

I would like the member and, indeed, all members of the house to be reassured that this is an area of concern. Obviously, we would urge anyone who owns these vehicles or intends to purchase them to understand that there are already some strict obligations in relation to those who can use them, even on private property. I urge all members to ensure that any constituents who raise these matters comply with those recommendations, and I undertake to come back to the house when further consideration has been made of the national report.

QUAD BIKES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:47): Supplementary: my question really related to whether you have turned your mind to the thought of giving a rebate to people, as the other states have done.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:47): Again, they are matters that will be considered in relation to whether there is any obligation imposed on parties, bearing in mind that this is a little bit like seatbelts on buses. Retrofitting an existing product

isn't always easy or able to be safely attended to, but they will be matters under consideration after the principal decision is made as to whether there should be any obligation for that to be imposed in relation to any future purchase.

ECONOMIC INVESTMENT

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:48): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house about key investments in our state that will create more jobs for South Australians?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:48): I thank the member for Elder for her excellent question. Her question is about driving investment to create more jobs here in South Australia. Can I say that we on this side of the chamber are doing everything we possibly can. We are working harder than ever before to create the right business environment to stimulate, if you like, private sector investment in South Australia.

A fundamental component of that is making sure that businesses have the requisite skills in place when they need them. We are making huge investments in skills, as I have already outlined to the house. We are also pushing ahead with—

Mr Picton: On 100 apprentices—100 out of 20,000.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —massive reform in terms of tax, lowering the emergency services levy in South Australia, cutting out payroll tax for all small businesses in South Australia and pushing through with our largest land tax cuts in the history of the state. This is a very important reform to create a more attractive business environment, to stimulate economic growth and, most importantly, investment in the South Australian economy.

I would like to update the house on some of the most recent investments in South Australia, which I think all South Australians should celebrate. Only last week, I was up at the Monarto Safari Park and I notice—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —sitting in the Speaker's gallery today is the Hon. David Wotton, the former member for Heysen and the former environment minister for South Australia. He played a formative and instrumental role in the establishment of the Monarto zoo, which is now, as of last week, renamed the Monarto Safari Park. Gerry Ryan OAM is making a very strategic and significant investment into that park—\$40 million—to create accommodation, to create facilities, to enhance the offer there, which I believe will ultimately be the very best safari experience in the world, outside of Africa.

This will drive incredible interest from interstate and from overseas, for people to come to look at these incredible animals in a safe, accessible, affordable way, and in fact to stay overnight. I did query where the fence was for the glamping—which side—but apparently you are on the other side, away from the animals, which I thought would create the most safe environment, so I was very pleased with that.

Earlier this week, I was at the topping out ceremony for SkyCity's expansion of the Adelaide Casino, a \$330 million investment into the economy in South Australia. This is creating more than a thousand construction jobs in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and, ultimately, 800 ongoing jobs here in South Australia. It's going to be fantastic. It's going to be ready for the T20 next year and I think it will again create another level of accommodation in South Australia, something that we have wanted for a long period of time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was also very pleased this week to meet with the managing director of Treasury Wine Estates. I thanked Treasury Wine Estates for their massive investment—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Stephan is after a bottle of wine.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee has been upgraded to two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in new packaging facilities to increase the productivity and the capacity of their facilities in the Barossa Valley. This is a massive investment for our state; in fact, it's between \$150 million and \$180 million. This is on top of the commonwealth government's investment in terms of naval shipbuilding, in terms of electronic warfare, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance work that is happening out at Edinburgh, in terms of the SmartSat CRC and, of course, the massive announcement made by our Prime Minister in the United States of \$150 million going into space over the next five years, and much of that will be here in South Australia.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:52): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm that the entire Liberal party room unequivocally supports his latest land tax measures?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:52): I am very grateful to the member for Lee for providing me with this opportunity to again talk about our reform, a reform which has been called for for a long period of time.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: These are contentious issues; nobody is saying these aren't contentious issues, but we resolved unanimously to introduce the legislation into the parliament in October this year. We do that—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We resolved unanimously—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to go to public consultation. That public consultation will finish—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on 2 October and ultimately to introduce that legislation into the parliament in October this year. We do that because we genuinely want to push through these very significant tax cuts in time for the start of the next financial year on 1 July next year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's not without its complexity. Other lesser governments—won't reflect on anybody in particular, but take it as you will—would just be kicking this can down the road. They would say, 'This is a bit tough, so we will just sweep it under the carpet.' Let me tell you, South Australia has been suffering because of a lack of courage—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —at the leadership level for 16 years of Labor. They didn't actually create an environment which was attracting business investment into South Australia. In

fact, they created a business environment, a taxation arrangement, which was driving South Australian investment—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —out of our state into cheaper jurisdictions. This makes no sense whatsoever, and now those opposite want to defend the status quo. That is outrageous. That is absolutely outrageous. What we have made very clear is that 92 per cent of individual investors will benefit from the land tax—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —package that we are putting forward, and 75 per cent of company groups will benefit from what we are putting forward. We are absolutely determined every day that we are in office—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to improve business conditions in our state, and we owe our next generation.

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And I look up to the public gallery today and I see some students here. I am not sure which school they are from.

An honourable member: The Eudunda Area School.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Eudunda Area School. We say welcome to the students of the Eudunda Area School, and it reminds us—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Pay the land tax!

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

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Unlike those opposite, we aren't making cheap quips at people, residents, citizens of South Australia who come in to look at the way that we are operating. In fact, we welcome people to the public gallery, and they remind us—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, be quiet.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of our obligation to the next generation to create more jobs, because for too long in South Australia so many of our young people would finish school or finish university, get a good qualification and then leave South Australia and move interstate to get a job. Well, that has got to change, and every day that we are on the treasury bench—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we are going to be advancing reform, whether it is easy or not—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but reform that will move our state forward, create jobs and keep our next generation here in our state.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:56): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house how many landowners will benefit from the land tax changes to be brought to the parliament in October by the government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57): I have outlined this on many occasions, and we are happy to provide detailed briefings to the opposition and to other people in South Australia, but—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the modelling that has been done and has been independently verified shows that 92 per cent of individual investors will—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —have a reduction. We know that 75 per cent of company groups—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —will get a tax reduction. That is exactly and precisely—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Playford and Badcoe are on the edge, again.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are agitated, sir. They are frustrated. They were in for 16 years and they squibbed useful reform in terms of land tax. It was put to them but they were not up to it. In fact, the only land tax that they contemplated in their 16 years in government was a land tax on every single house in South Australia. That's what the former treasurer, the Labor treasurer in South Australia, was advocating. Well, we reject it—absolutely reject it.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. The point of order is for debate. The question was about the benefits of a certain proposal. The Premier has taken some time to provide some preamble. The Premier has finished his answer. There is a supplementary, and then I am going to move to the member for Frome. The member for Lee.

LAND TAX

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:58): My supplementary is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm to the house that the numbers he has quoted are for the changes to be introduced into the parliament via a bill in October?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:58): As I have said repeatedly to this house, the suite of reforms that we are taking in terms of land—

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader can leave for the remainder of question time; yes, the deputy leader.

The honourable member for Port Adelaide having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is like they don't want to understand what reform is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Just let's get a big piece of carpet and sweep all the problems under the carpet and hopefully they will go away. Well, look, they don't go away. This is a reform that is necessary. We know for a fact that there are those opposite who wish they had a party leader who had the courage to push ahead with useful reform in South Australia instead of floating around like a feather on the breeze.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has finished his answer. I think the Premier has completed his answer. I am going to move to the member for Frome.

SCHOOL TRANSPORT

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister please update the house on the progress of the review of the regional school bus policy, which I am led to believe was completed in February this year. Also this is in addition to my previous questions in September last year and also June this year.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:59): I thank the member for the question. It is a matter that we've discussed. I think the member is probably accurate in that we were hoping it would be completed by February this year, but my understanding is that our optimism was ill founded. There were in fact many, many more people who wanted to make submissions and come and talk to the reviewers than we had anticipated. We had anticipated a good level of interest; in fact, we had an enormous level of interest from people around regional South Australia.

I appreciate the frustration of not just the member for Frome but potentially more particularly families of school communities across South Australia who are looking forward to seeing not just the review but any potential policy implications that might be drawn from the review. I can certainly advise the member for Frome that there are a good number of members on this side of the house, too, who have been asking about this question, some of whom asked about it this morning when there were some briefings in relation to the regional consultation on year 7 to high school.

This is certainly something where I appreciate people's frustrations. The member for Frome would be well aware: he waited a long time as a member of cabinet, where he asked for a former government to do this review. He waited a long time for that review, and that did not propose any changes. It didn't take into it the presupposition that there was in fact a public policy benefit of considering the needs of students in non-government schools. So they did a review that didn't presuppose that being an idea—that they needed to be looked after, that their needs might be considered from a transport point of view, not just the needs of the public school system.

The other thing this review is doing—and we look forward to its considerations being completed—is considering the opportunities for regional communities that come from the school bus infrastructure potentially being available for broader community use in those communities, rather than sitting dormant in a schoolyard while the community has certain transport needs and opportunities that might be developed. We have asked the reviewers to consider whether there is a public policy benefit—potentially an economic benefit, certainly a social benefit—that is affordable within the scope of what that offering is.

It is a complex area, to be sure, and there are complex financial considerations that go beyond just the needs of bus routes and regional communities. Some other issues that have been raised revolve around the application of the current policy, which is obviously for public school students to have a right of access to their local public school.

Currently, students from non-government schools who are approximately on the route can get on the bus; potentially students in preschool or kindergarten services can get on the bus as well, but they don't have a right to that access. So, as I understand it, there are a number of people who

made submissions—I haven't been provided the submissions by the reviewer, but I've certainly been given copies of, or advice from people who have made submissions about, what was in their submissions.

I know this is an issue that has been raised as well. It is a significant review. I am looking forward to seeing what it recommends and how it proposes to handle those complex sets of interrelated issues, between the transport department, the education department and Treasury funding it. When that review comes, I think it will be going to the Treasurer first, as Treasury is leading the review; I imagine that the Minister for Transport and I will hopefully get briefed on it very, very soon thereafter, and it will obviously go to cabinet for further consideration. Once we're in a position to make any announcements, I look forward to doing so, and I have absolutely no doubt that the member for Frome and I will have a good chat, potentially over a piece of pizza, while we're having that chat.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Light, be quiet.

LUCAS, HON. R.I.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:03): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house whether Rob Lucas will remain as Treasurer until the next election?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:03): I'm not in the habit of speculating regarding what will happen in the cabinet. In the fullness of time, we will make it clear exactly and precisely what we will be doing. I'm sure those opposite would like to start this game.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will not impute improper motives to the Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I make this point—that the member for Lee is one of those more astute people on the opposition benches—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He realises that they have run out of questions. So what he does is he starts, 'What's your position on this?' and, 'What's your position?' That way, he gets his stats up. He got 10 questions asking one question. I'm not going to start this about the cabinet and who is in the cabinet, how long they are going to be in cabinet and work through the list. This is a decision that we will make.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Primary Industries!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Can I just say that obviously Mr Lucas is doing an outstanding job as the Treasurer of South Australia. It's a tough set of circumstances at the moment, with the slowing Australian national economy. I think we saw our GST writedown between the Mid-Year Budget Review and May this year, when we were preparing this year's budget, of \$2.1 billion—a massive writedown, which we have accommodated. We have accommodated it, while still making sure that we contain within our budget the largest capital investment in the history of this state: \$11.9 billion going into important—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: the question was about Robert Lucas's tenure as Treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: And the point of order on the point of order?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: When the question is about somebody's performance, surely a description of that person's performance is relevant.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I respectfully ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I have said, these are matters that will be considered in the fullness of time. I think the big question, though—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The big question, really, for the South Australian parliament to consider, which is much before the next election, is: is the Leader of the Opposition going to keep his job, because he is not doing a very good job? Most of the front bench don't even get questions. He is saying it's all about him. He occasionally lets his mate the member for Lee ask a few questions, but that's about it, so it's a pretty hopeless opposition at the moment. People are basically on the phone—

The SPEAKER: Premier, this is debate.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and, let me tell you—

The SPEAKER: This is now debate, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —usually about now there would be a point of order. But they all love it—they all love it—and he can't call a point of order on himself because it will look like he's shutting it down.

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Who's coming to his rescue? Not one of them. They are sitting on their hands, checking their phones or writing an email. They don't want to—

The SPEAKER: Premier! The Premier will be seated. The member for Newland would like a question.

UNDERGROUND MINING SCHOOL OF EXCELLENCE

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:07): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on how BHP's Underground Mining School of Excellence is developing careers in the state's mining sector?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy and Mining—on the buzzer.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:07): I thank the member for Newland for this fantastic question and, yes, I can update the house on this terrific initiative. Back on 30 August—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —the Premier and I had the privilege of going up to Olympic Dam with BHP, most notably with Ms Laura Tyler, the Asset President from BHP, the most senior person in Australia with regard to the operation and oversight of the Olympic Dam mine and a very capable person. We were given a good look around the facility, particularly underground. But the reason we were there on that day was so that the Premier could officially open what BHP is calling their School of Rock—a fantastic name for what is also a fantastic program.

BHP recognise that they want to expand, they want to grow, they want to continue to make the extraordinary contribution to the South Australian economy that they have for 30 years now, but they also know that they need to have very capable, focused, trained, skilled employees. They also know that getting people to work underground is one of those quite specialised things, separate from

the specific job. Just working underground is not for everybody. Quite understandably, it's not for everybody. So they have opened up a five-week program where people start on day one underground. They are getting theory training, they are getting practical training, but from day one they are working underground in classrooms, on jobs, and it's a very positive aspect.

It fits also incredibly well with the Marshall government's apprenticeship and traineeship program, which the Minister for Innovation and Skills is championing for us: I think it is 20,816 traineeships and apprenticeships over four years and \$100 million from the state government and similar from the federal government to get 20,000 apprenticeships out, so it is an absolutely outstanding program. The Minister for Innovation and Skills reminds us regularly that he is right on track delivering on those apprenticeships, which is in the interest of those young people, in the interest of employers who have these people coming into their business and, of course, in the long-term interest of our state.

These two programs work very well together. It was an enormous pleasure to meet a young woman who had been working in a pharmacy in Port Pirie before she came into this School of Rock program. A young man from Victoria, who was a plumber and actually had his own plumbing small business in Victoria, came across to start here. A young woman from the West Coast—I think it was Streaky Bay—had actually been a schoolteacher beforehand, and there were many other people. In fact, Gordon, a young man from my town of Wilmington, was also there and it was a pleasant surprise to meet with him.

All sorts of people from all walks of life are coming to take advantage of this tremendous training program. It fits exactly with our government's priorities of growing the economy, skilling people up, getting them jobs, and making sure that today, tomorrow and for decades to come the people of South Australia have a tremendous state to live in, a good place to live, and, very importantly, a really strong economy, which gives decades of life.

We want people to stay in South Australia. We want people from other states in the nation to come to South Australia. We have already started to turn around the net loss of people to interstate from South Australia and we are determined to turn that into a net gain. Programs like BHP's School of Rock are integral to that and we have much more work to do in that area.

Grievance Debate

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:11): Last week, Channel 9 aired an exclusive interview with the Minister for Health about the overcrowding and ramping crisis that is facing our state. We have heard the facts before: ambulance ramping and overcrowding in our hospitals is now so bad that it is beginning to cost lives.

Last week, it was revealed by the Ambulance Employees Association that a 93-year-old woman died whilst ramped in the back of an ambulance for more than an hour outside the Flinders Medical Centre. There was also the tragic death of 34-year-old Jason Mountstephen, who died while waiting more than 20 minutes for paramedics to arrive. His parents, too, blame ramping for his death.

I can tell you that it does not get much worse than this for a minister for health. Belatedly and reluctantly, after being asked by Channel 9 to front the cameras four times in eight days and refusing, Mr Wade finally agreed to give an interview. If the families of Mr Mountstephen and the 93-year-old lady thought they would get some solace from the comment from Mr Wade, they would have been bitterly disappointed by what they heard.

I have said it before: the hallmark of this Marshall Liberal government is a fundamental lack of compassion. Time and time again, we have been dumbstruck on this side of the house by the decisions that are made by this government. There appears to be no discernible vision linking the decisions that are coming out of cabinet and nothing but a consistent disregard for those who will be disadvantaged by those decisions.

The comment given to Channel 9 by the minister in this story, I think, is the best example yet of that callousness. When asked about the death of Mr Mountstephen and whether he took responsibility for it, Mr Wade said, 'I apologise to the family that the health system wasn't able to meet their expectations in delivering care in that very stressful time.' Surely this is a new low in

bureaucratise. It sounds to me like whoever writes the recorded messages for the big banks is now writing media lines for minister Wade. Where is the empathy? Where is the sense of emotion that you would expect from another human being when confronted with a story about a young person losing their life?

I know the minister's words offered no answers to the grieving families about why their loved ones are no longer with them, but they do, I think, explain how this government can simultaneously cut more than 1,000 jobs from SA Health, put corporate liquidators in charge of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, make the Mental Health Commissioner a part-time job and still believe that things in the South Australian health system are actually going to improve.

It is collateral damage; it is a collateral damage mindset. When you are on your second pint of Kool-Aid and you are convinced that tragedies like the deaths of Jason Mountstephen and the 93-year-old lady are just the unavoidable cost of doing business, then of course you give the kind of cold, robotic, heartless response that the minister gave on Channel 9 last week.

This minister is clearly completely oblivious to just how out of touch he is. In fact, his comment to Channel 9 reads like a Donald Trump tweet. He said, 'I believe there would be very few South Australians who wouldn't appreciate that I'm 100 per cent committed to delivering better health services.' I cannot believe I am saying this, but there might be fewer people who agree with that comment from the Minister for Health than there are who agree with this government's changes to land tax. What evidence, what skerrick of evidence is there to support the minister's claim that he is 100 per cent committed to better health services?

I can tell you that it is not the upgrade of Modbury Hospital, because that is a Labor government project. It is not the expansion of the emergency department at Lyell McEwin Hospital either, because that is another Labor project, too. It is certainly not the Royal Adelaide Hospital or the biomedical precinct, because they were Labor projects as well. So what is it? Where is this evidence to which the minister can point, evidence that might lead South Australians to actually believe that he is committed to delivering better health services in this state? What the people in the real world are seeing is very different from what minister Wade sees through his rose-tinted glasses.

They see the worst ramping this state has ever seen, they see overcrowding in our hospitals, they see nurses being assaulted at work and they see a stream of South Australian health staff leaving the system every day. You cannot avoid scrutiny forever. The message that awaits this government from South Australian voters in March 2022 might sound strangely familiar to the Minister for Health: 'We apologise to the Marshall Liberal government that you were not able to meet our expectations in delivering leadership to our state during this very important time.' I tell you, they will say it like they actually mean it.

ARMSTRONG, REV. G.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:16): Some months ago now, on 7 July, I attended a celebration service at Para Vista Uniting Church. On behalf of the church council and the congregations at Para Vista and Modbury Uniting Churches, I would like to acknowledge and extend thanks to the Reverend Gowan Armstrong for the wonderful contribution he has made to our community over the past 26 years, and I am grateful to the Reverend Lyn Leane and chair, Marlene Matthews, for the following remarks.

Gowan has spent much of his time on the road, much of it with his wife, Shirley, and their family. Gowan grew up in the rural Mid North of South Australia, near Robertstown, a farming area, and Gowan has always had a strong affinity with people from farming areas. By the mid-1940s, Gowan had left South Australia for Canberra and that was where he tried his hand at preaching. That practice in local preaching and the recognition of his gifts led to Gowan studying at Wesley College in Wayville for four years, from 1947 to 1950.

In April 1951, Reverend Gowan Armstrong became the probationer Methodist minister stationed at Mount Gambier and was allocated the task of conducting monthly services. In May, he broke his leg while playing football and so he arrived on crutches the following Sunday. Gowan was reprimanded by the Adelaide office of the Methodist Church, who said he had been sent to preach the gospel, not to play football.

Gowan was ordained in 1952 and was then sent to Hallett/Terowie in the heartland of merino stud farming. Four years later he was on the road again, this time further to the north, to the industrial centre of Port Augusta where he interacted with Stirling North, Willsden and Port Augusta West congregations and where he saw to the building of new church halls.

In 1959, Shirley, his soon to be wife, became the infant mistress at the school in Port Augusta and something special sparked between them. They were married in 1960, in Woodville, where Shirley had grown up. And then another big change: Shirley agreed to go with Gowan to Maningrida, a government-run Aboriginal settlement of about 1,200 people in Arnhem Land where Gowan became a chaplain in 1963.

Gowan says this was a very special chapter in their lives and by now, children John and Roslyn had joined the family. The first baptisms were held at Maningrida, the church was built and Gowan did some further study in anthropology. One of Gowan's achievements was his assistance in setting up the Maningrida Arts and Cultural Centre in 1973. Today, it is one of Australia's largest Aboriginal art cooperatives and represents over 700 artists. After the 10 years at Maningrida, Gowan and Shirley moved back to Darwin, where Gowan was an early staff member of Nungalinga College, which he helped set up.

Then came all the drama of Cyclone Tracy between Christmas Eve and Boxing Day in 1974. That great cyclonic wind blew the Armstrongs south, when they came to minister at Athelstone/Dernancourt and where they stayed until 1982. Gowan's last years as a minister in placement were in Prospect North, where he and Shirley spent 11 years. From there, Gowan became a minister in association and has spent an amazing 25-year plus period ministering selflessly to so many in the neighbourhoods and congregations of Modbury and Para Vista.

When Gowan and Shirley came from Prospect North to the Modbury/Para Vista linked churches in 1993, they attended the Modbury church at first and then the Para Vista church trying to decide which church to worship in permanently. They decided in the end that, as Para Vista had a choir and they loved singing, they needed to alternate between both churches. They sang in the choir each fortnight under the guidance of Elsie Hall. Gowan still comes to choir practice and, while some believe that he is there to practise singing, Gowan often has other ideas. The choir would like to thank Rosslyn for bringing him more recently as driving at night has become difficult.

Gowan continues to be a vibrant part of the church communities. He is now no longer with his beloved Shirley, whom he cared for until her death in December 2017 aged 92. His insight and experience have been extremely helpful at church council meetings and he is still looked to for guidance in decision-making and for his quiet, thoughtful suggestions. On Monday morning, there is a prayer meeting led by Gowan, who then attends Mainly Music for a short while to dance and sing with children.

Tuesdays is the award-winning International Community Group at Modbury, which Gowan attends. It was previously the African Women's Day and was recognised as the top volunteer community program in the state of South Australia in 2011. Bible studies have been conducted at Gowan's home for many years, encouraging and discussing with others his interpretations of the scriptures, with people from both churches participating. Messy Church is once a month and it sees Gowan participating in the church service with children and activities, after he has cut and buttered the bread for the shared Sunday tea.

A community breakfast is held monthly at Modbury on Saturday mornings, which Gowan also attends. Pastoral care is his forte and there would not be many who have not had a visit from Gowan at home or in hospital at some stage. When Para Vista had the Work for the Dole program, Gowan spent time teaching the lads how to cook and how to make pizzas as he conversed with them over the stove.

Gowan is known everywhere for his laugh. You can hear if he is in the shops at Clovercrest, or anywhere else for that matter, from far away. He may mix up names occasionally, but people from both Para Vista and Modbury all love Gowan and we are so enriched by all his contributions to our spiritual and daily lives. Thank you, Gowan, for your contribution to both churches and your remarkable life of service, which continues to this day.

EY, MR SIDNEY

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:21): On 31 May last year, I delivered a speech to this parliament about Mr Sidney Ey. Mr Ey was a World War II veteran and I spoke about his service to his country. It is with great sadness that I advise the chamber that this morning Mr Sidney Ey passed away at the age of 103 years and four months. He was, until today, our oldest veteran in this state. What I am about to say is based on a transcript of an oral history undertaken by Mr Barry Neylon, who is one of the oral history people in the Town of Gawler who do a wonderful job in recording oral histories and making sure that a history of our town stays alive.

Sid Ey was born on 31 May 1916 to Elsie Dawkins and Luis Ey. His first home was at 4 Moore Street, Gawler, and he lived his entire life in Gawler. Sid was educated at Gawler Primary School and worked with his father at the local chaff mill, which was located on the site where Coles now sits in the heart of Gawler. During Sid's life, Gawler changed remarkably. When he gave his interview to the Oral History Society, Sid remembered the time when wagons pulled by horses used to travel to Gawler from surrounding areas carrying wheat and barley to be loaded onto trucks to be sent to Port Adelaide. Sid also remembered his grandfather's 1924 Ford Buick car. He studied wool classing and, once qualified, had the opportunity to travel extensively across South Australia.

At the commencement of World War II, Sidney enlisted in the Army along with many others from the town. He joined the field ambulance service after meeting two Army officers in Gawler who informed him that they were developing this unit. Sid did not know what the unit was about at the time but thought it would be a good fit for him. He also stated that he never had any regrets in being a part of that unit. Sid received his early training at Wayville and was initially deployed to the Gaza Strip and later deployed to Tobruk when it was under siege.

He remembers one night in particular when he was looking after a patient with a broken leg in the hospital. As the patient had a broken leg, he was unable to evacuate to the air raid shelter when the sirens went off. Sid decided to stay with the patient to try to stop him in case he tried to get to the shelter. He remembered sitting with the patient during the bombing, and he remembered it being an incredibly nerve-racking period, but thankfully they were not hurt.

That was the sort of person Sid was. The bravery displayed by Sid on this occasion is quite inspiring. Tobruk was under siege for six months until they were relieved from duty. Sid remembered that water use was rationed and that they were allowed to use only a quart of water a day for drinking and shaving. It was a difficult time for those people at war and a difficult time for nations across the world.

Sid remained with the Army for many years, later serving in New Guinea, where he caught dengue fever, before rejoining his unit. Sid remembered the emotional moment when he surprised his parents on his return home. Sid finished his military service at the rank of sergeant in the field ambulance service. He witnessed the horrors of war from the front line and witnessed the loss of many good people, including many nursing and medical staff.

I think it is incredibly important to acknowledge the work of medical staff in our military, as they often experience the trauma and brutality that war has to offer. They played a very important role in making sure that soldiers who were injured received the care they deserved and ensuring that those who did not make it home were treated with dignity and respect. I would like to acknowledge Sid's military service today on the day he passed away. I would also like to acknowledge the military service of all those people from my electorate who have served in armed conflict throughout past and in many modern conflicts.

Sid enjoyed playing tennis and used to play in his early years when he returned from the war. He was a member of the Tod Street Tennis Club for many years. It is quite sad today to advise that Sid has passed away, but he had an incredible life. One thing I will miss are the ANZAC Day services and Remembrance Day services that Sid attended. For the last 19 or 20 years since I have been attending ANZAC Day services and Remembrance Day services, Sid was always there. In terms of services, the last time I think I saw him was at the Remembrance Day service last year, but he was a regular at the local RSL club. He used to go weekly to the RSL club. He will be sadly missed, but he had a life of service and respect.

TRIPLE J'S ONE NIGHT STAND

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:26): I rise today to pay tribute to the entire Lucindale community and the surrounding towns for their incredible effort in organising and hosting Triple J's One Night Stand, a drug and alcohol-free family event that was held on 14 September, featuring some of the country's most talented and up-and-coming musicians. Triple J's One Night Stand has been travelling to remote and rural towns for the past 15 years. The first event was held in Natimuk, Victoria, back in 2004. Since then, it has traversed the country and grown, setting up in towns such as Ayr in Queensland, Cowra in New South Wales, Collie in Western Australia, Mildura in Victoria and, last year, St Helens in Tasmania.

The process of winning and hosting the event began way back in 2013 when a Facebook page was started up by Lucindale local Kate Rayner, with the support of Louise Stock and the students from Lucindale Area School. They set about getting as many likes on social media as they could to alert Triple J to their tiny town with a population of 500. Their campaign continued, their supporter base steadily grew and in 2018 they presented a formal expression of interest to Triple J. While they were unsuccessful that year, in 2019 Lucindale was short-listed.

On 27 June this year, live on Triple J radio, Lucindale was announced as the town to host the 2019 One Night Stand. Kate Rayner and her team of campaigners, which had grown to include Georgie McKay from the Stand Like Stone Foundation, a local philanthropic organisation that provides grants to charitable projects; the Lucindale Lions Club; the Naracoorte Lucindale Council; LINC, a collaboration of local businesses; as well as the entire Lucindale community, had less than 12 weeks to pull this mammoth event together, with the help and support of the ABC and Triple J.

The musical line-up was impressive. This year, Adelaide's own Hilltop Hoods were the headline act. The boys from Blackwood were joined by Mount Gambier band Chelsea Manor, which won the Triple J Unearthed competition; Meg Mac; Ocean Alley; and G Flip to entertain the thousands of people who were expected to descend on Lucindale.

The lead-up to the event was described by one local as waiting for a storm to come in. The town knew it was going to be big, but just how big remained to be seen. Hosting the event at Lucindale was dubbed the most challenging, as it was the smallest town to date to stage One Night Stand. For those of you who do not know, Lucindale is situated on the beautiful Limestone Coast, a 3½-hour drive south-east of Adelaide and five hours west of Melbourne. To get the One Night Stand up and running would require the help of pretty much the entire Lucindale population.

Logistically, the thought of turning a town used to catering for 500 into a town that needs food, drink and services for up to 20,000 is daunting to say the least, but, true to the country community's 'just get in and do it' attitude, Lucindale got down to business. Thankfully, this agricultural town has experience hosting the famous South East Field Days, an annual two-day event that attracts thousands of visitors from across the state.

Ensuring there were adequate facilities and infrastructure was a huge task. This included bringing in more than 200 extra toilets, over 100 showers, nearly a dozen generators to power the concert and food stalls, 2.1 kilometres of security fencing and 17 light towers to provide lighting at the camp site and concert. There were also 45 food stalls to cater for both campers and daytrippers and dozens of drink stations to refill water, not to mention setting up the camp site itself at nearby Yakka Park.

In the days before the event, the Yakka Park camping ground mushroomed, with over 5,000 people checking in. These visitors had the option of paying for a standalone camp site or hiring a tent complete with mattresses and camp chairs. The money from the camp site raised funds for a wide range of local community groups and enabled the organisers to pay for important infrastructure at Yakka Park and the surrounding township.

There was also a communications issue: how to get mobile telephone and internet services for such a huge number of people. It was not an easy task. I pause here to thank the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Telstra, the local Lions and the Naracoorte Lucindale Council for splitting the cost to bring a mobile phone tower into the town, ensuring that the area had adequate wi-fi service for the event.

There is no doubt that the One Night Stand was a huge achievement. The concert shone a light on Lucindale. It attracted people from across the country and brought families and friends together. The One Night Stand was streamed on ABC iView, YouTube and Triple J, posted all over social media and replayed on a special edition of *Rage* last weekend, ensuring that the Australia-wide audience knew all about Lucindale and the South-East of South Australia.

The success stories from the night are still coming in. Sporting clubs, such as Kybybolite and Border Districts, set up food stalls inside the concert ground and reported making thousands of dollars in profit selling food such as nachos, doughnuts, sliders, hot chips, gravy rolls and drinks. The money raised provided an important boost to these clubs, who play such an integral role in the lives of those who live in the country. The success of the event is a testament to what can be achieved by the persistence of a small group of people with a vision and passion to bring a national music event to a country town. Congratulations, Lucindale. You should be proud of what you have achieved.

AGED CARE

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:32): Tuesday 10 September was a very special day for all workers who are part of the aged-care sector in Australia and for older people and their families. It was Thank You for Working in Aged Care Day. I rise today to talk about one of the most important social services our community offers its citizens—that is, aged care—and more specifically about the people who work shifts around the clock, give their all and update their training and skills constantly to provide the best possible care for older people in our community.

The federal Department of Health's 'The Aged Care Workforce, 2016' report calculated that there are 366,000 aged-care workers in Australia. It found that 87 per cent of the residential care workforce is female, with a median age near 50, while one-third are born overseas. On the whole, they express high job satisfaction except for their pay. That is what we as a society are going to have to do something about because the share of older people in our population is only going to get bigger, so we will desperately need more workers in this industry.

The Productivity Commission has estimated that by 2050 Australia will need to triple its aged-care workforce to almost 980,000 people. To tackle that, there must be a concerted campaign to counter these negative perceptions of low pay and low status. The best way to tackle these negative perceptions is to actually do something about the low pay and low status that these workers feel. I come from the trade union movement, and I am very proud of that fact. That is why I know that industries predominantly made up of females tend to be the lowest paid in our workforce.

Sadly, these workers, their training and their dedication to the task, are not taken as seriously because of the simple fact that they are female. We know this from the childcare industry and the campaigns those workers have engaged in for years to increase their pay, to staunch the high turnover rates and to improve the community's perception of the important work they do in educating children in their earliest years. I applaud their tenacity in the face of the federal Liberal government, which has cut funding to child care across the country.

Now we must turn our attention to aged care. In October last year, the Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety was established. Over 6,000 submissions have now been received from right across the country. The reporting out of the hearings so far has been deeply disturbing.

While I would not want to prejudge the findings of this royal commission in any way, a familiar theme is emerging. Aged-care workers and their unions have made it very plain that the answer to the issues in aged care simply is more staff. When older people are being hurried through meals and showers, dressing and undressing or their medication, more staff is the answer. When we hear of the loneliness and depression so many older people face, more staff is the answer.

The Our Turn to Care campaign, which has been initiated by United Voice, makes this very clear and very plain. They are campaigning for one extra hour per resident per week. It does not sound much, but it is a lot to ask—one extra hour per resident per week. Imagine the difference that would make to an older person in residential aged care. Imagine the difference to the dignity of older persons living in the aged-care sector.

Many people are choosing to live at home as they advance in age, even when their care needs become higher, and that should be encouraged. But we do know that it is not possible for older people all the time, who, for varied and many reasons, need to move into residential aged care. I have had the pleasure of visiting many aged-care homes in my local electorate—all wonderful and all providing wonderful care and wonderful support of the older people of the electorate of Cheltenham. They all play a crucial role in ensuring our older citizens are engaged and active.

With our ageing population, it is time we gave aged care the funding it deserves. Since 2013, \$2.1 billion has been ripped out of aged care, funding that desperately needs to be returned. The Our Turn to Care campaign, being championed by aged-care workers and their unions, United Voice and the Health Services Union, is fighting for a fair paid workforce to tackle the looming jobs crisis with concrete action to make it an attractive career path with secure and permanent jobs.

Those campaigning for better aged care are arguing for mandated minimum staffing levels and a workforce mix that is focused on the physical, emotional and social needs of residents. To aged-care workers I say this: we need you and we respect you. We could not do without you. You are simply diamonds, and we thank you from the bottom of our hearts.

PASKEVILLE FIELD DAYS

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:37): I rise today to inform the house that the famous Paskeville Field Days are underway as I speak at the field days site in Paskeville. I would like to start by thanking the member for Frome for pairing me out yesterday so that I could take the opportunity to attend but one day of this major biennial event, the largest such event in the Narungga electorate. It was a very much appreciated pair and, as I said, it allowed me to attend this significant community event.

The field days are acknowledged as the oldest in Australia and are held every two years. A wide range of community groups contribute to the running of the field days, and I would like to thank all the ag bureaus—Boor's Plains, Bute, Cunliffe, Arthurton, Paskeville, Petersville and Moonta, many of which have served for over 30 years to stage this event—along with various Lions clubs, Apex clubs, sporting and other service clubs that have contributed to the food, marshalling and other aspects of the show. Thank you for all you do to make sure that this event continues to run smoothly.

Mr Deputy Speaker, as you well know, the event has a major focus on agricultural machinery and equipment, with dealers and retailers coming from far and wide to show their wares. There is also an assortment of stalls showing quality crafts, general interest products and other assorted knick-knacks. With approximately 700 stallholders in total, it is a large event and a massive show.

Congratulations should go to new president, Bruce Philbey, and his fellow committee members Geoff Lamshed, past president Nick Correll, Dulcie Barker, Martin Kenny, Paul Browning, Rosalie Pearce, Luke Graham, Brenton Drewett, Malve Haynes, Michael Barker and Adrian Mason. An incredible amount of hard work goes into organising a show of the magnitude of the YP Field Days and the only way it is possible is with a well-populated committee and everyone pulling their weight. In this instance, it is plain to see for all those who attend that the committee has done an outstanding job.

The job of organising a show like the field days is difficult under normal circumstances, but this time around it was made all the more difficult by the ordinary office building that housed all the records, papers and procedures burning down in a fire in the lead-up to the field days. The office building has yet to be rebuilt, but the show must go on, and what a wonderful show it is. It was wonderful to be there yesterday. Congratulations and best of luck to the committee, all the service clubs and everyone playing a part in the organisation and running of the field days for the remainder of today and tomorrow.

If there is anyone out there listening to the live stream of this speech who is intending to visit the field days this afternoon or tomorrow, then, please, stop by the Cyclone Pavilion, site 15, and visit the Narungga electorate office, which has been transplanted into the pavilion for the duration of the field days. It was a pleasure to be there with them yesterday interacting with constituents, particularly on the Port Wakefield solution, the plans of which we have proudly displayed at the front of the stall.

There was significant interest in that plan and the benefits that it will provide to the local community and the opportunity that it presented the community to solidify the future of their town and the opportunities that would come along with it. There has been a litany of other inquiries, and it has been a pleasure to host the stall with the member for Grey, Rowan Ramsey, with visits from Senators David Fawcett and Alex Antic over the past couple days. Thank you very much to those three gentlemen for coming down. I took the opportunity to chat with a wide number of farmers, machinery dealers, agronomists and farm-related industry representatives, and I visited the GPSA tent yesterday.

Mr Deputy Speaker, as you would well know, there is a great deal of excitement around the lifting of the moratorium on genetically modified crops and the benefits that would flow to both the farmers and the consumers. Support for the lifting of the moratorium was widespread if not unanimous, and the relief that the independent review showed exactly what everyone thought it would be plain to see.

I would caution those opposite about standing in the way and trying to frustrate the implementation of the result of that independent review. Those opposite need to take politics out of the equation, read the report and finally offer some support to the farming sector. It is a sector already riddled with red tape, and this, finally, is an opportunity to make things easier for our primary producers. They are excited about it, they are expecting it to be delivered and I urge those opposite to help deliver it.

While I have a little bit of time left, it was great to see the Hon. Frank Pangallo at the field days yesterday, although I do note that he spent more time in Norway than Narungga in the first 18 months of this term. Nonetheless, it was pleasing to see him there listening to the concerns of the farmers regarding mining. I hope that while he was there he, too, picked up the sentiment of the public, of the farming community, about the lifting of the GM moratorium and the benefits that it would provide, and ensures that SA-Best get in behind it and support the lifting of the moratorium.

Bills

LAND ACQUISITION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:42): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Land Acquisition Act 1969. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The important bill that I have introduced today amends the Land Acquisition Act 1969. The act governs the acquisitions of land by approved authorities. Generally, this means a government agency undertaking to acquire land for various road or infrastructure projects. A special act of parliament is required to authorise compulsory acquisitions of land, and the special act also designates the relevant authority for the purposes of that act.

The act outlines the procedures to be followed in acquisitions and also provides statutory authority for compensation to be paid to persons whose properties are being acquired. The act is committed to the portfolio of the Attorney-General; however, operationally, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (referred to here as DPTI) takes carriage of significant state land acquisitions affecting multiple parties for the purposes of delivering large-scale infrastructure projects. Some examples here are the work undertaken on the Torrens to Torrens road project, or the Northern Expressway.

The amendments to the act contained in the bill have originated from several sources. Firstly, in 2015 the parliamentary Select Committee on Compulsory Acquisition of Properties for North-South Corridor Upgrade (which I will refer to as the select committee) was formed to examine the compulsory acquisition of properties for the north-south corridor under the former Labor government. The select committee handed down its report in June 2017.

Of the recommendations in the report, six were legislative. All legislative changes were accepted by the government and recommended for implementation. There were also a number of non-legislative policy and operational changes recommended in the report. The majority of these policy-related changes were also already part of DPTI's processes or have since been implemented at the departmental level.

There are also a number of amendments in the bill that address ongoing issues that commonly arise during land acquisitions, as well as significant amendments to clarify the position of the act in relation to acquisitions of underground land. The amendments arising out of the select committee recommendations are briefly as follows:

- section 23(1) has been amended to require that both an authority and a claimant must negotiate in good faith during compensation negotiations;
- an amendment to oblige claimants to respond to an offer of compensation within six months of the date of acquisition. An additional provision has also been added to allow a claimant to apply for an extension of the time to respond to the authority. If no response is received, the offer reverts to the authority and no longer accrues interest. This right to compensation is not affected by the reversion;
- an amendment to introduce a solatium payment to the compulsory acquisition process. A solatium payment compensates a person for non-financial disadvantage or loss resulting from the need to relocate the person's principal place of residence. This payment applies to residential owner-occupiers who are losing their principal place of residence due to the acquisition. The payment will be 10 per cent of the assessed market value of the property or \$50,000, whichever is the lesser amount;
- an allowance of \$10,000, payable in advance, to cover professional fees for claimants who own their properties has been introduced. The balance of any further reasonably incurred fees will be paid at the conclusion of a matter; however, this will assist claimants with up-front fees (most likely to be legal fees). The dollar figure will be prescribed in the regulations, but it is intended that it be \$10,000;
- introduction of a compulsory settlement conference before court proceedings can be commenced. A conference must be convened if requested by the claimant, and must be held prior to court proceedings being commenced. The cost of the conference is to be borne by the authority. An offence has been introduced if a person fails to follow a direction of the conference coordinator, with a maximum penalty of \$2,500. The qualifications of the conference coordinator will be prescribed; and
- an amendment defining 'professional costs'. The current act only deals with the payment of legal costs; however, the inclusion of non-legal professional fees, such as property valuers and accountants, will provide guidance to these professional industries and any acquiring authority to ensure that only reasonable fees are reimbursed. The full list of professional fees that can be reimbursed will be prescribed by regulation.

I advise members that other reforms include:

- the introduction of a valuer's conference, which must be held if requested by either party. This conference generally only involves the professional valuers for each party and is intended to allow for the valuers to address any factual issues involved in their respective property valuations—for example, discrepancies in the boundaries of the property that has been valued, agreement on the value of fixtures, etc. This conference occurs early in the process of compensation negotiations and is of great assistance in resolving factual issues;
- an amendment to require that compensation moneys must be withdrawn from the Supreme Court Suitors' Fund within 24 months. The suitors' fund sits within the Supreme Court and is used to hold moneys for litigants, in a similar manner to a trust account. If the moneys are not withdrawn, they revert to the authority and will no longer accrue interest. It does not affect the claimant's right to compensation;

- an amendment to allow offers of compensation to be varied up or down. Where offers are increased, the bill allows for the excess to be paid directly to the claimant. If the authority wishes to vary an offer down, they will be required to apply to the court for an order to do so, with new information that was not previously known to the authority;
- an amendment to provide that for parties with an interest not exceeding \$10,000 (the dollar figure will be prescribed) payment can be made directly to the claimant without the requirement for moneys to be paid into the Supreme Court Suitors' Fund. This amendment will save on administrative costs and time associated with withdrawing the money, leading to improved outcomes for the dispossessed tenants;
- an amendment has been introduced to allow the authority to determine the rent to be paid by claimants if they remain on the premises following the expiry of the three-month grace period following acquisition. The rent must not exceed a reasonable market rate for the property;
- an amendment to expressly provide that the authority can make a payment to a tenant whose interest in land is subject to acquisition but is not readily able to be purchased by agreement prior to the acquisition. The act does not currently allow payments to be made, for example, to tenants prior to serving a notice of acquisition, except with an exemption being sought from Treasurer's Instructions. The issue generally arises when dealing with the holder of a subsidiary interest in land, the subject of a notice of intention to acquire. As the land has not yet been acquired, there is no damage and no compensation payable under section 25 of the act. This amendment will allow the authority to negotiate and make a payment to an interest holder in advance of the formal acquisition, paid on the same basis as for land which is compulsorily acquired. This allows for more flexibility in the process and would also allow easy claims to be finalised early on, providing more certainty for claimants; and
- an amendment to place a statutory obligation on the landowner to disclose persons with an interest in the land and the nature of their interest. This will allow both regular acquisitions and underground acquisitions. DPTI have encountered issues in past acquisitions where landlords have refused to disclose the names and contact details of tenants, which can delay claims for an extended period of time. Often this has happened with unscrupulous landlords who have tenants paying cash and no registered bonds with the Consumer and Business Services for residential tenancies, or who have too many tenants or are otherwise not complying with their legal obligations as a landlord/proprietor. This amendment will ensure that landlords are obligated to supply the details of their tenants so that DPTI and other acquiring authorities can ensure compensation is paid to those who are properly entitled to it. A criminal offence with a maximum penalty of \$5,000 has been introduced for a failure to provide this information without a reasonable excuse.

Finally, some of the most important amendments in this bill relate to acquisitions of underground land. A new set of provisions will be inserted into the act to clarify the position in relation to compensation for underground acquisitions and create a modified procedure for dealing with underground acquisitions. The act is currently silent on the question of compensation for underground acquisitions, which causes legal and operational confusion.

In South Australia, landowners also own the underground parts of their land with no limit as to depth and, therefore, an acquisition needs to take place in order to tunnel under private property, but it is not always necessary to acquire the surface and structures. This is not to be confused with the rights to minerals, of course, underground.

The act will be amended to provide that no compensation will be payable for underground acquisitions, as landowners will not suffer any detriment or loss of enjoyment of their land. A modified notification procedure has also been created, removing the need for DPTI to serve a notice of intention to acquire. A notice of acquisition will instead be served at the time of acquisition. This will apply only where the underground part of the land will be acquired.

New South Wales and Western Australia both have provisions in their equivalent legislation that provides that no compensation is payable for underground acquisitions and, therefore, the new provisions of our act are in keeping with the position in other jurisdictions.

The amendments that relate to the underground acquisitions are vital for the next stages of the government's north-south corridor infrastructure projects. Clarification of the procedures for underground acquisitions allows the government to explore options for the remaining sections of the corridor that involve tunnelling, which allows the possibility of vastly improving road infrastructure with a minimum of disturbance in built-up areas.

I thank members of the select committee who sat to provide us with a report and a number of these recommendations, and I commend the bill to the house. I further seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Land Acquisition Act 1969

4—Amendment of section 6—Interpretation

This clause amends the definition of *compensation* to provide that payments made under Part 4 Division 4 (other payments inserted by this Bill) do not constitute compensation for the purposes of the Act.

5—Amendment of section 7—Application

This clause puts beyond doubt that a special Act that authorises the compulsory acquisition of land will be taken to authorise the acquisition of underground land.

6—Amendment of section 10—Notice of intention to acquire land

This clause removes the requirement that a notice of amendment be served in the same way as the notice of intention to acquire the land. It also clarifies that a notice of amendment does not constitute a new notice of intention to acquire land for the purposes of the Act.

7—Insertion of section 10A

This clause imposes an obligation on an owner of land who is given a notice of intention to acquire land to notify the Authority of any other person who, to the owner's knowledge, has an interest in the land to which the notice of intention to acquire land relates, and the nature of that interest.

8—Amendment of section 12A—Right of review

This clause extends the period in which the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal has to complete its proceedings from 14 days to 21 days.

9—Amendment of section 15—Acquisition by agreement etc

This clause removes the requirement that a notice of a decision not to proceed with acquisition be served in the same way as the notice of intention to acquire the land.

10—Amendment of section 16—Notice of acquisition

This clause changes the time period after which the Authority may publish a notice of acquisition in relation to land from being 3 months after the last occasion on which a notice of intention to acquire land was given to 3 months after the first occasion on which any notice of intention to acquire land was given.

11—Substitution of heading to Part 4

This clause amends the heading to Part 4 to include reference to other payments contained in inserted Part 4 Division 4.

12—Amendment of section 22B—Entitlement to compensation

This clause amends section 22B to provide that only persons with an interest in land that is capable of alienation are entitled to compensation. This requirement has not been extended to interests consisting of native title.

13—Amendment of section 23—Negotiation of compensation

Section 23(1) currently provides that the Authority must negotiate in good faith in relation to compensation. This clause broadens subsection (1) by providing that claimants must also negotiate in good faith.

This clause also introduces a valuers conference into the statutory scheme. The Authority must convene a valuers conference on the request of the claimant, or may do so of their own volition at any other time. The purpose of the valuers conference is to determine a valuation, if possible, with which both valuers agree, and to determine other agreed facts and issues of contention.

14—Amendment of section 23A—Offer of compensation and payment into court

This clause amends section 23A to allow the Authority to not make an offer of compensation when it gives notice of the acquisition of land in certain circumstances, being if the Authority is of the view that the amount of compensation is unable to be determined or in any other circumstances prescribed by the regulations.

The Authority is also given an ability to vary an offer of compensation in this clause. The Authority may increase the offer by notice to the person who received the original offer. Alternatively, if after making the original offer, the Authority becomes aware of information that negatively affects the value of the land, the Authority may apply to Court for an order that the offer be decreased. This clause also provides for the manner in which the difference between the original offer and the offer as varied will be paid back to the Authority or to the claimant, as the case may be.

15—Insertion of sections 23AB and 23AC

Inserted section 23AB requires a person to whom an offer of compensation is made to respond to the offer within 6 months, or within such other period as may be specified by the Authority on application of the person. If, on application, the Authority refuses to specify a longer period in which the person has to respond, the person may refer the matter to Court for review.

If the person does not respond within the prescribed period, the money which was paid into Court under section 23A will revert back to the Authority (though this reversion will not affect the person's entitlement to that compensation). Once this has occurred, the claimant will not be entitled to any interest that accrues on the money so reverted.

Inserted section 23AC provides money that has been paid into Court under section 23A as an offer of compensation to a person must be withdrawn by the person within 24 months after the money is last paid into Court. If the money is not withdrawn by the person within this period of time, the money will revert back to the Authority (though this reversion will not affect the person's entitlement to that compensation). Once this has occurred, the claimant will not be entitled to any interest that accrues on the money so reverted.

16—Insertion of section 23BA

Inserted section 23BA provides that upon the application of the claimant a settlement conference must be convened by the Authority before a matter is referred to Court under section 23C (and may otherwise take place on the volition of the Authority). A number of requirements apply in relation to a settlement conference including the appointment of a conference coordinator. A coordinator has the power to give directions for the purposes of a settlement conference, and an unreasonable failure or refusal to comply with a direction will amount to an offence. The conference is to be conducted on a without prejudice basis.

17—Amendment of section 23C—Reference of matters into court

This clause amends section 23C to provide that a claimant must apply to the Authority to convene a settlement conference before referring a matter to Court under that section. The clause also requires that once convened, the claimant take part in the conference.

18—Substitution of section 24—Entry into possession

Section 24 of the Act is substituted by this clause to change the manner in which the Authority can enter into possession of land where an interest in possession has been acquired under the Act in relation to that land. This clause removes the requirement for the Authority to obtain agreement from the relevant claimant as to the terms on which it will enter into possession of the land, and provides that the Authority may enter into possession on a date fixed by the Authority, being no sooner than 3 months after acquisition has taken place. The Authority is required to notify the person who is in occupation of the land of the date on which the Authority will take possession. This will not be required where the relevant land is vacant, in which case the Authority may enter into possession from the date of acquisition of the land.

The occupier has the ability to apply to the Authority to fix a later date, and if the Authority refuses to do so the occupier may refer the matter to Court.

The Authority may enter into possession of the land at an earlier time either upon agreement with or application of the relevant occupier, or if the occupier vacates the land prior to the date specified in the notice.

A person who remains in occupation of land after the date specified by the Authority will be taken to occupy the land pursuant to a tenancy, the terms and conditions for which (including the amount of rent payable) are to be determined by the Authority.

This clause also proposes to insert new section 24A, which provides that the Authority may apply to the Court for certain orders.

19—Insertion of section 25A

This clause provides a mechanism by which the Authority may increase the amount of compensation payable to a person by 10% of the market value of the land or \$50,000 (or such other amount as may be prescribed by the regulations), whichever is the lesser. This increase in compensation is available to a person who owned and occupied the acquired land and whose principal place of residence was acquired.

20—Insertion of Part 4 Divisions 3 and 4

Inserted Part 4 Division 3 provides a mechanism by which the Authority may make a payment of compensation directly to the claimant where the amount of compensation is under a prescribed amount, rather than paying the amount into Court.

Proposed Part 4 Division 4 inserts several payments that may be made by the Authority to the claimant depending on the circumstances. Inserted section 26B provides for payments relating to professional costs to persons who are owners and occupiers of land to which a notice of intention to acquire land has been given. Under this proposed section, the Authority has discretion to pay a person an amount or amounts of money towards payment of their professional costs relating to an acquisition of land (or a proposed acquisition). In determining any subsequent payment under this section, the Authority will take into account any other amount paid under this section.

Inserted section 26C allows the Authority to make payments to residential tenants after a notice of intention to acquire land is given to the tenant but before the relevant acquisition occurs. A residential tenant who accepts a payment under this section will not be entitled to further compensation under the Act in relation to their interest as a tenant. Conditions may be attached to a payment under this section with which the residential tenant must comply; in the event of non-compliance the payment made under the section will become a debt owing to the Authority.

Under inserted section 26D, the Authority may pay transfer costs to a person who was an owner of certain land (the whole of fee simple land) that was acquired under the Act and who purchased land to replace that land. A person must apply to the Authority to receive this payment.

21—Insertion of Part 4A

Inserted Part 4A relates to the acquisition of underground land. Much of the Act is disapplied to the acquisition of underground land, and, as such, section 26F provides for the way in which underground land is to be acquired. The Authority may acquire the land by publishing a notice of acquisition in the Gazette at any time, and must thereafter, as soon as is reasonably practicable, give notice to the person who was the owner of the land. A person is not entitled to compensation for the acquisition of underground land under this Part.

Section 26G imposes an obligation on persons from whom underground land has been, or may be, acquired to notify the Authority of other interests in the underground land.

22—Amendment of section 36—Costs

This clause amends section 36 to provide that the Court, in making an order for costs, may take into consideration a failure on the part of the Authority or the claimant to negotiate in good faith.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. S.C. Mullighan.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY (REMUNERATION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:55): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Flinders University Act 1966. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:55): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

South Australian universities have an important role to play in the provision of outstanding higher education and world-leading research, both of which are essential to South Australia's ongoing prosperity and economic growth. Our universities also introduce thousands of students from around the world to South Australia and attracting more international students to study here in Adelaide is important for our local economy.

It is vital that South Australia has an education and training system driven by quality courses and student choice with training programs to ensure South Australians are job ready and able to capitalise on emerging industries here in South Australia. Our universities undertake this important work in an increasingly complex and competitive environment.

The government is seeking to amend the Flinders University Act 1966, at the request of Flinders University, to enable the council of the university to remunerate its members. Specifically, the bill will provide for the Flinders University council to make a determination to remunerate a council member. A determination of the council may fix different amounts of remuneration for different members according to the office held by the member or other factors.

The bill will disapply section 18C of the act so that council members will not be in breach of their duty in respect to conflicts of interest in relation to the making of determinations regarding remuneration. These amendments will put Flinders University on a similar footing to the University of South Australia. The University of South Australia has provision within its governing legislation to make statutes to set the terms and conditions under which the council members hold office. Many other universities across Australia also have provision for the remuneration of council members.

The amendments will ensure Flinders University continues to have access to the highest quality candidates for membership of its council. The government has consulted closely with Flinders University in developing these amendments. I commend the bill to members. The explanation of clauses is as follows:

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Flinders University Act 1966

3—Insertion of section 7

This clause inserts new section 7 into the Act to provide that the Council of the University may determine that a member of the Council be remunerated.

Section 18C of the Act, which imposes certain obligations on members of the Council in the event of a conflict of interest, has been disappplied to the making of determinations in relation to remuneration.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SIMPLIFY) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 12 September 2019.)

Clause 1.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My question to the minister is: what consultation did he and the government conduct on the bill with regional newspapers?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have been advised that agencies were asked to give feedback on the consultation process with country newspapers. I am also advised that the consultation process was predominantly handled prior to the change of government and that at that time there was no recollection of any direct consultation with country newspapers.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Further to the minister's answer, agencies were to report back on the consultations that they conducted. Which of the agencies reported back on the details of the consultation?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The advice I have here is that the environmental protection agency was consulted. The EPA only publishes notices in regional newspapers on an ad hoc basis for significant matters relating to the Environment Protection Act 1993 and will continue to do so. The

Attorney-General's Department only publishes notices related to the Gaming Machines Act 1992 in *The Advertiser* and will continue to do so. There have been no examples or any objections to notices relevant to the Public Assemblies Act 1972, so there will be no impact.

Notices to businesses regarding local aerodrome fees under the Aerodrome Fees Act 1998 are proposed to be posted on the website rather than in a regional newspaper. Without the simplify bill, freight users will have to keep physical notes of notices placed in regional newspapers, as well as being able to access information online. Notices under the Air Transport (Route Licensing—Passenger Services) Act 2002 will likely remain in newspapers, especially those in wider circulation, as declared routes are of interest to industry in terms of competing for markets.

Notices under section 11B(2)(c) of the Geographical Names Act 1991 currently require councils to advertise major proposals in a newspaper. In future, councils will have the opportunity to place a notice on their website, so if they deem a proposal to be contentious they can still advertise in the local newspaper. The ability for notices to be made in a regional newspaper under both the Impounding Act 1920 and the Livestock Act 1997 remains in both and will continue to be utilised, as they are the best way of reaching the community.

The Essential Services Commission of South Australia has indicated that, regarding the AustralAsia Railway (Third Party Access) Act 1999, the Maritime Services (Access) Act 2000 and the Railways (Operations and Access) Act 1997 where reviews or decisions have a strong regional focus the commission may continue to publish notices in regional newspapers. These notices occur on an average of once a year.

Expenditure by the South Australian government on public notices in all regional publications in all departments totalled \$171,421 in 2016-17 and \$165,425 in 2017-18. The expenditure on public notices in regional publications is considerably smaller than expenditure by the South Australian government on public notices, which totalled \$414,459 in 2016-17 and \$418,890 in 2017-18. From memory, there has actually been an increase in the amount of expenditure on public notices in regional newspapers since the change of government.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My third question on clause 1 is: what feedback did the primary industries department provide on the details of their consultation?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I provided that in my previous answer.

The CHAIR: We have had three questions, member for Lee. The question before the Chair is that clause 1 stand as printed.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The CHAIR: Clause 2, member for Lee, you have three amendments in your name. Are you looking to move one, two or three of them?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will speak to the first amendment. I move:

Amendment No 1 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 6, lines 10 to 12 [clause 2(2)(a) to (c)]—Delete paragraphs (a) to (c) (inclusive)

I was grateful for the contributions of a number of other members to the second reading debate—not unexpectedly, a contribution from the Deputy Premier, the member for Narrunga and the member for Hammond.

The Deputy Premier, if my memory serves me correctly, spent most of the time extolling the virtues of the capacity to move to electronic conveyancing and that the bill we have before us will in part facilitate that. I indicate that we are not only entirely supportive of those elements of the bill but that indeed it was the former Labor government who went off on the electronic conveyancing initiative, funded the ICT systems replacement and introduced that reform into the conveyancing industry.

However, aside from that, there were some reflections from the Deputy Premier on *The Islander* newspaper, which is, as I understand it, distributed on Kangaroo Island. The Deputy Premier

was the first of a number of those members opposite who extolled the virtues of these small regional community newspapers moving to online distribution, rather than the hard-copy distribution, and how much more beneficial it was for the regional communities they serve.

I am the representative of the demographically oldest electorate in South Australia or, if not, it is very close to it. The other competing electorates in that regard are most usually regional electorates. It is reasonable to say—in fact, there has been a lot of data that has been produced in the last 15 to 20 years as online sources of information and access to them has become more and more prevalent—that it is often the more elderly in our community who are locked out of accessing information online because they may not have either the devices or the capabilities for utilising those devices in order to access that information.

I am sure there are a number of members of the community on Kangaroo Island who are used to their printed copy of *The Islander* who may feel bereft at the soon to be lack of information from the state government about important notices being published by various departments in that regard. Indeed, the Deputy Premier, much to my interest of course because I certainly have not read the pages of *The Islander* as much as she, remembered quite fondly that perhaps the most telling remembrance she had of the contributions of *The Islander* was the column that the 'little old lady used to recount the island gossip in'.

I would have thought that there was a slightly broader role for comments in *The Islander* in communicating matters of importance to the community rather than gossip, which is really what we are here to talk about, which is important public notices. For many decades this parliament has taken the view that these notices should be published in regional newspapers in order to best disseminate them to the community. The first of my amendments speaks to this. It seeks to remove those sections of clause 2 that provide for the commencement of different parts of the bill.

After the Deputy Premier, of course, we moved on to the member for Narungga, who fulsomely declared to the house that he has a direct interest in the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*, and good on him. He is someone who has direct experience with regional newspapers and the importance of publishing regional newspapers. In fact, I think he was telling the house that, of a circulation of approximately 7,000 newspapers, it reaches a fair proportion, more than 25 per cent, of his 25,000 electors in the seat of Narungga, so it is quite a penetrating circulation from that particular journal.

He even went on to tell the house that advertising is an important source of revenue for these papers but qualified that by saying that private advertising is more important than public advertising, which I thought was a remarkable claim to make, really, because we are talking about periodic advertising that happens from time to time. Even given the scant examples the minister just provided to us of agencies regaling the consultation they undertook—or perhaps, if we are honest, did not undertake—with regard to the bill, I would have thought that, whether it is an annual publication of a notice, a seasonal publication of a notice or a more frequent publication of a notice, advertising revenue is absolutely critical.

The figures that we have been provided by the minister already show a declining advertising spend, from \$171,000 in the 2016-17 financial year to \$165,000 in the 2017-18 financial year. The member for Narungga says, 'Don't worry, you can trust us. You can trust this Liberal government. We will continue to spend money on these ads in regional newspapers.' Well, I do not think we can have any faith in that comment. I do not think we can have any faith in this government to maintain, let alone increase, a spend on regional advertising.

The reason is simple: while the minister, in his opening remarks in his second reading contribution, said that this is a red-tape reduction bill aiming to relieve red tape and costs for consumers and businesses, we know that the vast majority of the changes to the 27 acts that this bill seeks to make are to remove a cost-incurring requirement to advertise in paper form in these regional newspapers.

I think that is a bad thing. We struggle for independent media coverage generally throughout the community in the modern day, let alone through the medium of these regional newspapers. We see the capacity here where ministers will receive written advice from their agencies about how these public notices should best be communicated to regional communities and, by and large, I do not think

it is a stretch of the imagination to imagine that a department will recommend a cheaper way of advertising these public notices.

I am assured by the minister, and I think it does give us some heart, that there are some commitments from the agencies to continue with some notices in hard-copy form in newspapers. I think that is a good thing. Air transport routes, of course—a requirement of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure—are really important for people to understand in their regional newspapers. I remember a few years ago we had uncertainty about the air services provider up to Port Augusta, which I know would be a considerable concern for the member for Stuart, for example.

I am sure that the member for Mount Gambier, who also has a regional airport and a community that relies on air services to differing extents, would also feel that that is an important notice but not necessarily the local aerodrome fees, which can be published on the AGD website. It would be unparliamentary for me to ask for a straw poll of members to indicate the last time they accessed the Attorney-General's Department website, but I would wager—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: The last time I wanted to know what the aerodrome fees were.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: You do not know what an aerodrome fee is?

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: No, I said, 'The last time I wanted to know what the aerodrome fees were.'

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, it is almost self-explanatory: it is a fee charged to or by an aerodrome. It does not require much lateral thinking to chase that one down and corner it comprehensively. The Geographical Names Act, of course, is important to local communities. That is because the Geographical Names Act is often invoked for the naming of a new suburb or changing the name of an existing suburb.

That is a matter of community interest. There is no question about that, particularly when the Deputy Premier is running around trying to do the work on behalf of the Burnside council to annex different parts of metropolitan Adelaide and bring them into Burnside. This is some sort of Middle Ages, European endeavour here, to annex property and land and bring it under the auspices of a different ruler.

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is a form of imperialism and, given it is Burnside, perhaps even cultural imperialism as well. That is of key community interest. We have even heard the blowback from some of those other communities not wanting to be annexed into the City of Burnside in the way that the Deputy Premier was envisaging, and for good reason, most probably. Maybe they thought they were going to lose their local member and pick up the Deputy Premier. Maybe that is the source of their concern rather than just changing council area, but you can see—

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, can I just interrupt for a moment. Ordinarily, when speaking to a clause, we allow about 15 minutes—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Should we start now?

The CHAIR: —and we are getting close to that. We guessed, but I think there are about three minutes left.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Okay. No worries.

The CHAIR: Can I just add—I will allow you this extra time—that I think 'aerodrome' is a wonderfully old-fashioned word.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is.

The CHAIR: It is much better than 'airport'.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes. I am sure we can all remember the times when people took a zeppelin to the local aerodrome to go on their first travels. I can understand that these matters are of great community importance but, once again, according to the information that has just been furnished to the house by the minister, this will not be up to a minister to make a decision about

whether that is advertised in a community newspaper. In fact, now we learn that that is going to be derogated to a council to make a decision about how that is advertised. Indeed, it might be advertised on a council website.

I like to think that I try to gain as much information from my local community as frequently as possible, but I must admit, other than development applications and reminding myself whether it is the green or the yellow bin night on a Thursday night, I do not trawl through the local council website all that often. If somebody was about to be some summarily annexed from Beaumont to Burnside or from Springfield to Heathfield or whatever the nefarious plans of the Deputy Premier were in her local community, I cannot imagine that people should have to rely on that. In the interests of timeliness, I will leave my remarks on my first amendment there.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The government does not support the amendment. When he thought we were going into committee the last time we sat, the member for Lee expressed to me that he wanted these done en bloc. I do not know whether he has changed his mind.

The CHAIR: Really, minister, that is his prerogative.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I just want to put that on the record.

The CHAIR: Yes, okay, but that is his prerogative.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That was the conversation that he had with me prior, which I agreed to. I have a couple of points in response to the member for Lee. First of all, as far as a consultation goes, there was a perfect opportunity to ask the Treasurer, who is responsible for this bill in the cabinet, that question when the bill was passed unamended and without any attempts for amendments from the Labor Party in the upper house just a couple of months ago.

I am advised that the Treasurer did, in actual fact, speak to a number of country newspapers. If it was such a concern to the opposition, they had that opportunity to actually ask that question when they had the Treasurer in the chamber. They chose not to and they actually chose not to have amendments such as these in the bill when they first introduced them to parliament in 2017 when they were the government.

They also chose not to work with Independent members or crossbench members in the Legislative Council to attempt to introduce these amendments in the Legislative Council. Instead, there has been some conversion on the road to Damascus between the houses and one can only speculate as to the motivation of the opposition for doing so.

I will take this opportunity to point out that I am advised that there is no reference to regional newspapers in any of the acts that are being amended. The reference to newspapers is statewide newspapers. I am more than happy to put the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to regional South Australia up against the previous government's commitments to regional South Australia, even for a small thing like where they spend their money.

If we look at the Port Pirie *Recorder* in the member for Frome's electorate, in the last year of the Weatherill government the government spent \$2,859.35 on advertising in the printed paper in the Port Pirie *Recorder*. In the first year of the Marshall government they spent \$6,129.01.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: We spent \$5 million building them a new oval in Port Pirie.

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

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Then, if we look at the member for Mount Gambier's electorate, in the last year of the Weatherill government \$5,895.48 was spent on advertising in *The Border Watch*, and in the first year of the Marshall government, which is committed to the regions, the figure is \$8,213.96, so nearly \$8,214—just a bee's whisker off that.

Again, in *The South Eastern Times*, \$1,360.90 was spent by the former Labor government in its last year in office, and \$2,871.47 in the first year of the Marshall Liberal government. Even something as small as expenditure on classified advertising in regional South Australia illustrates that the Liberal Party backs the regions.

If you look at the difference in the total spend with all the regional newspapers, \$165,424.65 was spent in the last year of the Weatherill government, the previous Labor government, and \$225,528.25 was spent in the first year of the Marshall Liberal government. I am talking about financial years in all those instances.

The government does not support these amendments because the amendments are not necessary for the advertising to continue in regional newspapers. The reference is predominantly about statewide newspapers. I am not quite sure about the understanding that Murdoch Mullighan has about the bill itself, but I am advised that the major change in this particular bill is the requirement to use a statewide newspaper.

We have shown that we are committed to regional newspapers. There is no legal requirement, as far as I understand, for this government to use regional newspapers, but our record, just in our very first year, shows our commitment to regional South Australia by using those regional newspapers.

I think that one has to question the motivation of the member for Lee and the opposition for raising these amendments at this very late moment when they had every opportunity to do so, first of all, when they introduced the bill when they were in government and they controlled this chamber, and their second opportunity was when the bill was introduced in the upper house.

Since 1975, the government has not controlled the upper house with its numbers. It has always had to work with the opposition or it has had to work with Independent members of the parliament in order to get legislation through. We all know in that situation that if you are passionate about making a change to legislation that is your best chance of actually making that change, but this shows that there was no passion in this from those opposite—no passion whatsoever, just politics. It is for those reasons that we do not support the amendments. The amendments are not necessary, and so we will not be supporting them.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I can advise the member for Unley why previously I had indicated that we were prepared to move amendments on particular clauses en bloc. That is because I, along with what I understand to be a majority of other members in this place, on the last sitting day that we were here discussing this bill were hoping to get through it as quickly as possible so we could resume the debate on the Surrogacy Bill, which is a government bill, which unfortunately has continually been adjourned time and again by the government.

I think that is regrettable, and once again we are using the simplify bill now to effectively run down the clock to the end of the day because the government is still not prepared to bring on the Surrogacy Bill—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Point of order—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and withholds law reform—

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, there is a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —from people who are seeking better access to surrogacy arrangements.

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, there is a point of order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The member is imputing improper motives and I ask that he withdraw.

The CHAIR: I do not uphold that point of order, but I would take a point of order on relevance. I think the member for Lee really needs to come back to his amendment and speak to that, please.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: In that way, I answer the minister's query about why the change of approach in moving these amendments and doing it individually. I understand that in doing so I am conducting the will of the house to try to push that minute hand around at least one more 360-degree revolution so that we can up stumps without an adjournment debate. That is, as I understand it, what we are here to do. That is why we are moving them one by one.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: On a point of order, you have already ruled—

The CHAIR: Yes, I am going to uphold that point of order this time, minister. Member for Lee, could you come back to the amendment that you have moved, please.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I was saying, despite this new piece of information from the minister—that we are now talking about statewide newspapers and not necessarily discrete regional newspapers, which service regional communities—I do not believe that to be the case at all. In fact, we have had member after member of the government benches who have made reference to the importance of newspapers in their electorates.

I made reference to the Deputy Premier before and her comments about *The Islander* and; the member for Narungga and his comments about the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*. We even had the member for Hammond speak about *The Border Times*, *The Murray Valley Standard*, *The Southern Argus*, *The Times* (in Victor Harbor I am talking about there), *The Lakelander*, a new one to my knowledge, and I thank him for lifting our brow about that, and the *Magnum Mag*, another one with which I was previously unfamiliar. Who says you don't learn something every day, Chair?

That is why this is important. That is why these amendments are important—to stick up for all these papers and make sure that there remains an obligation on these government agencies to support these regional newspapers. I cannot believe that we now have now a minister representing a Liberal government in this state who is saying that it is no longer important to enshrine in law a requirement for a government to advertise as broadly as possible, including in regional newspapers, and that we should instead leave it up to the discretion of the minister of the day.

As much as they might think that they are travelling well politically at the moment, with one of the most poorly received budgets in recent times and the shambles of land tax reform, I assure those opposite that, as much as they might be enjoying their positions and perspectives at the moment, they will not be there forever. I would have thought they would like protection for these country and regional newspapers to make sure that government agencies, of the \$20 billion that is spent each year as a state budget, are making a defined contribution to these papers.

That is why this amendment should be supported by those opposite. I think it will rest heavy on their shoulders if they vote against it because, mark my words, we will be telling all those regional newspapers that have come and spoken to us since this bill was introduced upstairs, raising concerns about a loss of advertising revenue, that it was the minister and those opposite, members of the Liberal parliamentary party, who are making sure there is no longer a requirement for government agencies to advertise in their papers in this way. I think it is a dreadful move by them.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The cat is out of the bag. The member for Lee has just told this place that you cannot trust Labor to look after the regions without legislation. That is what he has just said. That is the only interpretation of what the member for Lee has said.

Our constituents know that we understand regional South Australia. That is why we have increased our spend in regional newspapers in South Australia, and we did not need legislation to do it. There is no legislation there that tells us we must do it now, as far as I am advised. We are also understanding what this is about for the ALP, and that is it is about—

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

The CHAIR: There is a point of order, minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have introduced the amendment. There has been a contribution on it—

The CHAIR: You have moved the amendment, yes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and I have made closing remarks on the amendment. Isn't now the time to actually be moving the amendment?

The CHAIR: In fact, I have had a discussion about this with the Clerk and my understanding is that the minister can speak up to three times, up to 15 minutes every time on each and every clause.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This technically could go for 66 hours; if that is the will of the house, no worries, no problem.

The CHAIR: As long as you are both aware of that, I am happy. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Of course, this was not the first time that Labor could not trust itself to do the right thing. Remember the 'Put your family first' campaign in 2010 to hold the seat of Mawson. Do you remember that? When they pretended—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order.

The CHAIR: There is a point of order, minister, and I am anticipating—but away you go.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Relevance.

The CHAIR: Relevance. I uphold that point of order.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Actually, that is a good point. I am upholding the point of order, but you were not in your seat, member for Light. After all that, please let's get back to the task at hand. Minister, I will bring you back to the clause at hand, please.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Yes, and I thank you for that, sir, but it is obvious now that there is a pattern.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Light, you are called to order. You have had your point of order.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There is a pattern with those opposite: they cannot be trusted to do the right thing; they cannot be trusted to look after regional South Australia. There is no other way of interpreting what the member for Lee said other than the fact, 'You better put this in legislation because we ain't going to do it.' There is no doubt that that was the message that came from the member for Lee, but it is no surprise to members like yourself, sir, the member for Narungga and other regional members. That is no surprise. They have experienced 16 years of Labor government and tokenistic visits through country cabinets.

One has to ask: why is it that none of these amendments were put forward when Labor first introduced the bill when they were in government? They had the opportunity, they had the control of the House of Assembly, they had the opportunity to work with both the opposition and the crossbenchers in the upper house and they also had that opportunity when the bill was reintroduced into the upper house under the new government—not a peep. As a matter of fact, that is one of the shortest pieces of *Hansard* I have seen for quite some time in the contribution from the opposition in the upper house.

I put it to you that regional newspapers are better off today than they were before 18 March. The figures I read into *Hansard* earlier demonstrate that. That is real money. No legislation was needed to do that. That is a commitment from this government—that we will continue to support regional South Australia. Unlike those opposite, we do not need legislation in order to do that.

Mr BELL: I rise to support the amendment and inform the house that I will not be proceeding with my amendments because these are more streamlined and articulated in a simpler manner. I have a couple of comments around this. Whilst the minister says that regional areas are better off today than they were under a previous government, there is no guarantee that they will be better off tomorrow.

There are a lot of good parts to this bill, but the part that I take particular issue with is the removal of the requirement for the government to advertise in statewide or regional papers. There is no guarantee that we are going to be better off tomorrow. In fact, it is a perplexing situation when you are trying to defend a position and say, 'Trust us, because we know it's important and we will be directing our departments to advertise in regional papers.' If you think about that, that is a fair enough commitment, so why not keep the clause in the existing legislation that mandates it?

If you are saying that you agree that advertising in regional papers is important, where is the issue in keeping the legislation exactly the same? It is exactly what these amendments are doing. It is perplexing and quite bewildering when you sit back and think about it. You cannot defend the position of, 'We think it's important and we are going to direct our departments to keep the status

quo,' which many ministers have come and said to me, yet the amendment that is right before us at this point in time does exactly that: keeps the status quo around advertising in a statewide or regional paper.

The reason I will also be supporting the amendments put up by the member for Lee is the consultation that I have done. I will just read something in our local paper today from Country Press SA. I believe this has gone into all regional papers around South Australia and I find it disturbing that other regional MPs are not fighting actively for this amendment, whether that was in the party room or on the floor.

Quite seriously, if it is so important, this amendment should be supported because it is keeping the status quo, which many ministers are saying they are going to do anyway. This is just an extra level of protection. In a worst case scenario and if the fears of the minister that another government may not advertise in regional areas or in statewide papers are correct, then support this amendment. It forces future governments to do exactly what you are saying you are fearful of occurring. The headline of the article is 'Country Press South Australia opposes proposed advertising amendment'. The article states:

I write to you in my capacity as president of Country Press South Australia in relation to the 'Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2018' being debated in parliament this week.

Our member newspapers totally oppose any changes that relax governments requirement to advertise in regional newspapers.

These aspects of the Simplify Bill are seen as a slap in the face to a medium that serves government on many levels.

We disseminate the government's message on many issues affecting our readers and encourage informed debate on policy.

Over 80pc of regional people read their local newspaper every week.

We are the mouthpiece for the communities we serve and remain the most effective medium to deliver these messages to regions.

The Simplify Bill opens up options for government departments to use less focussed multinational platforms, rather than support the very medium known for its trust and accuracy in regional communities.

I ask you Mr Lucas, should the tax payer dollar be directed this way?

This is not only a slap in the face to regional publishers but also the regional communities they serve.

It might appear to our readers the government is attempting to bury decisions made on North Terrace that directly affect regional South Australians.

It seems ridiculous that sitting Liberal members would want to work against regional press in their own communities.

Newspapers that employ their constituents.

Revenue generated from government paid advertising in South Australia helps fund local jobs for South Australians.

Regional newspapers employ journalists who strengthen the democratic process by stimulating informed debate.

We strongly encourage the Liberal Party to support the proposed amendments to the Simplify Bill.

Darren Robinson,

Country Press South Australia president.

It is for those reasons that I support these amendments. I think it is common sense if we want to have a level of protection baked into the regulations and legislation that the status quo remains, which is effectively what these amendments are aiming to do.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I agree with the member for Mount Gambier that the status quo should stay, because there are no amendments through the bill that will remove a requirement that is there at the moment for advertising in a regional newspaper. The only change is a requirement to advertise in a statewide newspaper. I have been advised that when there is a specific requirement

to use a regional newspaper, the regional newspaper requirement remains. Section 6(2) of the Aerodrome Fees Act 1998 provides:

- (2) If an aerodrome operator fixes fees under this section, the aerodrome operator must publish in the Gazette and in—
 - (a) a daily newspaper circulating in the State; or
 - (b) a periodical publication prescribed by regulation, a notice setting out the fees.

The proposed amendment states:

- (2) If an aerodrome operator fixes fees under this section, a notice setting out the fees must be published by the aerodrome operator
 - (a) in the Gazette; and
 - (b) on its website; and
 - (c) in—
 - (i) a daily newspaper circulating in the State; or
 - (ii) any periodical publication prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this subsection.

It is clear that there is still the option to use those methods of publication as there was before the amendments. It is disappointing that the opposition has chosen to not quite understand the intent of the very bill that they brought to parliament as the government back in 2017, the same one that went to the upper house and was very quickly moved through the upper house without amendment. There was plenty of opportunity for amendment and probably a possibility of persuading some crossbench members who may have been hoodwinked by the rhetoric that the member for Lee is trying to use at the moment to run a scare campaign.

Let's face it, Labor is pretty good at scare campaigns. They have run them successfully previously. It is fair enough to even suggest that they own them when it comes to trying to have a civil debate about improving the regulatory environment, making improvements to the economy, improvements to the training system or whatever it is. There will be a—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The member interjects, sir, and we all sat here patiently waiting for his contribution.

The CHAIR: Thank you for your guidance, minister. I did pick up that the members opposite were interjecting.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, you have had your opportunity and will have many more by the look. So, minister, back to the task at hand.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have highlighted the government's case, I have presented evidence that the government is a friend of the regions here in South Australia and we have demonstrated that with cold hard cash.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: They don't believe it, writing letters in to the minister.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Under the same rules and conditions and the same acts that the previous government was using regional papers for public notices, we were using regional papers for public notices. The only difference is that we spent more money with regional papers than those opposite did.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I should not be, but I am gobsmacked by that contribution from the member for Unley. To say that the requirement will remain after the passage of this bill to

advertise in these newspapers, and then inexplicably reads part of the bill out, and he chooses the excerpt from clause 4:

- (2) If an aerodrome operator fixes fees under this section, a notice setting out the fees must be published by the aerodrome operator in the Gazette and—
 - (a) on its website;

And here is the devastating revelation for the member for Unley, the unfortunate inclusion of the conjunction 'or'—not 'and' but 'or'. I would have thought all 47 of us would have somehow made our way here having had the benefit of understanding what the word 'or' means. It indicates a choice between one thing and another, not both things together. It is one thing or another, so it is a website or it is a newspaper, not a website and a newspaper.

If you cannot understand that then you probably do not understand the representations from the member for Mount Gambier reading out letters to the editor circulated across every country regional newspaper in the state imploring the Liberal Party of Australia to swallow just a modicum of pride and do the right thing by country newspapers. That is just extraordinary. Maybe if you want to know, member for Unley, or, Chair, if you would like to know why the member for Unley sits in wonder at why this debate was not had upstairs, perhaps I can avail the house of two facts.

Perhaps we would have made these representations upstairs, and an experienced, wily operator like the Hon. Rob Lucas, somebody who probably knows the dictionary definition of the word 'or', would have realised the problem that he is getting his party into by obliterating the requirement to publish public notices in country newspapers, and maybe he would have found the wisdom to set that aside to save the member for Unley the humiliation that he currently finds himself in, demonstrating to the house the failure to understand a basic definition of a two-lettered, single syllable word in a bill. It is just extraordinary.

This has been sitting on the *Notice Paper* for the best part of a year. We have had country paper after country paper after country paper—indeed, in my second reading contribution, I read them all out into *Hansard*—concerned about the impacts that this bill might have on their operations. We hear from the member for Mount Gambier that the president of the Country Press association is now taking the extraordinary step to lobby members of parliament via a broadly circulated letter to the editor in every regional newspaper to implore those members opposite not to go ahead and make this decision. What else do you need?

This could be easily resolved. In fact, not only could it be easily resolved but we could deal with these amendments very, very swiftly. We could even deal with this before 5 o'clock or maybe even just after 5 o'clock, and maybe we could finally get onto the Surrogacy Bill. Maybe those thousands of South Australians who would like greater reproductive certainty could have access to that as well as the comfort of knowing that public notices will still need to be published in country newspapers. However, both those things are what the Liberal government is putting beyond the reach of South Australians, and I think it is shameful—absolutely shameful.

You can dress it up in all the politics that you want and you can misapprehend the basic definition of a simple two-letter conjunction like the word 'or' as much as you like, but that will be the real impact on these businesses. It does not take a genius to know that there has been a massive contraction of media penetration across regional Australia, and indeed in regional South Australia, in the last 30 years. Here we have a government and a minister happy once again to lead the charge, lancing it into country newspapers once more. I think it is outrageous.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 22
 Noes 21
 Majority 1

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
 Bignell, L.W.K.
 Brown, M.E. (teller)

Bell, T.S.
 Boyer, B.I.
 Close, S.E.

Bettison, Z.L.
 Brock, G.G.
 Cook, N.F.

AYES

Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.
Wortley, D.		

NOES

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

Amendment thus carried.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Could members find their places, please. The member for Lee has further amendments to move.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I move en bloc:

Amendment No 2 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 7, line 3 [clause 2(2)(f)]—Delete paragraph (f)

Amendment No 3 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 7, line 5 [clause 2(2)(h)]—Delete paragraph (h)

It will not be a surprise to you, Chair, why I move these amendments. These amendments, similar to the last amendment, have the effect of preventing the commencement of sections of the bill that, if not prevented, would in turn mean that it was easier for a government to choose not to advertise in regional papers.

It is important that we on this side of the house, with the support of regional MPs who care about their communities, continue to support these amendments because we have had the extraordinary scene of the Liberal Party of South Australia, formerly the Liberal and Country League political party, vote actively against the requirements to maintain support for regional newspapers.

Extraordinarily, we not only saw the government—a Liberal government—vote against this amendment but we also saw the member for Narungga do the same, which I think is a great pity. For the ease of the house—

Mr Ellis interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, it is a free society, as I am reminded by the member for Narungga. It is also free in the Liberal Party to cross the floor whenever you like. I have moved these two amendments to clause 2 en bloc.

The CHAIR: Amendments Nos 2 and 3, standing in your name, member for Lee, have been moved. He has just indicated that he is moving them en bloc, so, minister, do you wish to speak?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The government does not support the amendments, and I only reiterate that since coming to office the government has proven that it is supporting regional newspapers in South Australia. This simplify bill is much broader than regional newspapers; this simplify bill makes it much easier for businesses to conduct business here in South Australia. That is what this is about. That was the motivation of the previous government when they introduced this

into the chamber and it is also the intent of this government: to make it easier for business to be conducted here in South Australia.

We know that many of these acts of parliament that are being amended have been around for quite some time. There has been a lot of new technology in that time. Of course, one of the key things that has changed since the change of government is that by the end of this financial year all our schools will be connected to high-speed fibre. In a period of just over two years, we will be going from the worst connected schools in Australia to the best connected schools in Australia; consequently, we are moving.

Innovation is happening here in South Australia. Technology is spreading beyond Adelaide and the suburbs and we are opening up regional South Australia to technology. We have the GigCity extension down to Mount Gambier and up to Whyalla. We are committed to the regions. We have been investing in the regions through our rollout of fibre in schools and our extension of the GigCity fibre into regional South Australia to create regional hubs so they can participate in the innovation agenda of this government. I know, sir, how important it is to your community to have access to fast internet.

More and more people are even reading the newspapers online, whether they are in regional South Australia or in the city. Remember that the main focus of the amendments that relate to publications and newspapers relates to statewide publications, not regional publications. It is important that this bill does what it was set out to do when it was introduced by the previous government, and that is to simplify the business of doing business here in South Australia and update legislation to take advantage of innovation and technology that has happened since many of those acts were originally written.

It was quite a lengthy process to go through to achieve this outcome, so that is why it is important that we do not push additional burdens onto business here in South Australia by not following through with this legislation that, until it reached this chamber, had bipartisan support.

The committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes 22
 Noes 23
 Majority 1

AYES

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

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	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.	Speirs, D.J.
Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	

Amendments thus negatived.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: What feedback has the minister obtained from those people who publish regional newspapers regarding the government bill?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: If the member was in the chamber earlier he would have heard the answer to that.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: My further question, then, would be: what is the minister's response to the concerns raised by the publishers of regional newspapers?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There was plenty of opportunity for the opposition to ask these sorts of questions of the Treasurer, who had carriage of this bill through the parliament. My understanding is he did speak with a number of those stakeholders. I was not at those meetings, but I can advise that the Treasurer did in fact speak with those who wanted to speak to him about matters of this bill.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Through you, Chair, just to clarify, is the minister saying that he is not aware of the feedback or that he is aware? I would like to clarify, because it is very important whether he is aware of the feedback and is choosing not to tell this house, or he is not aware of the feedback, in which case he cannot tell this house.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I refer the member to my previous answer.

The committee divided on the clause as amended:

Ayes	22
Noes	23
Majority	1

AYES

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

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

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

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Clause as amended thus negated.

Clause 3.

The CHAIR: Any questions on clause 3? The member for Light has a question on clause 3.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Am I allowed to speak or just—

The CHAIR: Yes, you can speak, and weave some comment and question into it.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I do not want to use up my three for just questions. I would like to speak to it, too, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: You have the call, member for Light.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Thank you, Mr Chair. In support of this amendment, as I have supported others and I will support the other ones as well, what we have just seen in terms of the minister's earlier non-answers to the questions I asked and also the minister's comments to the previous amendments is very interesting, because he talked about all these things that the government is doing—innovation things—and what he was actually saying was, 'Okay, that's all very good.' The only inference you can draw from the comments he has made is that the print media in regional South Australia does not matter anymore—it does not matter. That is the only conclusion you can draw from the minister's comments.

The fact that he refused to even answer questions and refused to put before this house the feedback from regional newspapers is really a disgrace. He was not even prepared to acknowledge that the opinions expressed by the regional newspapers were valid for this chamber to hear—he was not prepared. He said, 'You want to hear it? Go to the upper house, where they have actually had the debate.' The point he was making was that it was below him and below his party for them to bring those comments into this chamber and for this chamber to hear the views of our country newspapers. That is an absolute disgrace.

The CHAIR: Member for Light, with all due respect, we were dealing with and discussing newspapers during the previous clause. This particular clause talks about rail safety.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am talking about the advertisements required for rail safety in country areas, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: You will weave that in? Alright, thank you.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think he was referring to subclause (1) of clause 3:

In this Act, a provision under a heading referring to the amendment of a specified Act amends the Act so specified.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That is correct; thank you, member for Lee.

The CHAIR: So you will be specific to the clause, member for Light?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Very much so.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: All the acts being amended.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: All the acts being amended, so I can talk about all the acts being amended.

The CHAIR: But we are discussing clause 3. Your call.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That is correct. Thank you, Mr Chair, and I appreciate your wise counsel and direction. What is really puzzling about this whole debate is that throughout this whole discussion in this chamber there is one simple solution to this whole matter. When you strip back the minister's comments and a whole range of other things he has said, the reality is that he could just support the amendments, which would actually give effect to the views he supposedly holds on this matter. The fact that he is not prepared to support the amendments, which would give effect to what he believes in, quite clearly means that he actually does not believe it.

I have had, as have other members I am sure, quite a bit of feedback from regional newspapers about this bill, particularly in terms of the requirements of all the various acts that need to be amended under this clause. The feedback has been quite clear: they believe these amendments should be supported by this parliament in toto. I agree with them, but the minister is not prepared to do that.

I would like to make another very interesting point. On a number of occasions, the minister has told this chamber that the CEOs would be directed to do that, all the requirements of the act. How many times have we stood up in this chamber and asked questions or called a minister and said, 'Why haven't you done this?' and the minister's answer has been, 'Well, I can't direct my CEO. It is a matter for the CEO to make that decision in terms of the budget'? That is the answer we would get in the future when the government does not advertise. The answer would be, 'Well, I can't direct my CEO, I'm sorry.'

The way to rectify that problem or to ensure that does not happen is to support these amendments. The fact is that the government is not prepared to do so and is prepared to see our regional papers die.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I can only reiterate what I said earlier about the commitment to the regions by this cabinet. We have proven that in the time we have been in office in the comparisons of money that is being spent in regional South Australian newspapers. There is no requirement by law to spend that extra money in regional newspapers; it is something we chose to do because the regions are important to us.

I put it to you, sir, that this was so far off the radar of the Labor government when they were in office that it did not appear anywhere in their first bill and it did not appear anywhere when the bill was in the Legislative Council. These amendments have, I would suggest, an alternative purpose for those opposite. If they were interested in regional South Australia, I am sure they would have picked this up with their country cabinets that they say were so valuable to them when they were in office. This would have appeared in the original bill that they had responsibility for when they were in government back in 2017. The government will not be supporting the amendments. We are about supporting the regions. We have demonstrated that we are doing that.

The CHAIR: Minister, if I could just interrupt you, we are actually discussing clause 3, to which there are no amendments. I invited questions and comment on as it is printed.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you, sir. I was using this opportunity to respond to comments made by the previous speaker. I have made that response and we can continue with the clauses.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr BELL: Mr Chair, I indicated before that I will not be proceeding with my amendments, so I think we can move on.

The CHAIR: Member for Mount Gambier, a point of clarification: are they all the amendments in your name on both schedules?

Mr BELL: That is correct, yes.

The CHAIR: You will not be proceeding with them; thank you for that. Member for Lee, you could achieve your desired outcome by voting against the question that the clause stand as printed, so you do not need to move an amendment as such.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I indicate that I will not be supporting clause 4, and not supporting clause 4 has the same effect as moving my amendment, which would actually remove the clause from the bill I agree, Chair. I would urge all members, including those opposite who purport to represent country electorates, not to support this clause.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes 23
Noes 21
Majority 2

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES

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

Clause thus passed.

Clauses 5 and 6 passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I was hoping that the minister could advise the house about—and this may also extend not just into clause 7 but also subsequent clauses 8 and 9—the treatment of aquaculture leases and what the experience has been in the last two or three years with the cancellation or granting of pilot leases or indeed the granting of production leases and corresponding licences.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Could I have that again, please?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I was hoping that the minister could advise the committee what the experience has been in the last two or three years in regard to the number of lease cancellations, as well as the granting of corresponding pilot leases or granting of production leases, when it comes to aquaculture endeavours?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I do not have that information with me. If it is relevant and if I can, I will bring it back.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It must be relevant because the government has put parliamentary counsel to the effort of drafting a series of amendments to remove from law the requirement to advertise the cancellation of leases, the granting of pilot leases or the granting of production leases from publication in country and regional newspapers and instead provide the choice by getting a minister to decide between publishing the notices relevant to those types of leases in a newspaper or on a website.

I implore the minister that it is indeed relevant. I would have thought perhaps, Chair, for your electorate, the aquacultural hub of South Australia, that this information would assist the committee greatly in its deliberations on these most important clauses.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The Chair knows and the member knows that the number of cancellations or otherwise is not affected by any amendment to the bill. This has no relevance whatsoever to the operation of such a licence. It has no relevance to the bill at all, other than the method of notification.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am sorry, Chair, but I must disagree with the minister because if I was a resident on Eyre Peninsula, whether it be on an east coast beach like Tumby Bay or heading down towards the southern tip of Eyre Peninsula or heading over to the West Coast with such verdant aquacultural fields like Coffin Bay, Streaky Bay or Smoky Bay, for example, and I was not an oyster farmer or indeed a fisherman but instead just somebody who engaged in recreational pursuits at the water's edge, I might be quite surprised that the government had granted a pilot lease for a new aquacultural activity in the vicinity.

I might feel, for example, in that instance, that the granting of that lease might perhaps deter somewhat my capacity to enjoy my previous recreational activities in those waterside locations and I might find that interesting to the extent that I might read a regional newspaper, one published, for example, on Eyre Peninsula, to make sure that I still had access to those favourite boltholes that I had enjoyed so much for those many years to sun myself at water's edge.

If that capacity were to be removed by a decision by a minister to grant a pilot aquacultural lease and I did not know about it, despite the efforts I had gone to in ensuring that I had read cover to cover the periodicals as published in regional communities by those news outlets, I would be most vexed because I had not had the wherewithal to insert myself into the bowels of the PIRSA website to find that information.

That is why it is relevant. I would implore the minister to perhaps make some inquiries of those next to him about whether there has been the granting of such a lease or perhaps, to improve the betterment of my recreational pursuits, the cancellation of such a lease, which might further extend my capacity to enjoy those sorts of locations.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Does the minister yet have any advice about the frequency of the granting of pilot aquacultural leases?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Sorry, I missed that question.

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, could you repeat the question, please.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Does the minister yet have any advice about how often pilot aquacultural licences have been granted in the last, say, two or three years?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: No, I do not have that advice.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Is it the minister's advice to the committee that he regards such information as irrelevant?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We do not have that information, I am sorry.

Clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 24 passed.

Clause 25.

Mr BELL: I have a question around the sale of land for non-payment of levy. This seems to strike me as an interesting one because it states:

The Commissioner must cause notice of the auction to be published—

- (a) on at least 2 separate occasions in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the State; or
- (b) on a website determined by the Commissioner.

If it is so important that this is not just a general notice, this is a notice that must be put on two separate occasions, does the minister have concerns that the awareness within a community or a state may not be there because local newspapers or papers are not required to publish that notice?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The way I understand it is that there is no requirement for a legal newspaper to be involved at the moment and this simply gives the option of a state-circulated newspaper—as was previously the case; it was a state newspaper—or a website. Of course, so many more state newspapers are in actual fact using websites themselves.

I know that I and certainly many members in this place do not have the paper delivered anymore, but they read it on their iPad. They subscribe through that and my understanding is that that is also a preferred method of subscription by many of the newspaper providers in Australia and certainly around the world. My understanding is that there is no requirement in the current act for a local newspaper to be used. This refers to an option for a statewide newspaper or a website.

Mr BELL: On a point of clarification, I do not believe that I said 'local newspaper', I believe I said 'state circulation'. So is the minister saying that under the current act there is no requirement to advertise in a state-based paper?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I just need to clarify also that RevenueSA has never enforced any sale for the emergency services levy. That is the advice I have. The amendment is very clear that it

is giving an option for a statewide newspaper or an option for a website determined by the commissioner. Currently, as I understand it, there is no requirement for a local newspaper to carry that notice.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is important, I think, the question we have had from the member for Mount Gambier, because this potentially is a very serious matter—to have the government sell a property of a member of the community for the non-payment of a levy. While we might find some comfort in the advice of the member for Unley that this is yet to be done by RevenueSA, in the current environment you could easily imagine that this might eventuate quite quickly, even in the member for Unley's own electorate.

For example, if you were a wealthy property owner, perhaps living in Unley Park with quite an expensive house that attracted a very large emergency services levy, and out of the blue you found yourself stuck with a new aggregation policy for land tax which crippled your investment portfolio, you might find it very hard to make ends meet.

You might not be able to pay your emergency services levy once you have been subjected to the full force of the previously unannounced measure. Indeed, it is a measure previously committed to by the Marshall Liberals to not introduce such a land tax policy. You might find yourself suffering the financial impost of part of the \$86 million tax hike in land tax via aggregation and, in not paying your emergency services levy, you might find that your property is to be sold by RevenueSA.

It is important at this juncture to avail ourselves of what the current Emergency Services Funding Act says at section 20(6):

An auction under this section must be advertised on at least two separate occasions in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the State.

Now what we are going to be confronted with, if the government's bill is successful, is a choice, not even for the minister, not even for the minister responsible, the Treasurer, but indeed for the commissioner of taxation, who must cause notice of the auction to be published either in a newspaper circulated generally in the state 'or'—that most vexatious word that is confronting us yet again—on a website.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: Online—online newspaper.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It may be a surprise to the member for Chaffey that a website, yes, is indeed housed online. That is how they generally work.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is generally how websites work; they are generally online. I know that we have had some revelations: conjunctions are not just 'and'; they also include 'or', and websites, yes, are commonly held online. That would be the concern for a landowner to have a property sold out from under them merely by an ad that is published online, and indeed published not even for a minimum duration, just published online. It could be for an hour. It could be for a minute. I think that is regrettable. So I am glad that the member for Mount Gambier has drawn the committee's attention to the impost that this may cause an Unley Park landowner, and I would urge the member for Unley to stick up for his constituents.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: One thing is for certain: there is less risk of people ever being forced to sell their home because they have not been able to pay the emergency services levy—because it is much lower under this government. It is much lower, and \$90 million is returned to taxpayers every year. It is extraordinary, the mischief that the member for Lee is up to and the extent of the mischief.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:30.

The CHAIR: Welcome back to committee. My recollection is that we are on clause 25. The member for Mount Gambier has asked two questions, the member for Lee has asked his first question and the minister was on his feet, responding. Would you like to continue?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Yes. I want to raise a point in response to the member for Lee who suggested that someone—I think he used the example of a constituent of mine in Unley Park; whether that was Victoria Avenue or Northcote Street, I am not quite sure—would not necessarily

find out that the Treasurer may be going through the process of putting their house on the market because they had not paid their emergency services levy. The act is very clear that 'a copy of a notice must be served on the registered mortgagee or encumbrancee of the land', so there is a proper legal process in managing that.

I think people would be quite surprised to learn from the member for Lee that the only method of communication the commissioner of taxation here in South Australia would have with somebody they were going to enter a very serious legal situation with was through a newspaper advertisement. It is fanciful and I think it just proves the motivation of these amendments by the Labor Party in the chamber.

I can assure the member for Lee that the government would not be conducting the sale. If my experience of watching real estate in the seat of Unley is any guide, it is probably likely to be a company like Toop and Toop or a number of other companies that spend a lot of money in advertising, in both newspapers and other forms of media, so there certainly would not be any lack of knowledge about the house being for sale. It is a frivolous argument from the member for Lee and I think it actually trivialises the concern some members might have about the options that are being offered to government departments to use other forms of media to publish notices in this bill.

Mr BELL: Does the minister have any concerns around the probity of this amendment in terms of reducing it from two separate occasions in a newspaper circulating generally throughout the state to the potential situation where the commissioner is giving cause of notice of the auction, which is just published on a website determined by the commissioner?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: This is a public notice. The mortgagee is served a notice, so they know all about it. It concerns them and the government. It may be of interest to other parties who might want to buy it, but I can assure you that the sale would be advertised like any other government sale. When an asset is decided to be sold by government, it is handled by agents and they have marketing budgets.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Perhaps I can provide the minister with some further particulars about the process. It is not a sale: it is a public auction, and we are not really discussing whether there is any prior notice to the property owner and further opportunities for the owner to make good the debt they have to the commissioner in that regard. Talking very specifically about section 20(6) of the Emergency Services Funding Act, that talks about the process by which property is to be disposed of in the event that the debt is not made good, and that is by auction.

I hope that clears it up for the member and for the residents of Victoria Avenue or Northcote Street. I understand those people who find themselves unable to meet their emergency services obligations to the commissioner are likely to be impacted the most by the land tax aggregation changes. I hope that has clarified it for him.

Indeed, by insisting on the amendment we would make sure that all residents of South Australia would have the opportunity to be advised of an impending auction not once but twice in a newspaper, not merely by placing it on Toop and Toop's website or of some other favoured agent of the minister. That would ensure the widest possible publicity is—

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: I ask you, Chair, to ask the member to come to his question.

The CHAIR: The member is allowed to speak. It is quite within the purview of this committee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If I were a resident of the electorate of Stuart, for example—

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: You would be so lucky.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would be lucky; depending on how much I desired a good local member, yes, I may be lucky. However, if I were fortunate enough to be a member of the communities that are encompassed within the electoral boundaries that comprise the seat of Stuart, I might find some interest in purchasing a property that was available, via public auction, as a result of some difficulty that a resident of Northcote Street or Victoria Avenue might find themselves submerged in as a result of the land tax aggregation changes.

I think it is a good thing that there be two separate notices of that auction in a newspaper circulated generally across the state and not merely placed on some nameless website at the discretion of a future commissioner to presumably the ignorance of a great many people.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is extraordinary; I cannot believe the member for Lee made that statement with a straight face. You could just imagine people in the market for a house in Victoria Avenue going through the classifieds: 'Is there one there? Is there one for sale in the classified ads? In the public notices, is there one for sale?' This is just extraordinary. It is absolutely extraordinary.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for Lee! You have had your opportunity. Minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Give the man some private sector experience, give him some real-life experience. He might understand the market, how things work in the marketplace. It is absolutely extraordinary and you are degrading yourself, member for Lee, and for what purpose? It is absolutely extraordinary.

The CHAIR: Are there any other questions?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Minister for Energy, they are allowed to make contributions.

An honourable member interjecting:

The CHAIR: No; I do not think so. I put the question that clause 25 stand as printed.

Clause passed.

Clauses 26 to 30 passed.

Clause 31.

Mr BELL: Regarding clause 31(b)(iii), does the minister concede that giving an option not to advertise, and I quote, 'in a newspaper circulating in the locality to which the order relates' potentially disadvantages regional communities and undermines the government's argument that regions will not be affected by this amendment if it is indeed not printed in a local paper?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is still an option to use a local paper to print such a notice.

Mr BELL: I was not asking if it was an option; I was asking whether or not it potentially disadvantages a regional community and undermines the argument that I have heard in this chamber tonight that regional communities will not be disadvantaged because of statewide publications being removed, not regional papers. Subparagraph (iii) specifically talks about 'a newspaper circulating in the locality to which the order relates'. I take that as being, if it is in a regional area, a regional paper.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I do not believe that there will be any disadvantage for local communities. The fact is that the record is very clear: we are supporting local communities in using the measures that are available to us. There has been an increase in the spend in local media since this government has been in office—a significant increase on the previous government's commitment—and we have done that without any legislation in order to do that.

There is nothing in any of these bills that we are amending that told us we had to spend more money in regional newspapers since coming to office, and we did because the regions are important to South Australia and the regions are important to this government. That is why we support the regions.

It is not just the few thousand dollars that are spent in many of the newspapers published in regional South Australia; we support them with our programs: the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development with his growth fund for regional South Australia. We support them through the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure with the road program we are rolling out in regional South Australia. We support them through the Minister for Education with the rollout of fibre to every single school in South Australia within a two-year period—a terrific contribution from the Minister for Education.

Also, of course, the new school we are building in Whyalla will no longer separate year 10 from the senior years. The perception that Whyalla has had over many years is that it is a bonus to do years 11 and 12 because you go to a different school. That will be gone and there will be brand-new facilities.

We are doing work through our Skilling South Australia fund to help our biggest exporters from regional South Australia find the skills they need in order for them to export more to the rest of the world and produce more products for Australia. Fifty per cent of our merchantable exports come from regional South Australia, yet half the jobs advertised in regional South Australia remain unfilled. We are supporting regional South Australia in every possible way that we can, and we will continue to do so. The only threat to regional South Australia is the return of a Labor government.

Mr BELL: Can the minister guarantee this house and regional communities that they will not be worse off because of this amendment to the bill?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I ask the member for Mount Gambier to look at the record of this government since it has been in office and the commitments it has delivered on in supporting regional South Australians. We have done that. We have spent more money with regional media than the previous government did the year before and even the year before that, and we are committed to supporting the regions. It is the aim of this government for the regions to be doing much better under this government than they have for a very long time, and we are working towards doing that.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This is, I think, a clause that all members should be greatly concerned about. It basically removes the requirement that the chief officer must circulate notices about the fire danger season in publications with reference to a specific locality in the state. I cannot imagine that any member would be comfortable with, instead, potentially requiring members of the community to become reliant on a website for these sorts of notices rather than ensuring that they are published in a newspaper.

Yes, fair enough, they are covered in the *Gazette*, and there are a small number of us who pay regular attention to that, but that is not the public. Again, most people access the *Gazette* online. It does not take too much of a stretch to imagine how a regional community would be left in the lurch when fire danger notices are no longer published in local papers.

For example, I am thinking of the *Eyre Peninsula Tribune*, the *Port Lincoln Times* and even the *West Coast Sentinel*. They would all think that the publication of these sorts of notices by emergency services and the chief officer are absolutely essential community information, rather than providing a discretion for them to be made on a website. Even the member for Heysen would probably prefer the retention of the requirement that they be able to be published in publications that service his electorate, whether it is *The Southern Argus*. Maybe even his colleague, the member for Kavel, would like to think that perhaps notices are still published in *The Courier* around Mount Barker, for example.

If you were concerned about the vast swathes of forestry down in the South-East, you might be concerned that the *Border Chronicle*, the *Coastal Leader*, *The Naracoorte Herald*, *The Pennant* or *The South Eastern Times* would still have public notices from the emergency services advising the community about fire danger. That is what is to be lost through the passage of this clause of the bill.

Having moved past what some members might not think is so serious, such as aerodrome fees or air-route licensing agreements and so on, we are now in the territory of essential public notices and essential community information, which should be required to be disseminated as broadly as possible via as many channels as possible. That is now being removed by this clause of the bill. There is now a new discretion to choose not to publish in those papers but instead to merely place it on a website.

I am not sure what the reaction of a home owner would be if they felt they were about to be confronted with the danger of a bushfire. Given the locations I have lived in around metropolitan Adelaide, I have never had to be confronted with that sort of danger, but I suspect that there are some members opposite who probably quite likely have been in that position.

Mr Pederick: In the middle of it.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Or in the middle of them, as the member for Hammond says. I shudder to think what that must be like. It must be absolutely terrifying. To use the colloquialism, if you have not had your ear to the ground in the time leading up to that, but you became aware that there may be some threat, then you might want to avail yourselves of the information that would be available to you.

It might be done at a time, for example, when you are not online, as the member for Chaffey needed clarification on. You might not have had access to a website. For example, you might have the local rag sitting on the kitchen bench and you think, 'I will just flick through that to see if there are any notices in here of public importance about fire danger.' You might try to find out some information like that. That is what we stand to lose now with the passage of this clause.

I cannot believe that the government is insisting so stubbornly—and really so that they do not have to be seen to be supporting any initiative of either a crossbencher or a member of the opposition—that this clause remains and not accept an amendment from elsewhere in the house to strike out this clause. We are now far beyond the realms of politicking and of making petty points about who supports whose amendment or otherwise. This is now a matter of community safety.

I would implore the minister, the member for Unley, who, other than his years—well-versed as they are in this place—as an apprentice, has probably spent most of his time upright in the same way I have, mostly in metropolitan Adelaide. He probably does not know that feeling of discomfort, if not fear, that the member for Hammond brought to our attention about being confronted by the danger of bushfire. Many of their constituents would know that and many of their constituents, if they have not directly experienced it, worry about the prospect of experiencing it.

So I implore the minister: now is a good time to put the politics aside and accept the suggestion from the floor that this clause not be agreed to and that we maintain the requirement for our emergency services to disseminate these public notices via all means available to them, including local newspapers.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Well, that was extraordinary. The member for Lee would have you believe that this clause is about warning people when fire is around the corner. You can imagine, it is Tuesday, *The Border Watch* comes out on Thursday: 'Oh, I'm going to wait until Thursday to read about this imminent danger.'

The facts are that this is about the fire season and when it starts. That is what this is about. It is not about a bushfire around the corner. This is another attempt by the Labor Party to throw a spanner in the works for political purposes. It is just extraordinary—absolutely extraordinary—that the member for Lee would even attempt such a thing on such a serious matter. It is very disappointing, I have to say.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will not use the term 'extraordinary'. I know the member for Unley has extended himself beyond the single syllable, dual letter term of 'or'.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Point of order, sir: that is just outrageous.

The CHAIR: There is a point of order, member for Lee. The member for Unley has taken offence to that.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: To which, sir?

The CHAIR: The slight.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Which slight was that, sir? Extending himself?

The CHAIR: I am thinking that is what it was, member for Lee. Member for Unley, you would like the member for Lee to withdraw it?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am happy to unreservedly withdraw and humbly apologise to the member for Unley for any offence that he has taken.

The CHAIR: The member for Lee has withdrawn. Thank you, member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I was saying, the member for Unley would have you believe that a notice of a fire season has absolutely no bearing whatsoever for a member of the community

about any proximity to fire danger because, according to the member for Unley, it is always the case that there is an orderly announcement of the fire danger season and of course circumstances know that it is much further down the track after such a notice is published that, if a bushfire is to occur, it will occur.

There are never bushfires, according to the member for Unley, at the commencement of a fire danger season. Of course not. There is always a much broader parenthesis around the dates for the fire danger season, according to the member for Unley. According to the member for Unley, maybe a fulsome notice of a fire danger season could commence, say, in late May. Would that be enough notice for the bushfires to get their act together, to start to gestate and flame up in time for an orderly burning out of a region for the member for Unley?

Of course, it never happens that the fire danger season might actually delineate when there is a danger of a fire happening in a locality of a much higher chance than occurs at another time of the year. No, according to the member for Unley. We learn that he is not just an expert former apprentice at his trade of choice but that he is also an expert in fire danger now. That is remarkable—absolutely remarkable. Not only does he do himself a disservice but he does this place a disservice talking this down as a serious issue that should be dealt with by the house.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There is a saying that politics is show business for ugly people and I think we saw a pretty good performance from the member for Lee when it comes to show business. It is vaudeville over there from the member for Lee. I am waiting for the cane, bowler hat and tap shoes. That is what I am waiting to come out next from the member for Lee. It is extraordinary, isn't it? Absolutely extraordinary.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes 23
Noes 20
Majority 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES

Bell, T.S.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

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

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

PAIRS

Duluk, S.

Bedford, F.E.

Clause thus passed.

Clause 32.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Could the minister explain the circumstances by which clause 32 might be activated?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have been advised that the notification comes out on assent.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I unfortunately missed the final syllables of the minister's answer and I ask him to repeat it.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Assent.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I thank the minister for his detailed explanation about how this clause would apply. He has advised us that it comes out on assent. My actual understanding was that this might be of some interest to members opposite and it involves the making of notices by the authorities to a private landowner to take steps necessary to prevent the outbreak of fire on their land, which I would have thought would be particularly pertinent to regional members of parliament, for example.

In fact, I think we had some conjecture in this place about a similar measure and who could instruct landowners about the treatment of vegetation on their land. It was the cause of some considerable brow furrowing for those opposite, yet now I think we are salved with the advice from the minister that it merely happens on assent. My understanding was that currently, under section 105F of the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005, a notice given under subsection (5), that is a notice whereby:

...the authorised person may, by notice in writing that complies with any requirements set out in the regulations, require the owner of the private land to take specified action to remedy the default or to protect the land or property on the land, within such time as may be specified in the notice.

This can be done:

- (a) personally; or
- (b) by post; or
- (c) if the authorised person cannot, after making reasonable inquiries, ascertain the name and address of the person to whom the notice is to be given—
 - (i) by publishing the notice in a newspaper circulating in the locality of the land; and
 - (ii) by leaving a copy of the notice in a conspicuous place on the land.

It is really (9)(c)(i) which now is to be given the vexed choice for the minister either of the publication of that notice in a newspaper or merely by publishing it on the website. I can almost guess that the minister's advice is going to be that if it is placed on a prominent location on the person's land—it might be, for example, next to a letterbox, or it might be some sort of Led Zeppelin album cover-like crop circle for a larger-type property notifying them of the need to tidy up the troublesome vegetation—publishing it on the website might be okay.

However, I would have thought, once again, that publishing such a notice in a newspaper in circulation in the locality was a good requirement to have legislated to make sure that we are using, once again, every means possible to notify the landowner. Would the minister agree?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The member is actually suggesting that somebody who would not be able to identify a risk like that themselves is a regular reader of a newspaper. The facts are that the act prescribes that an authorised person, a council, the SAMFS or the SACFS may, if they consider it is necessary, write a notice that requires the owner of the private land to take action in order to ensure compliance with the relevant fire prevention requirements of the act. I have every confidence that the Minister for Emergency Services would do everything within their powers to make sure that the notice was available when it was needed to be available to those who needed to know.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Perhaps we have uncovered in the minister's answer there the kernel of truth in the government's predisposition on this matter; that is, they believe not everyone reads country newspapers, so why publish the notice in a country newspaper? It seems, I guess, according to the minister, a bit superfluous. You could just post it on their property or rely on the authorised officer from SA Water, as we have just heard, to make such inquiries to locate that person without the need for a public notice.

I would have thought that not only is it a good way to get to the owner but that there is probably a broader public interest in making the notice in a publication published and distributed in that locality, and that is the interest that an adjacent owner might have as well. They might have a particular interest if there is a notice that needs to be served on their neighbour in relation to a property that needs to be tidied up so as to prevent the possible outbreak of fire.

I am a little bit alarmed. I know that in my previous contribution I drew the connection between the member for Unley and me, being that we are members who represent parts of metropolitan Adelaide and that, as far as I am aware, notwithstanding the fabled apprenticeship that the member for Unley has undertaken, he has probably spent the majority of his life in a metropolitan area, much like me.

But in trying to place my feet in the shoes of a true country resident, like the member for Heysen, for example, I just would imagine that I would have an interest in knowing via the public notices, if there was a situation where my neighbour was having a notice served on them, that they needed to clear up their property to prevent fire danger. Does the minister not agree that that is something that is of importance to be published in a local paper in a regional community?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I think the important thing to understand here, as I have been advised, is that the notification in a public website or in a local paper is a mechanism that is put there if the person you are instructing to make good or make safe their property cannot be contacted by any other way. So it is a last resort type of situation.

Currently, it is done, I think, at the same time as the notice. In this instance, a notice to take specific action may be published on a website or in a local newspaper if the responsible person cannot be served personally by post. So the public notification is notification specifically for the person who must take action. It is not and never has been the intent of that public notification for those that are not involved to know. It is another means of getting a message to the person that must act on that position. Again, the member for Lee is misrepresenting the intent of the amendments and the act as it stands.

Clause passed.

Clauses 33 to 40 passed.

Clause 41.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Can I ask the minister to advise the house what the practice has been in terms of how often these notices have been published?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am advised that the practice has been that the Attorney-General's Department only publishes notices relating to the Gaming Machines Act 1992 in *The Advertiser* and will continue to do so.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: How many applications, for example, were advertised, let's say in the 2018-19 financial year? Is this something which is used frequently, or something which has not been exercised for several years? What is the import to the community here?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That is something that we will have to bring back to the house.

Clause passed.

Clauses 42 to 66 passed.

Clause 67.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have a question before moving my amendment and that is: which website would be able to be used by the minister?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That will be determined by the minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Can the minister advise the house whether there is a website in existence at the moment that could be used by the minister if this section were to come into force?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The amendment provides: 'public notice means notice published on a website determined by the Minister.' That really is entirely the minister's role.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It might not be a website under the superintendence of the minister. It might be an ad, say, published on Craigslist; could that be correct, minister?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am not familiar with Craigslist.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Really? It is apparently quite popular with people who are trading in second-hand goods and so on, I understand. Nonetheless, I move:

Amendment No 29 [Mullighan-1]—

Page 23, lines 12 to 14 [clause 67(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

The CHAIR: Do you need to speak further to that, member for Lee?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Given the uncertainty that the house now finds itself confronted with about whether (a) a website exists that may be able to receive a publication or (b) what intention a minister might have in utilising such a website in the publication of a notice, I feel I have no choice but to remove the capacity of the minister to publish a public notice on a website.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That has no credibility whatsoever from the member for Lee, because this was a preprepared amendment to this bill by the member for Lee before he had heard any of the argument on this bill.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The minister may be aware that I had not moved the amendment before seeking the information from him, so it may come as some surprise to the minister that he finds—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It was tabled.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Indeed, yet the amendment had not been moved, had it?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It was tabled.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, not moved. It was not moved for consideration by the committee. I know it is a confusing process for some of us—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: For you.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —so it had been filed. No, I am entirely confident and relaxed with the proceedings that are going on here.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: When the member for Heysen provides his counsel, he must think Morry Bailes is here. I am entirely comfortable and relaxed with what is going on here.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, on the government benches! The member for Lee has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I said, given we have no understanding whether (a) there is a website or (b) it is ready to be used by a minister and the earlier clauses of this bill enable it to come into effect on a date fixed by proclamation at the whim of the Governor on advice from the Executive Council, I feel that I have no choice but to move amendment No. 29 standing in my name to delete clause 67(2).

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 68 to 102 passed.

The CHAIR: It has been drawn to the attention of the Chair that clause 2 was not finally dealt with. It is therefore necessary to reconsider clause 2. There is a final question that needs to be put. Minister, you need to move that clause 2 be reconsidered.

Clause 2—reconsidered.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I move:

That clause 2 be reconsidered.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
 Noes 20
 Majority 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	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.	Speirs, D.J.
Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	

NOES

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

PAIRS

Duluk, S.	Bedford, F.E.
-----------	---------------

Motion thus carried; clause reconsidered.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (20:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (20:41): I just want to make a few comments on the Statutes Amendment and Repeal (Simplify) Bill 2018. I really want to impress on the house the importance of regional papers: in my electorate, *The Border Watch*, *The South Eastern Times* and, in Penola, *The Pennant*. There have been a lot of numbers thrown around, and I have sought clarity from our local publisher around what the state government, in all forms, contributes to the livelihood and running our regional papers in the South-East. I just want to put on record that classified advertising, which includes public notices, actually comes in at about \$35,000.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Mount Gambier, I might just interrupt. Could members please desist from loud chatter while another member is contributing? Thank you. Member for Mount Gambier, you have the call.

Mr BELL: Classified advertising, including public notices, comes in a little over \$35,000. When all state government advertising and contribution is made—and that is from various sources—it is closer to \$100,000, so it is vital for regional papers and regional employment that we continue to support our papers. Of course, public notices and information connecting with local communities,

particularly regional communities, does enable that connection between what happens here on North Terrace and what happens in regional papers to come together in a more informative manner.

I do know that in *The Border Watch*—it runs four days a week—there is a state government-based story every day of the week, not always including me but sometimes. However, I feel that our papers also give back to the community in terms of informing and getting our message across. If there is ever a minister in the electorate, they are often on the front page or, if not, page 3, so I think the government gets pretty good coverage in regional papers, and long may that continue.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (20:44): I would like to echo some of the comments made just then by the member for Mount Gambier. I think it is unfortunate that we have a government which is largely elected from regional communities in South Australia, a Liberal government, which is absolutely intent on removing requirements on government agencies and ministers to continue the decades-old tradition of publishing important public notices in country newspapers.

This evening, during the course of the debate, we heard examples where the publication by the chief officer, for example, of a fire danger season no longer needs to be made in the local paper. I find that absolutely extraordinary. I also find it extraordinary that it is now quite feasible that on matters of genuine public interest to communities—and it might be something as diverse as the application for a gaming machine licence in a community, for example, which may exercise some members of that community who feel very strongly about gambling and the social effects that it can have—they will be denied the opportunity of receiving a public notice in their local paper for that sort of activity.

Even those sorts of land improvement notices that might be served on landowners to tidy up their properties to make sure they reduce the risk of causing a fire hazard no longer need to be published in a regional newspaper. While we are talking about land out in regional South Australia, if there is a decision to increase the footprint of a park or a reserve under the National Parks and Wildlife Act it no longer needs to be publicly made in the local paper.

These are matters of significant community interest, particularly amongst local communities where there is likely to be a diversity of views about the decisions being taken which will affect that community. Despite these matters quite reasonably being raised with the minister, he and his colleagues continue to turn their back on regional papers across this state and remove the requirement that they are supported with the advertising revenue from the state government in making these public notices. They also turn their back on regional communities who are genuinely interested about some of these decisions being taken by their government.

I think it is a pretty poor reflection on the modern-day Liberal Party when a city member, like the member for Unley, carrying this bill as a minister, can impose his will on the other regional members and, in doing so, deny the regional communities they represent the right to the information they have come to expect over many decades. I think it is a really poor reflection on where we have got to tonight, and I hear the comment from—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —the minister dressed as Pennywise over there.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, leader! The leader will cease interjecting.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The leader is called to order and the Minister for Agriculture will not respond. Desist. We are nearly there. The member for Lee has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Even those important matters which would affect your electorate, sir—the granting of aquaculture leases, for example, whether they are pilot leases or whether they are ongoing leases or even the cancellation of that sort of lease—apparently are no longer of such interest to a regional community that it does not need to be required to be published in a regional paper. I think it is a very poor reflection on those opposite in taking this decision.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (20:49): First of all, I thank all those who have contributed to the debate. I thank the public servants who have assisted

this evening and those who have assisted in putting this together. I thank the Treasurer, of course, for his guidance and leadership on this issue. There is no doubt that there has been a conversion on the road to Damascus by those opposite on this bill. The very things in this bill that those opposite were supporting just a few months ago they are now voting against.

It is disappointing that the opposition has put politics before good governance. I do assure the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Frome and, of course, the regional members on this side of the house who understand the commitment that this government has to regional South Australia.

We have demonstrated, without any need of legislation, that we have spent more in the regions on classified advertising since we have been in office compared with those opposite. Regarding the expenditure that the member for Mount Gambier spoke about in his local paper, there was no legislation for us to spend that money, that \$100,000. That is not legislated. Nowhere does it say that we must spend \$100,000. It is a good decision for public policy and for a government that supports regional South Australia, because we understand regional South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas: No, you don't. Why are you cutting regional road funding?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The leader is interjecting out of his place. We are bringing the evening to a close. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: He thinks it is a union gathering, where you can do whatever you like.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, minister; you are wrapping up the debate.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: No rules. The bully always wins in those union meetings, and that is what we are seeing from the Leader of the Opposition.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, you are wrapping up the debate. Please keep going.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I commend the bill to the house.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (20:52): I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 25
Noes 18
Majority 7

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Chapman, V.A.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Bell, T.S.
Cowdrey, M.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Brock, G.G.
Cregan, D.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bettison, Z.L.

Close, S.E.

Hildyard, K.A.

Malinauskas, P.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Stinson, J.M.

Boyer, B.I.

Cook, N.F.

Hughes, E.J.

Michaels, A.

Piccolo, A.

Szakacs, J.K.

Brown, M.E. (teller)

Gee, J.P.

Koutsantonis, A.

Mullighan, S.C.

Picton, C.J.

Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried; house adjourned.

At 20:58 the house adjourned until Thursday 26 September 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***SMALL BUSINESS**

1364 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). Is the minister responsible in the Marshall Liberal government for small business?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): Yes. Fundamentally, relevant government policy settings to support small business is the key focus of the entire Marshall Liberal government.

SMALL BUSINESS COMMISSIONER

1365 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). Who made the decision to take away the Office of the Small Business Commissioner from the minister?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

A cross-government Machinery of Government Taskforce made the decision in line with the Joyce review—a major review undertaken to support the growth of South Australia's economy.

SMALL BUSINESS

1367 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). How many complaints has the Small Business Commissioner received from small businesses in South Australia over the last 12 months?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

The Office of the Small Business Commissioner received 3,383 enquiries from small businesses during the period 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019 covering the Small Business Commissioner Act 2011, the Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995, the Building and Construction Industry Security of Payment Act 2009, the Farm Debt Mediation Act 2018, the Local Government Act 1999, and general small business enquiries.

Not all of these inquiries were complaints, many of them are requesting general information in relation to starting or running a business or seeking advice on where to get further assistance.

The office handled 262 new formal cases in this period. These are official cases where there is a dispute of some sort between two businesses or with a business and state or local government body.

Matters that cannot be resolved at this stage are usually offered formal mediation before one of the commissioner's independent and accredited mediators. In the 2018-19 financial year, the office facilitated 27 formal mediations for disputing parties.

SMALL BUSINESS

1368 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). How many people within the Department for Innovation and Skills are responsible for overseeing small business matters?

1. What are their job titles, classifications and responsibilities?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

There are currently seven people within the Department for Innovation and Skills responsible for overseeing small business matters, headed by a Manager, Small Business.

SMALL BUSINESS

1369 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). Has the number of FTEs employed within the Department for Innovation and Skills to deal with small business changed since in the past 12 months?

1. If yes, what is the new figure?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

The number of FTE's employed within the Department for Innovation and Skills with responsibility for small business matters is seven people.

SMALL BUSINESS

1370 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). How many small businesses in South Australia have exported goods and services overseas over the past 12 months?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): The Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment has advised the following:

In the 2017-18 release (released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) on 21 August 2019), the state level breakdown of this data is no longer available. As such, it is no longer possible to provide South Australian specific data at the small business exporter level.

The Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment has consulted with the ABS and is advised that it does not have plans to release this data at the state level.

SMALL BUSINESS

1371 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). How many small businesses in South Australia have declared bankruptcy over the last 12 months?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

According to the Australian Securities and Investments Commission, small business bankruptcies peaked under the state Labor government in 2012-13 with 438 businesses declaring bankruptcy. In 2018-19 the number of small businesses that entered external administration declined by 21 per cent to 347.

SMALL BUSINESS

1372 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). What KPI's have you set your department when it comes to small business in South Australia?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

The Department for Innovation and Skills has the relevant indicators published in the 2019-20 budget papers.

The KPIs will be reviewed as part of the ongoing implementation of the Joyce review.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

1373 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (11 September 2019). How many Indigenous Australians are currently undertaking an apprenticeship or traineeship in South Australia?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills): I have been advised:

The good news is that the number of Indigenous Australians currently undertaking an apprenticeship or traineeship has increased under the Marshall Liberal government.

Of the 17,416 apprentices and trainees that are in-training in South Australia, 569 identify as an Indigenous Australian as at 13 September 2019; 300 of these individuals are undertaking traineeships and 269 are currently undertaking an apprenticeship.

In comparison, on 13 September 2018, there were 16,204 apprentices and trainees that were in-training in South Australia, and 538 identified as an Indigenous Australian; 295 of these individuals were undertaking traineeships and 243 were undertaking an apprenticeship.

This is an additional 31 apprentices and trainees compared to the same time last year; an additional 26 apprentices and an additional 5 trainees that identify as an Indigenous Australian.