

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 1 July 2020

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

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

*Members*

### MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

**The SPEAKER (10:31):** Before I call on Mr Clerk, I have a statement to make in relation to country members' accommodation allowances. I made some comments yesterday in the house in relation to this matter. I can also advise members that late yesterday I wrote to the Auditor-General to ask him to consider commissioning an audit of the country members' accommodation allowance paid to members of the House of Assembly, and I have asked him to also consider suggesting ways to make the claiming and the reporting of this allowance more transparent. I also table copies of the House of Assembly country members' accommodation allowance information, which I referred to in my statement in the house yesterday, for the full financial years 2018-19 and 2019-20 up to 29 June 2020.

Further to my statement to the house yesterday, in relation to this commentary around the release of more detailed information, going back to 2010, let me say to the house I intend to publish this information, but what I am going to have to do—and I will need some indulgence of the house—is I will come back to the house with a reasonable time frame for the publishing of this information back to 2010 to occur, because, as members can appreciate, there is some time required to reasonably assemble that information. I will come back to the house once I have a better idea of the exact time frame that that information will be readily available. I appreciate members' indulgence with that.

*Bills*

### AGEING AND ADULT SAFEGUARDING (DISAPPLICATION OF TRANSITIONAL PROVISION) AMENDMENT BILL

*Introduction and First Reading*

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (10:34):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Ageing and Adult Safeguarding Act 1995. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (10:34):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

In 2018, the government passed the Office for the Ageing (Adult Safeguarding) Amendment Bill, creating an Adult Safeguarding Unit in response to instances of elder abuse that had been highlighted over previous years, and under the Labor government also. When we were in government, I moved and chaired a committee inquiring into elder abuse, and it came up with a number of very strong recommendations. This committee was triggered by horrific events, including that involving a gentleman at a Mitcham residential care facility, Clarrie Hausler.

Those events were featured on television because his daughter Noleen Hausler had popped a camera into the room, suspecting that her father had been mistreated. I worked over many years with Noleen Hausler when she was a registered nurse. I have deep respect for Noleen, and I thank her for her bravery in setting in motion a cascade of events that has led to a heightened awareness and indeed has culminated in the Adult Safeguarding Unit, which was a recommendation of the elder abuse committee.

It would be prudent to mention that the elder abuse committee was triggered as well by a motion moved by the Hon. Kelly Vincent of another place, back in around 2016 or 2017 from memory. That committee, with members from across both houses, sat over the course of a year and came up with a number of recommendations and shared many insights from evidence that was given by a number of people, including members of the public and experts in the field.

The debate on the legislation that led to the creation of the Adult Safeguarding Unit was supported across all parties and by Independents. Labor successfully moved amendments, enabling the unit to investigate systemic issues related to abuse. This becomes more relevant now as we discuss the delivery and implementation of this particular piece of legislation. The unit responds to all reports of abuse and works closely with other agencies. It has the power to require information and, by court order, authorise assessments of vulnerable adults or require a person to do or refrain from doing something in relation to a vulnerable adult.

I want to talk quickly about vulnerability as a concept, having engaged with hundreds of people in the disability sector, in particular, but also in the ageing population in my community. Many people are fine with the use of the words 'vulnerability' and 'vulnerable' when it comes to applying labels to groups of people, but I have also had really good evidence and representation from many people, particularly young, powerful disabled people in our community who do not feel vulnerable unless it is our policies and practices in the community that put people who are marginalised into the category of vulnerable.

For me, that is really poignant, moving forward, and something that I am taking into account every day as more cases come to light or as people call out for support to strengthen the supports and the oversight of people in marginalised communities. I can tell the chamber that I had many people put representation to me when we were discussing the bus cuts—the bus route cuts and the bus stop cuts—that were being applied broadly across our community.

I had people who live in marginalised communities or who, because of their own condition, are marginalised and require additional supports and our good policy to ensure that they are independent and strong. What we saw was a number of people reaching out to us and saying, 'I'm now vulnerable because I don't have access to transport at a vicinity close to my home. I cannot go a kilometre using a walking frame. It's not easy for me to navigate my wheelchair from one place to another, in terms of getting on and off buses.'

I had many people represent to me their horror at a statement by the Minister for Transport in this place that people had to be able to walk to get on and off buses. That is a fanciful statement from a person who is uninformed about the reality of very strong, very independent people in our community with disability who, in fact, use an alternative method of mobility.

Wheelchairs on and off buses are commonplace. I understand that it is from this week that all of our buses are accessible to people using an alternative method to their feet to get on and off buses, as well as mobility aids while on their feet. I think this is a great thing to celebrate. It was a process of investment, started under the Labor government, and it has now been completed, I understand.

I cannot understand why the government has not come out, other than the Minister for Transport is a bit embarrassed to say that all the buses are now accessible for people in wheelchairs. He said only three or four weeks ago that people could not get on and off buses unless they were walking. I call out to the Minister for Transport to make a statement about people getting on and off buses, the accessibility of our bus network and how great it is for people with disability in South Australia.

They are some broad thoughts about people, vulnerability and policy changes that we might undertake in this parliament that may affect negatively people living on the margins in our community, those who are marginalised and how we can negatively impact them. I think most of us come into parliament in order to make a positive impact and to react and respond to issues and grievances that arise because of people who are marginalised.

In terms of the adult safeguarding bill as it was applied and as we supported, at that time, unfortunately it was put in place with a phase-in approach. I understand the need to start sometimes smaller and build up, so it was not something that triggered any kind of worry for me back then. It

meant that the Adult Safeguarding Unit only had jurisdiction over those people considered vulnerable over the age of 65, or 50 years and older for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders, during the first three years of operation for the unit, which might not have raised any flags six months ago, but here we have Ann Marie Smith.

Annie Smith passed away on 9 April and I have talked several times in this place and publicly about how the community is horrified by such an incident. We are completely in despair about whether or not there are any other people like Annie who could be in the community. Annie by all reports was cognitively intact and in control of her own decisions. Under the NDIS during the last year or so, which was about power and control of your own choices and the capacity to put in place the care and supports you want under your terms, Annie then found herself in this situation which we do not know all the facts about.

There is a police investigation, and I take care not to talk too broadly about what may have happened or to speculate, but what a terrible event. We have seen a cascade of events where the state government has thankfully triggered at least some quick responses. As to the task force, I have been critical of the number of senior bureaucrats involved in previous years in shaping, overseeing and formulating policy in relation to people with disability in the community. I have been critical of the heavy weight. I understand that a few need to be on there.

People with lived experience account for either half or the minority in terms of the group that is undertaking this review, and I feel that there should be more people with lived experience in the community leading this response. We saw a report tabled more than two weeks ago that had some recommendations. We have heard commentary by the minister in the other place, Michelle Lensink, regarding the capacity to respond quickly to some of these recommendations, but we have not seen any response as yet.

In terms of this piece of legislation, the Adult Safeguarding Unit was provided information regarding Annie Smith's death on 9 April but they did not take further action, it was reported and recorded after questions by, I believe, the Budget and Finance Committee. It did not take further action as it had no jurisdiction because this particular community member, Annie Smith, was under 65. The unit would not have had jurisdiction to respond if anyone had reported information about Annie earlier, when Annie still had a chance when she was in her home.

The task force has tabled an interim report recommending the expansion of the adult safeguarding role, and the Minister for Human Services indicated in a statement to parliament that this action could be immediately taken. We say: what could have happened in the last two weeks? What could happen in the next three weeks until parliament sits again? In fact, if this does not get through and happen more rapidly, what could happen before the end of this year? We have the winter break coming up. This is not a complex piece of legislation; this is a tiny tweak to the numbers—a tiny tweak to what can be done. I do not see this being an enormous financial burden. I do not see this being complex and difficult.

The opposition is introducing the Ageing and Adult Safeguarding (Disapplication of Transitional Provisions) Amendment Bill 2020 to remove this phase-in approach so that adults who find themselves in a vulnerable position can immediately be reported. They can have reports made, they can report, they can get support from the state government under the Adult Safeguarding Unit immediately. The unit would be allowed to investigate instances of abuse in any adult regardless of age.

This bill will not bring Annie back—nothing we do will bring Annie back—but we can do so much, including strengthening the Community Visitor Scheme immediately. We can put this legislation in place so all adults are subject to the support and care from the Adult Safeguarding Unit and we can at least tick those boxes while we work on a deeper cultural change for the care and support of all people in our community, particularly people who are marginalised. I know that we do not need to make partisan comments about that because we all care about people in our community who are marginalised.

I know that deep in the hearts of those in government, as well as those in opposition and the Independents, they want to do that as quickly as possible, so I urge the government not to be partisan on this and help to pass this bill quickly and get it through the house. It will not bring Annie back, but

over the course of weeks and months we could save other lives. I commend the bill to the house, and I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted 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 Ageing and Adult Safeguarding Act 1995

###### 3—Insertion of Schedule 1

This clause inserts after section 54:

Schedule 1 – Transitional provision

###### 1—Disapplication of transitional provision

This schedule removed the transitional provisions which only applied this act to those people aged 65 years of over, or 50 and over if Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander.

This schedule therefore means any adult over the age of 18 years which was to apply from 2022.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **RETAIL AND COMMERCIAL LEASES (DESIGNATED ANCHOR LEASE) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 17 June 2020.)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (10:49):** I rise to speak on the member for Florey's private member's bill, which was introduced to insert a new hardship provision into the Retail and Commercial Leases Act specifically for retail shop leases that are designated shopping centres, to include an anchor tenant, such as shopping centres, department stores or cinemas.

In the circumstances where a lease of an anchor tenant is to be terminated or not renewed, the proposition put forward in this bill is that the lessor must give at least three months' notice to all other lessees, who may request a rent review according to certain criteria. Until the rent review is determined by an independent valuer, the rent would be reduced by the greater of either 10 per cent or an amount prescribed in the regulations. I hope that I have sufficiently summarised the intent of the operation of the bill.

Members would be aware from shopping centres that are now a common feature certainly in metropolitan areas, and also in many regional towns, that they usually have an ownership, sometimes by multinational companies and that have an anchor tenant. If I were to try to summarise here the types of tenants we have as anchor tenants, sometimes they are a government agency, sometimes they are a supermarket, sometimes they are a very in-vogue fashion house.

One shopping centre, which is now in the state seat of Unley but which abuts my own electorate, is the Burnside shopping centre. It is owned by the Cohen family. It has been a very successful shopping centre in that it supplies and services multiple outlets to people in my electorate. If it were to be described as to what its anchor tenant would be under this bill, I think I would have to say it is the main Coles supermarket. Others might argue, though, that it is the Zara house, which is a Spanish-owned department store outlet for fashion and accessories, which might also be described as an anchor tenant.

It is usually on the basis that the anchor tenant is the retail outlet that is going to have a high volume of patronage and it is therefore going to provide an enormous opportunity for anyone else who co-locates to have multiple use of that traffic; that is, if you go and shop at the Coles supermarket

you will be inspired to purchase other products at the other specialty stores around it, get your shoes repaired, buy some takeaway food or attend a chemist shop or whatever.

That is the way these things work. There is no question that often in these arrangements the rental for tenancies is quite high. I suppose the set-off for that is that you have an enormous volume of traffic of prospective purchasers. You pay higher rent, but you are sort of guaranteed a big population of potential purchasers and consumers and so it is a bit of a set-off.

I think the intent here, in the circumstances of COVID, etc., is that the mover of the bill wants to provide that greater protection to the smaller tenancies, and I think that is admirable. Obviously, we have announced a number of protections in relation to rent increase or review or eviction in relation to both residential and retail and commercial tenancies, but this is an area which, on the face of it, is attempting to proceed with a remedy but of which we do not have an ill.

In looking at this aspect, there are a number of people we have consulted with as quickly as possible because we welcome all ideas as a government that might be necessary to support people through this sort of situation. Has there been any evidence of a need for this in South Australia? On the information that we have assessed, the answer to that is no. My office has consulted with the Small Business Commissioner, who obviously has a fair handle in relation to people, whether they are a tradesperson having a professional qualification and the cost of that, across to licensing, to have some understanding of how that applies under Consumer and Business Services.

The Small Business Commissioner, however, has direct responsibility for some very targeted areas, and that includes the Retail and Commercial Leases Act. He advises us that, until such time as there can be some consultation with retailers and stakeholders, including the Shopping Centre Council, then he would not recommend to us that we action it.

In other words, there is not a demonstrated ill and we would need to do proper consultation on it before this type of approach could be brought forward. If the mover of the bill, however, has specific circumstances where there has been a cancellation, for whatever reason, of an anchor tenant, we would be happy to receive that data and we would be happy to have a look at it, but I can only indicate that on the information we have that would be opposed.

I just quickly indicate that we have also spoken to the Property Council. They represent members from the very little to the very big in the sense of tenancies and, of course, the landlords who are going to be pulled into this model or area of reform. They also claim that, from their assessment, the landlords have already negotiated some generous rent relief packages for their tenants impacted by COVID. As we know from other legislation, there is a process to add in protections for that.

Often, they claim that the terms of settlement on these have gone beyond the regulated code of conduct obligations and that this bill would open them up to further lease renegotiations at a time when they have just finished those arrangements. Obviously, they raised some concerns about it. Apart from those bigger picture issues, there are some concerns they have, and I will just place them on the record:

1. The bill does not say the rent cannot be reset generally and a tenant can use it as an opportunity to claw back an agreed rent which is already over market.
2. The bill applies even where the landlord is replacing the anchor tenant (e.g., with an even better one).
3. The bill applies even where there are numerous anchor tenants—that is, more than one. What happens if only one leaves and the others are still there?
4. The bill does not require that the tenant be anywhere near the anchor tenant or even be affected by the departure to be able to demonstrate the eligibility for the relief that is proposed in this bill.

These are just a few of the complications that they have highlighted need to be looked at. I thank the member for raising the issue. The bill is premature on the information we have received. It does not have evidence of there being people in an acute circumstance because of this and it would undermine the negotiated terms in the relief packages that have already been granted. For all those

reasons, I indicate that the government and the Liberal Party will not be supporting the bill, but I thank the member for bringing the matter to the house.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:58):** I rise to speak to the Retail and Commercial Leases (Designated Anchor Lease) Amendment Bill, brought to this place by the member for Florey. What the member for Florey intends with the introduction of this bill is to insert new hardship provisions into the act for retail shop leases in specifically designated shopping centres that include an anchor tenant.

An anchor tenant can be a particular shop, department store or cinema. It could be a Woolworths, Coles, Big W or something along those lines. In circumstances where the lease of an anchor tenant is to be terminated or not renewed, the lessor must give at least three months' notice to all the other lessees, who may request a rent review according to certain criteria. Until the rent review is determined by an independent valuer, the rent would be reduced by the greater of either 10 per cent or an amount prescribed in the regulations, which does leave it a little loose.

Whilst we understand that the intent of this legislation may be to provide greater protection to smaller shops during challenging times for retail, there appears to be little evidence of the need here in South Australia for such provisions. I note that, as the Attorney has indicated, we have consulted the Small Business Commissioner, and he concurs with the above assessment. It needs more consultation with retailers and stakeholders, including the Shopping Centre Council. These concerns were not raised during the passage of other amendments to the act last year.

Even in a seat like Hammond, I have had various redistributions, as we all do, but in my main town of Murray Bridge shopping has changed dramatically over the time of my life. It has been the business centre for my family since they moved down to Coomandook in 1961, so that is a little while ago. My memories growing up are of a standalone Woolworths adjacent to Bridge Street in Murray Bridge. Then, years later, there was the Murray Bridge Green shopping area near Swanport Road and Adelaide Road in Murray Bridge, where Woolworths came to.

There was a series of other tenants in this shopping centre. There was a whole range of tenants. Target was one of the bigger ones that I can remember in there, and there have also been various chemist shops and a few cafes and eateries. So this was quite a step up at the time in my electorate, because it services not just Murray Bridge but quite a broad area, obviously with the regional community, the farming community. It was quite an update.

We have been quite spoilt for choice in Murray Bridge. Back around those times as well people may remember BI-LO. My electorate office is now on a corner of that site on Mannum Road in Murray Bridge. BI-LO had a concrete floor and was very basic shopping, but it was essentially the supermarket, and then over time a cluster of shops was built in adjacent buildings around it and there were more improvements.

This was about eight to 10 years ago, and I could be a little bit wrong with those dates, and it did take a while to build. We had the Murray Bridge Marketplace built, which was a massive production. I think it was budgeted at about \$80 million, and in the end it cost about \$90 million at the time to put that in place. The major tenants there—they may even be part of even the ownership—are Big W up one end and Woolworths up the other.

This was, I guess, Murray Bridge's chance to shine and really have a flash, bright shopping centre, and it is a great venue. I know I worked with the proponents of the build around access to electricity when they were going to build this shopping centre. If anyone knows how that works, it is a bit of a convoluted process in that, if you are the first one in, you essentially pay probably something like 200 per cent of the energy needs of what you will need and then you are rebated as other users of electricity come in, and that is put back to you.

It is an interesting way to do it, but it is the way it is done. If there is an upgrade, new transformers or new lines or both are put in to make it work. I certainly did my best to get some rebate on that, but at the end of the day I think it cost about \$4 million just to get the appropriate amount of power because it is a very significant shopping area.

The BI-LO supermarket was bought by Coles over time, and then in the last few years Coles built a new supermarket opposite the main area of the Green supermarket area, and I helped open

it. If you have ever seen four fairly sizeable blokes, including me, the earthmover and a couple of others, clutch one pair of scissors to cut a ribbon, that is a trick, I can tell you.

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** Lucky it wasn't an umbilical cord.

**Mr PEDERICK:** As the minister says, it was lucky it wasn't an umbilical cord. I think in the end, out of frustration, I just grabbed the scissors and cut the darn thing myself. Anyway, it was quite an amusing moment for us and the photographers.

We were really spoilt, and we are still spoilt, for choice in Murray Bridge, as we had two Coles supermarkets running, two Woolworths and two IGAs, apart from numerous other small shops. In more recent times, Coles have shut down the one on Mannum Road, where our office is located, and Woolworths have moved out of their old site. They kept their new site open in the Marketplace and Roger Drake and John-Paul Drake moved into the old Woolworths site adjacent to Swanport Road. I acknowledge that because they have made a very positive contribution to our area and are quite happy to operate in a deregulated environment.

I note John-Paul Drake's commentary during the COVID toilet paper crisis, which seems to have come back in some places. He basically gave a shopper, so to speak, a very stern message on what to do when he brought back 150 packets of toilet paper he had hoarded through a group scheme.

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** I think it was 1,500 packets.

**Mr PEDERICK:** The minister is telling me it was 1,500 packets. It was a vast amount of toilet paper. Even though Kimberly-Clark cranked up to do a third shift down in the South-East and pumped out probably 50 B-doubles a day of toilet paper, we could not seem to get enough in Australia. I see that it is causing problems again in Victoria. I think that I would be buying pallets of spaghetti first; if you do not eat, you do not need the toilet paper, but that is another debate. Because I am running out of time, I cannot expand on that.

In closing, I will say that I have not been approached about this by anchor tenants in my electorate and, as I indicated earlier, we have not seen the need for this at this stage, so we will be opposing the bill when it gets to a vote.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:08):** I rise to speak on the member for Florey's bill, the Retail and Commercial Leases (Designated Anchor Lease) Amendment Bill. It is not an unreasonable bill at all in the current environment. It is a fairly straightforward proposition that those tenants of a shopping centre, or the like, who are placed into a situation where the anchor tenant of that shopping centre—and we are almost exclusively talking about Coles and Woolworths, or perhaps more recently we might be talking about an Aldi or a large department store—will no longer be part of that shopping centre offering, should be made aware of that fact at least three months out. If that causes them some financial hardship once that anchor tenant leaves, then there should be some requirement for the shopping centre owner to negotiate a modest rental reduction to reflect what would understandably be the loss in business and custom for those other tenants.

This is important, of course, because we have only recently, with the consideration and passage of the government's COVID-19 legislation, been considering how retail leases should operate in this unfamiliar environment. The topic of some discussion in this place, as well as in the other place, was about what provisions the government would specify for those tenants who found themselves literally at a loss because of the constrained trading environment that the coronavirus restrictions were placing on the community.

There was a request of the government from the opposition and the crossbench, both here in the house and over in the other place, for the government to specify a level of rent relief that would be provided. There was even a request made about whether the state government would be adopting the national cabinet Mandatory Code of Conduct: SME Commercial Leasing Principles During COVID-19. We were told that the state government would not be adopting those principles. We were told the reason that the state government would not be adopting those federally mandated principles in that federal code of conduct was that no other state was adopting that code of conduct and the principles within it.

We were misled because, as the debate in the other place discovered, other states had adopted the code of conduct, other states had had regard to the principles contained in that code of conduct and had enshrined, if not in legislation then in regulation, some provisions dictating how relief should be provided in the context of retail leases.

It is not surprising that, after being misled by the government during the passage of that COVID-19 legislation, when it came to the moderation or arbitration of leasing disputes between commercial landlords and their tenants, when the member for Florey, as a private member, seeks some form of redress for her constituents to make sure that they are not left in the lurch in the circumstance when an anchor tenant leaves a shopping centre, that would find its way into a bill to be brought before this place, because without it there is nothing that would provide any guidance for relief for commercial tenants.

In her remarks, the Deputy Premier says, 'Well, you have a common conception that an anchor tenant is a large national or multinational outlet, like a Coles or a Woolworths, or that shopping centres are nationally or multinationally owned pieces of real estate, ostensibly organisations that can afford to provide relief, but we know in reality that is not always the case. It is usually the struggling, small landlord who owns a shopping centre, who struggles to hang on to someone like a Coles or a Woolies, and when they leave it is through no fault of their own. To impose on them mandatory rental reductions for the other tenants in that sort of circumstance is unreasonable.'

That is not the circumstance for the vast majority of shopping centres we are familiar with today. That is just not the case. It is certainly not the case in my electorate. It is certainly not the case for the Westfield West Lakes Shopping Centre, which has anchor tenancies from both Coles and Woolworths. The other tenancies at Westfield West Lakes by and large are small businesses owned and operated by constituents of mine, small business people working as hard as they can to make a living, not only making a living for themselves but usually providing the first employment opportunity for young South Australians living in the electorate of Lee.

I am thinking about young retail workers who might get their first job or even young workers of fast-food outlets that are also attached to that sort of shopping centre. If Scentre Group, for example, which owns the Westfield West Lakes Shopping Centre, is unable to come to an arrangement with Coles or Woolworths or another anchor tenant, why should they not be required to advise the other tenants?

When the drop-off in trade inevitably occurs through losing such attractive anchor tenants, when all those people who used to go to a shopping centre to do their weekly grocery shop, for example—or if you have young children, more often than a weekly grocery shop—no longer need to go into that shopping centre as often, are not making the decision to stop off at the local butcher, are not making the decision to stop off at the local baker, are not making the decision to go to the chemist or the newsagent or even some of the small clothing retailers, that is going to impact those businesses quite significantly.

I do not think it is unreasonable that we support this move by the member for Florey and, in particular, that we support it in the absence of any other legislative guidance that is provided in the current circumstances of the coronavirus, because this was something that was sought in the previous discussions around the coronavirus emergency response legislation, and we were assured by the government that it was not required. Well, it patently is required. It is clear that it is required.

I cannot imagine why we would be asked to rely on the assurances of the Deputy Premier that it is not required when we relied on the assurances of the government during the course of the discussion over the COVID-19 emergency response legislation, and we were given an assurance that no other state was adopting the federal code of conduct and the principles within it, and when it turned out that, despite having been told that in this place repeatedly by the Deputy Premier and also in the other place by the Treasurer, other jurisdictions had in fact adopted that code of conduct.

We were misled in the advice that was provided to us, and other states had, in fact, adopted those guidelines. We do not have those guidelines, we have not adopted those guidelines and we do not have a way of determining specifically how these disputes should be resolved. We have this bill from the member for Florey, and it is understandable in the absence of what other states are doing that we should have some guidance in this area.



The last point I want to touch on is one made by the Deputy Premier that the Property Council in South Australia does not see the need for this. Well, spare me! When did the Property Council of South Australia become the arbiter of good public policy? We already saw during the course of the land tax debate how they cut loose small landlords, they cut loose small property owners and they did a grubby deal on the seventh iteration of the land tax legislation to provide massive land tax cuts for people who own literally millions of dollars worth of taxable land.

They are focused on the interests of the top end of town. They are focused on the interests of the Scentre Groups, of the Coles and the Woolworths and not the locally owned small businesses, which the member for Florey and I and the opposition are more concerned about.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (11:18):** Previous speakers from the government have indicated that the government is not supporting this bill. I would like to speak from a local Unley perspective because there are many more retailers in Unley on the streets of Unley Road, Goodwood Road, King William Road, Fullarton Road, Glen Osmond Road, who have much more responsibility for the vibrancy and who are also at risk of things that happen in shopping centres, but there is nothing in here for them.

If Unley Shopping Centre, for example, closed down or the anchor tenants moved out and people moved elsewhere, that would have an impact right across the strip shopping not just on Unley Road but on other roads as well. I do understand the motivation of the member for Florey in bringing this forward. She sees it as being a way of supporting small traders, but there are many more small traders that are affected by all different sorts of changes in shopping.

For example, when Franklins moved out of Rossiters Food Hall back in the early 2000s, that had an impact on the strip shopping nearby because there was less of a draw into that area. There was less reason to park your car because you could not do your supermarket shopping while you were popping into the map shop, or popping into a cafe, or popping into an antique print store or, heaven forbid, a store on Unley Road that made extraordinary handmade furniture.

We know that anchor tenants are crucial for smaller tenants of shopping centres, but they are also crucial for shopping districts, and this bill does nothing for those broader tenants of shopping districts when an anchor tenant moves out. We certainly do not agree that there is a lack of notification of anchor tenants closing stores. As far as I understand, anchor tenants generally are publicly listed companies. Publicly listed companies must make public significant changes that may affect their shareholders.

These changes are made well in advance. I have never seen them not be covered in the media, not just in the business pages but right throughout the media. When Harris Scarfe announced in their receivership process that they were going to close their Rundle Mall store, first of all, I do not think it was a surprise; they were in administration. Secondly, there was certainly plenty of notice for other tenants.

I am not actually seeing major or anchor tenants moving out of shopping centres in my electorate, but I am seeing small businesses in shopping centres moving out. At the Unley Shopping Centre, the fruit and veg store that has been there for as long as I have been living and working in Unley—and that is quite some time now—has been closed all year, and the only option for those in that shopping centre now is to go to Woolworths or Coles for their fruit and veg. I certainly much prefer to use the small retailer for such products. I go to the local butcher and either the Central Market or the local fruit and veg shop on Goodwood Road (or previously in the Unley Shopping Centre).

Another thing that is important to understand about strip shopping is that it works when it is a destination, when there is a reason to go there because there are a lot of things to do and there is an experience. Although there was quite a bit of controversy over the redevelopment of King William Road just recently, it has delivered a terrific experience for those who use that road. Obviously, locals walk there, and people use their cars to go to King William Road to experience what is on offer.

I congratulate the Unley council on the work they have done there. They have recognised that they are competing with shopping centres and competing with people buying things online. If you just want to buy a product, you do that online, but if you want to actually have an experience,

you might decide to make that purchase in a strip shopping part of Unley, for example, in a department store or in Rundle Mall because you are after more than just a product: you actually want a shopping experience. You are using the experience of that as part of your leisure.

When we were trading on Unley Road, the Unley council took a small delegation of traders, who paid their own way, to see what had happened on Oxford Street in Paddington. There we saw an uncoordinated go-for-all of landlords letting their buildings to the person prepared to pay the most rent. Over time, yes, there were lots of expensive frock shops, but there was no experience for those who wanted to spend the day on Oxford Street shopping. So the trading group got together and said, 'Look, we're going to have to try to bring the cafes back because the rents are too expensive for the cafes and we can't expect one or two landlords to lower their rent so that there is a broader benefit for the district.'

The landlords fixed the problem by setting up a fund. Those who had the higher rent-paying tenants contributed to a fund that would subsidise the cafes that they wanted back in the area. Anyone who has been to Sydney in recent years knows that it is a very nice experience to shop along strip shopping in Paddington and Oxford Street in particular. It is a destination. People travel from all over Australia and the world to experience it. They make a day of it. They are able to shop at various shops, purchase different products, and also have lunch, perhaps a glass of wine or a cup of coffee, with their friends. They can meet up with people and then go shopping together. They took on the convenience of shopping centres like Chatswood and Marion here and they brought it to a strip shopping area to make it an experience.

That is the challenge for strip shopping in South Australia. The member for Morphett has a lot of strip shopping in his electorate. The Premier has a lot of strip shopping in his electorate. We do not have as much strip shopping in South Australia or in Adelaide as they do in other states and cities, but it is an important part of living, particularly in the in the suburbs. We value our strip shopping.

That is why I was very pleased, when I raised my concerns about the extension of clearway times on Unley Road with the transport minister, that he asked his department to do some more work on the impact of extending those clearway times. He was pleased to advise me that the very little impact extending the clearways would have on through traffic was not worth the disruption to the strip shopping, so we still have the historical clearways on Unley Road as opposed to the extended hours proposed by the department before I intervened.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

#### *Motions*

### **WOMEN OFFENDERS SUPPORT SERVICES**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:29):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the importance of partnerships with the non-government sector in supporting female offenders in the community;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of connecting women to support services in the community; and
- (c) recognises the important role volunteers and former offenders can play in reducing recidivism.

Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity to talk about women prisoners and what this government is doing to help people to get back on their feet. I have chosen to move this motion today because it is important to identify opportunities to help vulnerable South Australians to make positive changes in their life. It is critical that we give these women a voice in this place to discuss what our strategy is, as a government, to support these women.

I will take time to acknowledge the important work that non-government organisations are doing to reduce reoffending and to support the children of prisoners, who are often forgotten about and left behind. This is not acceptable because all of our children are our future and these children deserve every chance of achieving their full potential. I thank the Minister for Police and Correctional Services for allowing me to learn about the government's strategy. I have learnt that the Marshall

Liberal government is working hard to support strategies for women, which are connecting women who have been in prison to support services in the community.

Today, I will share some of this strategy and the activities the government has in place to deliver the Department for Correctional Services Women's Action Plan 2019 to 2024: Strong Foundations and Clear Pathways<sup>2</sup>. But, first of all, let's look at the profile of women who are likely to offend. In our SA community, 5.6 per cent of women identify as Aboriginal women, and today 1,007 daily average women are under Community Corrections supervision. Of these, 24 per cent identify as Aboriginal women, and today there are on average 198 daily average women in prison and 30 per cent of these identify as Aboriginal women. Shockingly, 70 per cent to 90 per cent have been physically, sexually or emotionally abused as children or adults, and 60 per cent report post-traumatic stress symptoms, anxiety and depression.

Women prisoners are 20 times more likely than the general population to have suicide, self-harming ideation, and 60 per cent to 65 per cent of these women prisoners have children. While many prisoners of both genders have abusive pasts in common, incarcerated women have a greater statistical likelihood of experiencing physical and sexual trauma. The resulting pain often helps drive them into the most frequent convictions for women.

I make the point that, without programs that specifically target women's abusive pasts, female prisoners risk getting trapped in an habitual revolving door of reoffending. The state government, via the Department for Correctional Services (DCS), strives to address the significant interplay between women's offending and their common experience of accumulated trauma, mental health issues, substance dependence, unhealthy relationships and poverty. Significant trauma histories and current domestic and family violence and abuse are central issues in many women's lives.

There is growing evidence that 70 per cent to 90 per cent of incarcerated women have been abused as children and adults. The interplay between this accumulated trauma and victimisation of the women's involvement in the criminal justice system is now well documented. A high proportion of women's offending has also been found to occur within the context of these intimate and family relationships. DCS data indicates that at the Adelaide Women's Prison 69 per cent of Aboriginal women and 52 per cent of non-Aboriginal women, as at March 2019, had an intervention order listed on their case file either as a victim or defendant. Intervention orders are one indicator of the abuse and violence in many women's lives.

Poor mental health and expressing high level trauma and recent suicide attempts and self-harm are also common presentations of women on admission to custody. Studies identify that women in prison are 20 times more likely than the general population to consider suicide and self-harm. A significant proportion of these women at risk of self-harm and with trauma histories may also meet the diagnostic criteria for borderline personality disorder. Additionally, post-traumatic stress disorder, a response to trauma, is much more common amongst women incarcerated than in the broader community.

Substance abuse and dependency is a further key issue for many women, and for many it is interconnected with their current and past abusive relationships. Women will often use drugs or alcohol as a coping mechanism and to self-medicate, and for many substance abuse and addiction has become the central feature of their life.

Substance abuse can also contribute to women's poor health and functioning, and being under the influence of drugs or alcohol or having to support and fund addiction can be key drivers in women's offending. Many women's contact with the criminal justice system is closely associated with substance use, and it is well established that a high proportion of women in prison are drug dependent and exhibit gender-specific patterns of use for both illicit and licit substances.

Economic pressures and limited vocational histories are a common experience of many women who enter the prison and community correctional settings. On intake to correctional facilities women report high levels of need in the areas of education and employment. For women, a limited employment history can mean they have less ability to establish financial autonomy in the community or that they struggle to develop a clear vision of future occupation.

Habits of addiction and family responsibilities, as well as constraints on employment options as result of a criminal record, are further factors that reduce women's employability on release, and these can hinder successful community reintegration. Creating vocational pathways is important to building stronger futures for women, enhancing stability in the community, access to housing and desistance from crime.

Relationships and community connection are key cornerstones of women's rehabilitation. Relationships are increasingly described as women's most prevalent and criminogenic need. Assisting women to navigate their parenting and family responsibilities is also essential. From the research we know that, for women, substance use, family violence, homelessness and poverty are important factors that lead to their instability while in the community. Aboriginal women are also at least 20 times more likely to be incarcerated on remand than non-Aboriginal women. So establishing pathways to community and ensuring community and cultural linkage and support are key priorities for DCS in its work with women in custody and in the community.

The department's 2019-24 action plan will continue to address the factors underlying women's correctional service interface and risk of offending. This brings focus onto women's safety and choices in relationships as well, stabilising mental health and enhancing resilience as well as developing skills and vocational opportunities. DCS's end aim is for women to have healthy lifestyles, supportive relationships and meaningful opportunities in their life, devoid of offending.

Partnerships between DCS and a diversity of government and non-government community, industry and third-sector alliances are critical to outcomes for women. The DCS experience partnering with a range of community-based agencies also highlights that effective community supervision models for women can operate outside of mainstream community correctional service approaches, and the Marshall Liberal government's targeted programs and individual supports that are responsive to women's needs are delivered in partnership with non-government and specialised women's organisations. They are specifically aimed at enhancing service linkage and community connection.

Continued focus will be brought to the DCS action plan in building relationships and partnerships with key community services for women as well as to strengthen and learn from the knowledge and positive role modelling that women with lived experience can offer. This includes a new partnership with the Red Cross to deliver in its international community-based health and first aid in action program at the Adelaide Women's Prison, as well as exploring opportunities for a similar peer support model in the community.

The new plan also includes specific actions to engage partners to assist in reducing Aboriginal women's over-representation in custody and the criminal justice system, as well as establishing pathways to community through cultural linkage and support. The value of people with lived experience sharing their knowledge, experience and learning with others facing a similar experience is well known. It can inspire and instil hope, as well as offer practical steps and strategies from someone who understands the difficulties of the challenges and the situation.

DCS draws upon the learnings of women who have exited custody and who have pursued further studies or transitioned into employment and are now drug-free to return as speakers and mentors to other women in prison and to instil in other women that they, too, can turn their lives around. We will look at who is incarcerated, the crimes that have been committed and what access inmates have to rehabilitation and reintegration programs, along with the direct effects this has on community safety.

From 2018, new arrangements include partnering with Women's Safety Services SA to deliver a domestic family violence program for women in custody; the development of a memorandum of understanding with Seeds of Affinity to formalise women's access to this service and to provide women with lived experience a formalised mechanism to offer mentoring and support to other women in custody; and a memorandum of understanding with the Red Cross, as previously discussed.

A living, smart, individual and group capacity-building program is also due to commence in the Adelaide Women's Prison in partnership with Fourth Sector Solutions and Dream Awake: Research Education and Design, and is a recent initiative with the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement.

ALRM will pilot an Aboriginal visitors' program at the Adelaide Women's Prison, which seeks to bring a more proactive and supported approach to new Aboriginal women admitted into custody and ensures that ALRM has regular scheduled times to meet with women on their legal, housing and family needs and, where possible, expedite release. These are targeted programs and individualised supports that are responsive to women's individual needs.

Today, I would also like to recognise a couple more non-government organisations that are doing excellent work supporting prisoners and their families. Firstly, Second Chances SA is a not-for-profit volunteer organisation committed to restoring hope in the lives of prisoners and their families and communities across South Australia. Their programs are custom designed to equip prisoners, their children and whole families to create better futures for themselves. Second Chances CEO, Helen Glanville, has helped me to understand the many ways that Second Chances strives to support prisoners and their families, and has described some of the challenges in providing support.

One key challenge is funding. Last year, I attended a wedding-themed fundraising event for Second Chances with the member for Adelaide, and this was a great and worthwhile event. Second Chances had received donations of wedding dresses and they sold these off at very low prices to the community to raise money for the Second Chances programs. These Second Chances programs have been developed over 20 years of experience and include Christmas Angels, which is a special program to remember children of prisoners at Christmas time.

Bringing Hope is an in-prison volunteering program, and each week 12 accredited Second Chances volunteers visit prisons right across South Australia, providing friendship and practical support, including banking and property storage. Birthdays are an important occasion in the life of these children. For those with a parent in prison, birthdays can be a time of sadness or fear that they have been forgotten.

PK Birthdays provides presents to children on behalf of their imprisoned parent, reminding them that they are valued and loved. Second Chances is running many programs, and I will be advocating for more support of their programs in the future. Helen also told me that not one government body actually keeps a record of who these children of prisoners are, and that is something we need to look at in the future as well.

Secondly today, in my last couple of minutes I would like to also recognise Seeds of Affinity. The Seeds of Affinity group empowers women both during prison and upon their release from prison and is run by a woman who is living in King, Linda Fisk, who has invited me to spend time with women who have come out of prison. They are doing excellent work. This will be a continued focus for me in the future.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:45):** I rise to speak to this motion and also to move an amendment to the motion to add two paragraphs:

- (d) recognises the ongoing need for the state government to properly fund programs and organisations that work with women to increase their strength and self-worth as they transition from prison into the community; and
- (e) recognises that women leaving the prison system need access to safe and secure accommodation as well as education and employment opportunities to reduce the risk of homelessness, abuse and health issues.

Firstly, I thank the member for King bringing this motion to this place. Sadly, women and girls caught up in our criminal justice system are amongst the most marginalised and at-risk groups of people in our community. Tragically, it is well documented that for many women who spend time in the criminal justice system the experience of domestic violence and abuse has strongly contributed to their pathway to offending.

Evidence suggests, as the member for King pointed out, that somewhere between 70 per cent and 90 per cent of women who are in prison have experienced physical, sexual or emotional abuse at some point in their lives. This is an absolutely shocking statistic that speaks to the work we and our community must relentlessly continue to do to prevent and end domestic violence and sexual and other abuse—violence and abuse that persists for women and children in every corner of our state.

With domestic violence as the leading cause of homelessness amongst women, many women find themselves in extraordinarily difficult circumstances, circumstances that can make it very difficult to break a cycle of offending on exiting prison. Dealing with homelessness and stigma following the experience of prison and violent relationships makes it very, very hard for women to build a new life without significant support and funding for programs that deeply support women as they take the next steps in their journey and as they strengthen relationships and recommence their pathways to learning and to work.

Additionally, the trauma, grief and depression often associated with experiences whilst in prison can also impact a woman's capacity to reconnect with her community once she has been released. That is why we need to properly fund programs that relentlessly focus on building the strength, self-esteem and confidence of women transitioning back into community life and into employment and education. Upon leaving prison, women often have little access to safe and secure accommodation and training and employment opportunities.

We must reduce the risk of homelessness, abuse and mental health problems once women leave prison and provide the support women and girls need to get their lives back on track. We must address the housing crisis in this state that offers few opportunities for the most marginalised groups of community members to access a safe place to call home. We must better fund mental health programs that can mean the difference between women in this situation feeling isolated and alone and seeing the possibilities ahead of them.

Government has significant responsibility directly in addressing all these issues and must step up and do more in terms of turning around its appalling lack of investment in domestic violence prevention; safe, affordable and accessible housing; and community and other mental health programs. It also has significant responsibility in terms of appropriately funding community or non-government organisations to undertake the work that supports and empowers women to traverse the many difficulties they can confront on exiting the prison system.

In South Australia, Seeds of Affinity is one such group that provides programs to support and empower women with complex needs to build a life outside of prison. Seeds of Affinity's work was initiated by women, and continues to be informed and driven by women, who have an experience of being in prison and of the difficulties faced on exit. As mentioned, Second Chances, ALRM and Women's Safety Services provide important support, as does Offenders Aid and Rehabilitation Services which provides extraordinary support for offenders on exit from prison offering accommodation and other services, including in my own community of Christie Downs.

All of these organisations and others are deeply focused on walking with people, empowering them to make different choices. They are focused on kindness, offering real and practical support, crime prevention, transition to employment and education, the dignity of all people, ensuring the voice of offenders is heard, reducing recidivism, and advocacy. They deeply believe in people taking responsibility for their actions whilst at the same time being deeply committed to the right of people to be heard, not to experience stigma, and to have real choices about the next steps in their life.

With a growing population of women in the corrections system and an increasing complexity of need in terms of the many issues that women contemplate on exit from prison, more than ever these and other organisations must be well funded by this state government to enable their work with and for women to be lasting and successful. Seeds of Affinity operates part-time with extraordinarily limited resources out of the Semaphore Uniting Church and, shamefully, has little to no funding support from this state government despite repeated requests and representations about this lack of funding since 2018.

Its need for more permanent premises and the fine work that it undertakes must be heard. I thank every person involved with Seeds of Affinity for their ongoing commitment to making a difference with and for women, for their kindness and for the respect and dignity they seek to ensure all women experience. Seeds of Affinity is enormously successful in enabling women to stay out of prison. Their funded peer-driven approach works in other jurisdictions including in Queensland and Victoria; however, shamefully, there are no similar funded peer-driven services available to women in the South Australian criminal justice system.

The program in other states reduces the social isolation that many women feel after being released from prison. We must address the trauma, grief and depression associated with prison and support and empower women experiencing them. Seeds of Affinity and other organisations have the capacity and expertise to help do this but not the financial capacity. The relationships women develop through the program in other states that I have mentioned help them re-establish family life, employment and study opportunities.

I have moved an amendment to the motion today because we must properly fund similar programs in our state. We must properly fund Seeds of Affinity and other organisations in this space. I agree with the sentiment of this motion that we must connect women to support services in our community and I deeply agree about the importance of partnerships with the community sector in supporting women exiting the prison system.

Having represented community sector workers for many years, I know well their outstanding dedication to working with and for people, and enabling and empowering them to build strength and self-worth. However, what I also know is that the organisations in which these workers work must be properly funded if they are to do their best work to most effectively support people. If we are serious, really serious, about making change in this area and about valuing both the women exiting prison and the organisations that support them, we must do more than simply have this motion in our parliament.

We must properly fund the programs and organisations that this motion seeks to recognise and we must properly fund domestic violence prevention, affordable and safe housing, and mental health programs. That is what this amendment speaks to and that is why I commend this amendment to the house.

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (11:54):** I rise to support the original motion moved by the member for King, who I know is an incredibly strong advocate not only for her electorate but also for gender equality, so I thank her for bringing this important motion to the house. Her motion highlights the importance of collaborative opportunities to help support female offenders during and after their interaction with our corrections system. That is exactly what is being explored by the strong foundations and clear pathways women offender ministerial workgroup.

As co-convenor with the Minister for Correctional Services, we established this ministerial workgroup to utilise a wide breadth of experience across different sectors, to assist in making recommendations to improve responses for women offenders and their children, as well as enhance the ability of the justice system to better respond to their needs.

In my capacity as the Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention, I chair the workgroup which comprises Helen Connolly, the Commissioner for Children and Young People; Nicole Dwyer, CEO of Workskil; Maria Hagias, the Chief Executive Officer of Women's Safety Services SA; the Hon. Di Laidlaw, who most of us in this house will know was the former minister and champion of women in politics; Nerida Saunders, Executive Director of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation; Sarah Paddock, architect/coordinator of Totalspace Design; Kerryn White from Edge Church, who has experience working with former prisoners within the community; and representatives from the Department for Correctional Services, including the CE.

This ministerial workgroup is working to influence actions under the Department for Correctional Services' strategies: Women's Action Plan 2019-24—Strong Foundations and Clear Pathways<sup>2</sup>; and Safe Children and Strong Families 2017-20. The terms of reference for the group reflects the areas of expertise of the members who bring their own lens to assist in identifying opportunities to improve responses for women offenders and their children.

Key focus areas that impact women offenders have been identified and will support in steering the priorities of the group. The group is considering and seeking opportunities around:

1. Ensuring the effective management and rehabilitation of specific populations of women, such as Aboriginal women, women living with disability, and women experiencing domestic and family violence. Both the member for King and the member for Reynell talked about women from these particular groups.

2. Enhancing the safety and life outcomes of children and young people who are impacted by their parent's incarceration or criminal activity.
3. Addressing the impact of domestic and family violence for women offenders to mitigate risk and enhance their safety.
4. Gathering input from a broad range of interest groups, including women with lived experience.
5. Promoting and delivering messages about women offenders that is accurate and informed to challenge community stereotypes.

The work of this group with members from across government and non-government sectors speaks to the essence of the member for King's motion; that is, partnerships in this respect are very important in supporting female offenders across the community and connecting them with services.

The women offender workgroup has held two meetings since its inception this year, and the feedback, input and ideas from around the table have been incredible and so valued. The passion of members who want to make a positive, tangible difference to the lives of these women is certainly felt amongst the group. By working together and bringing together our respective areas of expertise, the group is working to consider and influence strategies to indeed improve responses for women and their children.

We know that reducing recidivism ultimately reduces the cost to the South Australian taxpayer. While this is an aim, it is not the only goal. The workgroup has a clear and strong desire to improve the skills, education, supports and wellbeing of women offenders to assist in changing the course of their life for the better. As a government, and with the input of the workgroup, we want to work towards tailoring services to best support the unique needs of women and their children. It is crucial that we ensure women in our corrections system are safe, have access to services and are best able to connect with their children and their family.

I thank the member for King for her motion. Certainly, the work of this ministerial group supports just how important it is to partner with the not-for-profit sector. I acknowledge some of the comments she made about the incredible groups, charities and non-government agencies that are doing work in this space and I echo her acknowledgement and thanks to those particular groups, service providers and industry leaders.

Regardless of whether women are serving time in custody or in Community Corrections, it is so important that they can be supported, educated and assisted to prevent their return to our correctional systems and ultimately that they are supported and empowered to live full lives as participating members of our community. I commend the motion to the house.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:00):** I am happy to support the member for King's motion, but I really want to commend the amendment by the member for Reynell, which is what I would like to see added to the motion today. I was very interested to hear the contribution of the member for Elder about the ministerial work group. Of course, these work groups have been around for the entire 23 years of my time in this house.

I very much remember the first visit I made to the Women's Prison in Adelaide on Grand Junction Road, which is now of course in the electorate Florey. To say it was shocking such a place existed in the world of 1997 would be an understatement. While being part of the greyhound training program was the pinnacle of your time in the Women's Prison, very few people were ever able to avail themselves of the opportunity to be involved with the program.

In supporting the member for Reynell's amendment, it is actually vital the government becomes involved as well, while not taking away from the member for King's notion it is very important for NGOs and volunteers who, of course, underpin nearly everything in our society now where we expect people to work for no remuneration at all, but that of course is another story.

Very early in my tenure as the member for Florey, one of my staff encouraged me to get interested in women's prisons and I have boxes of information. I am proud to say I knew Debbie Kilroy in the very early days of Sisters Inside and attended some pretty amazing conferences in Melbourne. When Anna Kemp and Linda Fisk started Seeds of Affinity, I was thrilled to be involved



with them, not only because of the importance of their work but because of Muriel Matters. I know you will all be surprised I am weaving Muriel Matters into this contribution today, but of course Muriel was imprisoned for her activism not long after chaining herself to the ladies gallery of the House of Commons.

Muriel famously said, 'If they thought they were going to break us, they were wrong. We merely added women's prison reform to our list of grievances.' So when I found out suffragists in Britain sold soap many years ago to raise money, it was no trouble for me to start selling Seeds of Affinity soap, and I have for the full 10 years of the Muriel Matters Society, and spread the word of the work of Seeds of Affinity throughout the whole of Adelaide because, like Muriel, I have spoken all over Adelaide.

I would also like to mention the work of Anne Bachmann, who is a community visitor to the Women's Prison and has been for many, many years. On my last visit there, just prior to the halfway stage of the new Women's Prison, I was taken through the current areas. I suppose this is secret squirrel, but I am going to tell you all today: I was impressed there was a barista's course because the one thing that is going to help women when they get out of prison is employment, and if you can make coffee you can just about get a job anywhere at all.

Jobs, as the members for Reynell and King said, and accommodation are such important parts of coming out of prison because, as probably most of you realise, when you go into prison for a period of time you almost always lose all your possessions—your furniture goes, your clothing goes—and it is very hard to get back into the community, not to even mention the loss of your children or, if you are unfortunate enough (or fortunate enough) to be having a child while you are incarcerated, the loss of your baby, which is still a very big blight on us here in South Australia.

As mentioned, there is also Helen Glanville, along with Geoff and everyone at Second Chances. Helen and I attended a public relations course at TAFE in the late eighties. So I have known Helen for many years and all the amazing work she has put into, particularly as the member for King said, supporting the children of prisoners, because they are a group who are often lost in this process. I commend Leigh Garrett at OARS, whose work has been amazing, and, of course, the work of ALRM and Cheryl Axleby particularly at the moment and all those who are there.

I think the really important thing for us to remember in acknowledging all the things that are mentioned in both the motion and the amendment is education for people who are incarcerated is a really important part of what I would like to put forward to the house. Nearly everybody I have met or been involved with in prison has not had formal education beyond year 9.

I remember having a debate with the then minister, Jane Lomax-Smith, trying to get an audit to see how many years of education we owe everybody, both men and women, in prison. Unless you are able to be literate and numerate, it is going to be so very hard for you—particularly now but also in those days—to secure employment, which is one of the few ways you can get ahead.

The other thing I would like to mention today is visiting and supporting prisoners who are incarcerated. It has to be one of the most demoralising things to do. Have any of you actually tried to make an appointment to visit a prisoner on the system? It is only open for a certain number of hours after a certain time.

We are still pushing and I do have a response from the minister about their online booking system. There is no excuse for not having one in this day and age. Of course, prisoners have been locked down without support. I understand there were five iPads for online visits in the prison I was interested in and the place is at capacity.

So, all of these things are really important. I am very happy to be able to support the amendment to the member for King's motion and I sincerely hope the house will accept it as the motion.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (12:06):** I rise to support the very commendable motion by the member for King and I also support the amendments by the member for Reynell, who is the shadow spokesperson for women. She has a deep understanding of the connections needed and the ambition that is required in order to establish community services and connections to government

with a commitment to ensure that women who have been in the prison system are given choice and options when they leave that system.

I not only support the motion but the motion is actually strengthened by the direction and the heart with which the amendments have been made. I hope that all members will support these very important amendments that strengthen our ambition and goal.

Partnerships with the non-government sector, of course, are vital. I have a long track record working in the community sector in community services—not only community services, but those that concentrate on providing skills, education and strength for people who find themselves, because of the circumstances in which they have grown up, most often on a pathway to victimisation, a lifetime of becoming a victim and having difficulty staying out of criminality.

It sometimes actually becomes almost a choice to return to prison, which is a terrible thing. I have spoken to a number of people who have been in prison for a large portion of their life, particularly women. Some of this recidivism comes from the very words that are mentioned in the amendment by the member for Reynell about providing those lessons for skills for life, for jobs, for housing, for education and for all those things that are really at the heart of developing a firm connection in the community that is supported not just by government but by really amazing community service workers.

Some of the organisations that are vital in supporting our women who find themselves incarcerated are organisations that have been mentioned. I will just do a quick shout-out to some of the ones that I have had connections with and whose work I have watched, such as Second Chances, Seeds of Affinity and OARS, and, of course, the Women's Legal Service and the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement. There is a whole range of other larger community service providers that also are connected, such as Anglicare, Uniting Communities, Baptist Care—we could go on forever.

From a community service point of view, while I acknowledge the importance of recognising some of the dialogue that has come from the member for King and the member for Elder, I just want members to think back as well to the cruel cuts to the community sector that were inflicted almost the minute the federal Liberal government took over in 2013. Since then, we have seen billions of dollars cut out of the heart of the community sector. There was enormous reform announced in terms of volunteering, which would have seen the guts ripped out of peak volunteering bodies that support the very organisations that you are trying to celebrate and recognise in this motion.

I sat with peak bodies and organisations, as a member of them myself, to fight these federal Liberal government cuts. At the time, when the state Liberals were in opposition here, they were silent on this. They did nothing to try to reverse this, nothing to speak up against it, and so I am encouraged by the acknowledgement of the importance of the non-government sector by the member for King. I hope that she comes into this place with fresh eyes on that determination to fight any other cuts that might be inflicted.

Having said that, I congratulate the motion from the member for King. I thank the member for Reynell for focusing on things that are fundamental to success for women leaving corrections, such as housing in particular, and I make a commitment to continue to visit, work with and talk with women and set goals around provision of secure and long-term safe housing, because without housing, you cannot access health, education, jobs, family reunification and other community networks.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:11):** I rise to make a very brief contribution to this motion. I want to congratulate, first of all, the member for King on bringing this very important motion to the house. Often in private members' business, which often goes unnoticed by members of the public, we are sometimes in furious agreement about certain issues, and this is certainly one of them from the outset. I do want to add, though, that I think that the motion is considerably strengthened by the amendments proposed by the member for Reynell, the shadow minister, because they go beyond words, beyond statements of support, to actual outcomes-based funding.

We have all been again in furious agreement about the importance of the work of Seeds of Affinity. Like most people who have contributed to this debate, I have had some very enlightening and enriching dealings with Seeds of Affinity since my time as the shadow minister for corrections.

They do some excellent work. I even spent an hour on their radio show on WOW FM, which I confess I had never heard of, not being a Port Adelaide person.

**Mr Pederick:** Shame!

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Indeed, and I have been corrected since. They are a very good group of women. Their work is informed, of course, by their own experiences largely. This goes to the importance of the member for Reynell's amendment because, while we are all in here talking up Linda and her organisation and, rightly so, the work that they do, they did come to the government on 28 August 2018, nearly two years ago, with a costed proposal which, from my reading, would help many, many women not only while they are incarcerated but also in finding pathways to employment, to education and, most importantly perhaps, pathways away from recidivism.

To my knowledge, and I would be interested to see if the minister himself will make a contribution, they have not received a response to the letter, let alone any commitment of funding. The member for King talks about an MOU. That is all very well, but again, as the member for Reynell very succinctly put it, these things need to be backed up with funding. Seeds of Affinity have a proposal. It is costed, and I would like to see the government make some sort of commitment to funding it.

The member for Florey introduced another angle to this, if you like, which is the state of the Women's Prison itself and the women's prison system. I think that it is a system that is long overdue for some reform. We will be saying more about that as time progresses, but it is very important to put that on the table straightaway. It is not just about pathways after women leave incarceration; it is from the moment they are incarcerated. It is about recognising that, as many people have said, women who are incarcerated are very often victims themselves of some very brutal and continuing acts. That needs to be recognised from the moment they enter the system, not just when they are leaving the system and we are trying to prevent recidivism.

I support the member for King in this motion. I think that it is a very good motion. I know that she is sincere in bringing it to the house, but I think it is considerably strengthened by the member for Reynell's amendment and I urge the house to support it.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:15):** I acknowledge this very fine motion by the member for King:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the importance of partnerships with the non-government sector in supporting female offenders in the community;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of connecting women to support services in the community; and
- (c) recognises the important role volunteers and former offenders can play in reducing recidivism.

I think that supporting women and their access to community and support services if they happen to find themselves on the wrong side of the law is very important work. They certainly need support moving forward and that has been recognised across the house in various ways. I want to move an amendment to the member for Reynell's amendment. I want to amend paragraph (d) as follows:

- (d) acknowledges the state government's role, support and funding of programs and organisations to increase their strength and self-worth as they transition from prison into the community.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Everybody has had their opportunity to contribute to this debate. The member for Hammond now has his. He will be heard in silence.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you for your protection, sir. I am only a little bloke. We accept the amendment inserting paragraph (e) as presented. Some people in this house—and it has just happened with the interjections—do not understand that there may be a different point of view. The last time I looked, this is not a socialist state.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** I am still hearing crickets, I think.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Carry on regardless.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Thank you for protection again, Mr Deputy Speaker. Your great support is highly valued. I would like to acknowledge the work that this government is doing in supporting women right across the board. Obviously, that work comes from the minister in the other place, the Hon. Michelle Lensink. We have the assistant minister here, Carolyn Power, and the member for King, Paula Luethen, provides great advocacy in regard to all matters regarding women.

Women are a very vital part of our community. We have put programs in place to support women offenders and we will go on doing that. It is alright to hear criticism from the other side but, for all the bleating, they had 16 years to do this. We will continue to strengthen the links between women and the support services they need throughout the community, whether they be government or non-government support services, so they can thrive and prosper as they move forward in their lives. We are a government that will stand right next to them. I commend the amendment to the amendment and I commend the fine original motion from the member for King.

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:19):** I would like to add my voice of support to the motion moved by the member for King and, in particular, the amendments moved by the member for Reynell. Recognising the ongoing need for the state government to properly fund programs and organisations that work with women to increase their strength and self-worth as they transition from prison into the community is so important as part of the original resolution, as is recognising that women leaving the prison system need access to safe and secure accommodation, education and employment opportunities to reduce the risk of homelessness, abuse and health issues. The member for Reynell has highlighted her reasons for moving those amendments.

There are so many people who do work particularly with the women who are transitioning from prison back into the community. On a number of occasions, I have had the opportunity to visit Yatala prison and other facilities to see the work the women there are doing. I know there are many organisations that assist with this. We have already heard about Seeds of Affinity. The member for Florey has spoken about Second Chances, OARS and ALRM. All these organisations do a lot of great work.

I would like to add to that list of people who do terrific work. One of my residents, Annie Backman, has worked tirelessly over many years to assist women while in prison and when they leave the prison system to transition back into the community. Speaking with some of the women, both while they have been in the prison system and once they have left, we do see generations of the same family go through prison. This is something that as a government we have worked on, and that needs to continue to be worked on so that these women get the support that they need. We really need to concentrate on that because it is about the future.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:22):** I rise to support the motion with the amended amendments that have been moved. I am surprised that we have had so many people talking on this topic. It warms my heart that we have had so many people supporting a better way forward for women who have ended up in prison, a pathway to empower them once they leave prison, thinking and talking about their children and the support they need as well.

I thank the member for Elder, the Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence, who has today given us a deeper understanding of the important progress that is being made to support and empower women offenders to make positive changes. I thank her for her contribution. I thank the member for Hammond for his contribution, which I could hear was heartfelt, and I thank him for his amendments. I thank the member for Reynell for supporting women on an ongoing basis and for moving some amendments. We are all in support of the core of those amendments.

I thank the member for Florey, the member for Hurtle Vale, the member for Elizabeth and the member for Torrens for their contributions and their support for these women. It is excellent to hear this level of interest and support to empower these women to have better futures.

In closing, we must continue to support these programs and support partnerships that empower women who have offended to access support services that build them up and build their capacity to fully function and parent in our community. Our whole community will benefit from that. This in turn will enhance community safety and break cycles of disadvantage and abuse which children may become subjected to.

I believe South Australians deserve a corrections system that is effective in reducing criminal behaviour, making our neighbourhoods safer and helping more people live their best life possible. The community suffers when the only thing a prisoner learns in prison is to continue on with the behaviours which saw them enter there in the first place.

I commit to this place that I will collaborate with every member in this house to make sure we build a better future for every single woman entering the system, for their pathway from this system and for the children who are impacted too. I thank everyone for their contribution.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The first question before the Chair in relation to this motion is an amendment to the amendment, which was moved by the member for Hammond.

The house divided on the amendment to the amendment:

Ayes ..... 23  
Noes ..... 20  
Majority ..... 3

**AYES**

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

**NOES**

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	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**

Patterson, S.J.R.	Gee, J.P.
-------------------	-----------

Amendment to the amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

**NATIONAL FARM SAFETY WEEK**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (12:31):** I rise today to move a very important motion. I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 20 to 25 July is National Farm Safety Week;
- (b) pays tribute to the Safe Hands national farm safety campaign and other initiatives undertaken to improve farm accident statistics, including by SafeWork SA and the Rural Safety and Health Alliance; and
- (c) reinforces the message for farmers not to be complacent—accidents happen to anyone regardless of age or experience.

Farming is one of Australia's most important industries. In South Australia in 2018-19, our primary industries generated over \$15 billion in revenue and accounted for almost 50 per cent of our state's merchandise exports. There is no doubt that farming is big business and our agricultural industry is a rewarding place to work; however, due to the nature and type of work, it can also be one of the most dangerous. Between 2015 and 2017, South Australian agriculture accounted for 19 per cent of workplace deaths. This means that South Australian farmers are being fatally injured at a rate of almost five times their share of the workforce.

In addition to the high fatality rate, every week nine South Australian workers in primary production are seriously injured enough to access work injury insurance. Those at most risk of serious injury are workers involved in sheep, beef cattle and grain production. Some of the most common injuries suffered by farm workers are caused by tractor run overs, falling from heights and becoming trapped in unguarded equipment, as well as body stress sustained from improper manual handling and awkward postures.

Vehicle accidents account for more than 75 per cent of workplace deaths in the Australian agricultural industry. Just in the last couple of years in South Australia, I can recall on-farm fatalities at Lewiston, Tarlee, Tanunda, Willunga and Port Lincoln. Accidents with tractors tipping, hay bales rolling off loaders and falls into grain bins are all such tragic accidents, carrying a long-lasting, terrible impact on family and friends, neighbours, farming communities and local emergency services volunteers who attend the accidents.

As well as that, they have a lasting impact on SafeWork SA investigators and industry reps. The devastation affects many. I recall a campaign reminding truck operators to 'look up' after a farmer in the Mid North area was killed when he was unloading his trailer and accidentally hit overhead powerlines. In May last year, there were three incidents of tractors hitting poles: one at Crystal Brook involving a 132,000-volt line and two other incidents involving 19,000-volt lines, including one in my electorate near Moonta.

SA Power Networks reported at the time they had already had several incidents that season where farm vehicles, such as seeders, had hit Stobie poles or powerlines and that, on average, there are 20 powerline on-farm accidents every year. Other incidents occur when loads are not strapped down or secured, when tractors carry loads too high from the ground on slopes and hills, impacting the centre of gravity, and when farmers fall from heights.

SafeWork SA has done a lot of recent messaging about the dangers of portable field bins and the serious injuries that can occur during the process of manually raising or lowering them. Then there are shed mishaps, including serious burns sustained when using welders and cutting equipment, and secondary hazards which do not cause fatality but which carry long-lasting serious impacts on farmers and farm workers—things like hearing loss, ergonomic back injuries, heat stress and sunburn.

There are more than 300,000 quad bikes in use around Australia, and they are an important, popular and useful piece of farming equipment. However, in South Australia alone they have caused more than 100 injuries resulting in work claims in the last 10 years. Across Australia, quad bikes result in an average of 15 fatalities a year, highlighting just how dangerous they can be.

Tragically, every year around 12 children under 15 years of age die on Australian farms. Major causes of these fatal injuries are dams, farm vehicles and machinery, including quad bikes. National Farm Safety Week, from 20 July to 25 July, valuably aims to raise awareness of farm safety across Australia and highlight some of the practical steps farmers can take to improve the health and safety of our farm workers.

Developing on-farm health and safety guidelines needs to be just as important as planning next year's production cycle, and safety management on farms must be an integral part of every farming system. For most farmers their workplace is also their home, and sometimes the lines can blur. That is why Farm Safety Week is a good opportunity to raise awareness and highlight a number of excellent resources available to assist farmers, their workers and families to stay safe.

In 2019, the Australian federal government announced a \$1.9 million grant for Farmsafe Australia under the National Farm Safety Education Fund. Farmsafe will use this funding for a revitalisation project that will enhance their existing resources and capability to promote and

support activities relating to on-farm safety and ultimately reduce on-farm fatalities and injuries. In addition to this, in 2019 the Rural Safety and Health Alliance was formed.

The alliance is funded by nine rural research and development corporations and aims to address community safety and health challenges. The alliance looks to improve farm safety by investing directly in safety solutions and influencing behaviour in the agriculture workplace. It will provide leadership, education and communication to improve safety. As an example, the *Safe Hands* magazine was published by the alliance in 2019 for the second year and distributed across the farming community.

The National Farm Safety initiative included personal stories from those who have been impacted by farming accidents alongside information and the latest innovations, research and initiatives being undertaken to improve farm accident rates. Further to the good work being done nationally, here in South Australia SafeWork SA has undertaken an extensive education campaign focussed on farm safety.

To assist farm managers to keep their workplace safe, SafeWork SA, in partnership with Primary Producers SA, developed the *Farmers' Guidebook to Work Health and Safety* and a video series focusing on common areas where workplace injuries occur. The *Farmers' Guidebook* looks at every aspect of farm operations, including plant and machinery, common farm hazards like handling stock, and industry-specific hazards, such as working in silos when handling and storing grain.

The guidebook provides safety solutions and checklists for farmers to use to identify workplace health and safety issues on their farm. Each section also has a set of quick safety scans, to help farmers carry out a self-audit to measure how well they are currently doing and to identify areas for improvement, and template forms and records that may assist farmers to document their work. The guidebook is accompanied by farm safety videos, which focus on the most common causes of injury and which are a part of an ongoing SafeWork SA education campaign aimed at reducing injuries by engaging farmers and improving safety and awareness.

The guidebook and video series are aimed at taking the guesswork out of managing the risks and knowing what is expected when it comes to health and safety standards, including understanding the farm business owner's legal obligations. They provide simple and practical safety solutions and tips to help farmers uphold their responsibilities and make their farm, family and workers safe. All of these things are important if we are to go any way to preventing further workplace injuries or death.

These resources and campaigns, along with many others, aim to raise awareness of health and safety in the workplace, encourage conversations about safety at work and support positive safety culture. Farm owners and workers must be alert to and understand the risks of the work they do each and every day. It is also crucial to remember that farm safety is not just about the physical risks and dangers. Recent events such as the drought, bushfires and COVID-19 pandemic have highlighted once again the devastating psychological toll taken on our farmers.

Work-related stress and mental illness can cause both psychological and physical injury. The suicide rate for Australia's farming men is about double the general male population's rate. I am aware of the considerable vital work being done and the support offered across the Narungga electorate by the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist and the many community-minded volunteers involved in the SOS Yorke and SOS Copper Coast suicide prevention networks. Long may this valuable work continue.

Isolation and difficulty accessing services are some of the challenges faced by our farmers. Many farmers work alone in remote areas under extremely difficult circumstances. When in need, it is vital that farmers understand the importance of seeking help. We must ensure we have the assistance and resources in place to provide them with the support they need. Help and support can come from a range of sources such as friends and neighbours as well as the more formal government agencies, authorities and services.

In the last 12 months, the Marshall Liberal government has committed more than \$420 million to mental health and has funded a number of initiatives to provide farmers with accessible mental health and resilience services. The mental health and wellbeing of those in our

rural communities who are struggling with day-to-day life or affected by adversity such as drought, fires or COVID-19 is a priority that this government takes extremely seriously.

The Rural Financial Counselling Service is doing an outstanding job not only in providing support for our farmers applying for the Farm Household Allowance but also in creating greater resilience in rural communities. The service, which is funded by both state and federal governments, aims to reduce the immediate burden on our farming community and assist our farmers in getting through the drought. Door-to-door support members can assist in ensuring people are able to access technical advice, drought assistance and other support measures available through government, non-government, community and charity networks.

A targeted mental health and wellbeing assistance program led by Wellbeing SA is being rolled out to all residents of South Australia's bushfire affected areas. The \$2.61 million package builds on the initial bushfire response and aims to provide support for long-term recovery in the communities that were severely impacted by the summer bushfires. Farmers may be struggling with additional worries caused by the COVID-19 pandemic.

As part of the South Australian COVID-19 Virtual Support Network a new support line has been created to provide a localised service for South Australians who need additional mental health support. We also have in place our Family and Business Support Program, which is run by an independent team of experienced professionals who can offer independent, confidential support free of charge to farmers. It is vital that we support and strengthen the resilience of our farmers and rural communities.

National Farm Safety Week does a great job in highlighting these issues and responsibilities, but it is only one week a year. All farmers must focus on farm safety every day of the year. The ongoing safety of agricultural workers is fundamental in ensuring a sustainable and secure future for generations to come. I urge all farmers to stay safe by keeping up to date with farm safety issues, accessing the many useful resources and maintaining work health and safety standards. They must take the time to consider how they can reduce incidents, accidents and avoid deaths on their property.

There were multiple farm accidents in South Australia in the last two years due to myriad causes, so the vital message this National Farm Safety Week is for farmers not to be complacent even if it is a task that you have done thousands of times before or you are under the pump because you have to beat the weather that is coming or get to the grain to the silo before it shuts or you are under stress because you are behind with your end of financial year bookwork or you are tired because you have been working for 14 hours straight again.

Every Australian has the right to return home from work at the end of the day healthy and uninjured. Unfortunately, on our farms this is not always the case. I encourage everyone to take a moment to consider safety in their workplace and to understand that the vast majority of fatalities and serious injuries are preventable. Weeks such as National Farm Safety Week offer timely reminders to take care. Complacency can be dangerous and accidents can happen to anyone regardless of age and experience. I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:44):** I also rise in support of this motion. As the member said, it is an incredibly important issue. It is one of those issues that, when you look at it, comes down to life and death or serious injury. In a previous life, I was a rehabilitation consultant and I worked with a lot of people with work-based injuries. A lot of them fell into that musculoskeletal range of injury, but some injuries were incredibly traumatic and incredibly serious.

During my time working as a rehabilitation consultant for about eight years, most of my work was taken up with people in the mining industry and heavy industry when it came to resource processing and contractors that fed into those processes. However, I had some clients who worked in the primary industry sector, some in the pastoral regions of our state who had quite serious crush injuries as a result of being crushed up against fencing by cattle, and others down in the grain growing parts of our state who had—if I can put it this way—run-of-the-mill musculoskeletal injuries that did have an impact on them and it took some time for them to get back to work.

Farming, by its nature, has generated a significant number of deaths and serious injuries over the years. Indeed, when you look at the national figures, when it comes to deaths and serious



injuries, it is the transport, postal and warehousing sector that usually tops the list, but coming next generally—and sometimes construction overtakes—agriculture, forestry and fishing are where you have significant injuries and a significant number of deaths per year.

When I first started working as a rehabilitation consultant, as I said, I was exposed to some very traumatic injuries in heavy industry. The number of deaths started to change, and the number of serious injuries started to change when owners and senior management took safety seriously. Once upon a time, they did not take it with the seriousness that was needed. It was almost seen as 'Oh, we're going to lose people; we're going to get serious injuries.' That was almost par for the course and almost culturally accepted in the ranks of senior management in some of our bigger industries.

It happened when management, with pressure from the union movement and others, decided to take injury and death seriously, and in a lot of those heavy industries we have seen a serious decline. In some respects, that is easier once that cultural shift takes place because we do have large companies. When you look at South Australia, there are just under 10,000 farms, so there is a degree of complexity, there is a degree of approaches that are going to be diverse, and it is going to come down to the individuals on those farms.

What has clearly happened over the years is that there has been a change in primary industries when it comes to injury and death. The priority given to it and the consciousness given to it has improved over time to the point that in the last decade or so the number of deaths and serious injuries in the primary industry sector has declined significantly. However, it is still too high and we want to see further decline.

The member for Narungga pointed to a number of programs and initiatives in place, and they all help. They all help to get the message across. They all help with the practical approaches on the ground that can lead to improvements. One of the disturbing elements on farms is the number of young people, children, who die. They are part of the farm because it is part of the family business, and it is tragic for the families involved and for their communities. There has been a focus on how we reduce that, just as there has been a focus on ensuring adults do not put themselves in the way of harm.

This is an important motion. Anything we can do at a state level, through the various agencies, to assist people to do the right thing, to work safely, is to be actively encouraged. We just need to continue to drive down the figures; the trends are good, but one death is one death too many and one serious injury is one serious injury too many. We know what the impact is on the family and on the broader community.

This is something that has strong bipartisan support; a year or two ago I was the one up there moving this particular motion. I will conclude now, because I know there are primary producers on the other side who have lived experience and who might want the opportunity to speak—perhaps the member for MacKillop is eager to get up and have something to say.

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:51):** I rise today to speak to the motion moved by the member for Narungga in relation to the importance of National Farm Safety Week, including that this house acknowledges National Farm Safety Week, amongst many other points, to cut it a bit shorter. I would also like to thank the member for Giles for his contribution; he is a regional member as well as the shadow ag minister. I thank the member for Narungga for bringing this motion to the house. The importance of farming to his electorate is substantial, as it is to mine. Those who live on the land, including myself, who both grew up on a farm and raised my own family on a farm, know that farm safety is critically important.

Farming businesses and drivers of safety risk can be hugely variable. Farm safety risks vary on the enterprises undertaken, on whether a farm has an emphasis on cropping, livestock, whether it is extensively farmed or is on a broadacre scale run on pastoral country, milk production, horticulture, viticulture, an integrated combination of any of these or an array of other farming enterprises. It does not matter whether the farm is run as a family business or by a large multinational company, risks need to be managed and people need to be kept safe. It is an unfortunate statistic that between 2015 and 2017 South Australian agriculture accounted for 19 per cent of workplace deaths.

People are important, and farms are places of employment where people come to work to earn a living. Like any other workplace, these employees have a right to work in a safe environment where risks to their wellbeing are managed. Farms engage people in a range of capacities, from self-employed farming families to seasonal contractors such as shearing teams, pruners, harvesters and the like. The day-to-day running of farming businesses can involve significant numbers of ongoing employees and, like any business, we want to make sure that people are able to work effectively and, importantly, safely.

Farms are also homes and places where families are raised. It is part of the attractiveness of living on the land that in growing up on a farm we are afforded a great many freedoms, experiences and opportunities that our city counterparts do not have access to. The opportunity to learn to ride a motorbike and drive a ute at an early age, the ability to get involved in animal handling, horseriding, sheep and cattle mustering and drafting are unique and special features of living and growing up on a farm.

With these enterprises and activities happening effectively and literally in our backyards, we also need to ensure that our families are safe. National Farm Safety Week, which runs from 20 to 25 July, reminds us all of the importance of farm safety and the support available to better manage risks on farms. In South Australia, SafeWork SA continues to play a key role in working with business and the various agricultural sectors to improve health and safety outcomes.

Common workplace injuries sustained on farms include being hit by moving objects and hitting objects, animals in particular; injury through manual handling activities, for example, lifting and dragging heavy objects such as chemical drums, machinery parts or sheep for shearing and crutching; falls, trips and slips; and vehicle accidents.

From a practical point of view, for those who are not familiar with farming, some examples of the types of occupations that are vulnerable to injury are livestock workers, where occupational hazards to guard against include crush injuries; vineyard workers and fruit orchard workers, where occupational hazards include the use of ladders, pruning shears and repetitive tasks; and shearers, where occupational hazards to guard against include strains and body stresses from the handling of sheep.

I thought I would touch on a couple of the issues and incidents that I have seen in the past in my small farming career so far. I have never seen a death, and I hope that remains the case in my neck of the woods, that is, locally, but I have seen some horrific accidents. A local farmer was working around his PTO-driven spray unit. He leant over that PTO shaft, which did not have the cover on it. At the time, back in those days—we are going back a few years now—it was not illegal for an owner farmer to have a PTO shaft without a cover. His clothes got encapsulated in the shaft and he was completely stripped of all his clothes and thrown out the other side.

Although bruised and scratched and barely able to walk, he did manage to walk to safety, nearly naked, I think, but for his underwear and some boots and socks. That is the sort of horrific, easy, quick accident, where the mind was not set on safety. He was trying to get a job done and the cause of injury was basically just negligence on two fronts: firstly, the shaft should have had a cover, and I believe all shafts are covered these days by law; and, secondly, you have to be aware that there are dangers all the time, and you have to be absolutely prepared for and aware of such issues.

Another incident that comes to mind is another local accident in my region, where a young girl was drilling a hole for a post with an auger. She was down trying to move the spill from that hole, which is the soil. Her hair became wrapped in the auger and it scalped her, right around the top of the head. That was able to be put back and she now lives a normal life, but that is another split-second incident that becomes an accident, where it can be a matter of life and death within a second.

Cattle injuries are really quite common. Cattle have a tendency to be either beautifully natured or mad in the head. The mad in the head animals, when they are put under stress and in yards—obviously, we want them to go where we want them to go, not where they want to go—do not always leave the people operating them with the best opportunity to get out of the way quickly enough or be in the right spot at the right time, hence why these injuries will probably come again and again.

When you are dealing with big animals—and I am talking 500 kilos to 1,000 kilos—they can have a mind of their own. If they do not want to do something and they become intense or irate, then it does put people at risk. All we say in this area is to be aware, understanding that it is not your world, it is theirs, and we should do everything we can to avoid it.

Motorbike accidents in our area are most common as well. Only recently, there was an accident in our region again. A newish motorbike rider was mustering stock. It was getting close to the end of the day—5.30—and getting to that darkish period. He was going too fast and rode into a fence because he could not see it, trying to open a gate quickly to get the stock through. He broke his leg and had a compound fracture on that leg. It was a difficult accident, a new learner.

What were the two things that went wrong with that accident? The speed was excessive and, secondly, he was not driving to the conditions and he was new. He should have been going slowly in the first place because he did not know the lay of the land. These accidents will happen, do happen and what is most important is that we put the processes in place to try to alleviate them, so that people can actually get home safely. Going to hospital in an ambulance is not a good outcome.

One of the deaths in the industry that I did see in my time—it was not in my neck of the woods, but it was in South Australia—was the death of a shearer. The shearer was shearing a sheep. The sheep kicked and rattled, not free but it obviously did it in a way that put the shearer in a vulnerable position. The handpiece went up into the neck of shearer, cut one of the main arteries to the head and he bled to death because they could not stop the blood from flowing on the board.

It was a very tragic set of circumstances. No-one did anything severely wrong. It was just one of those accidents. When you are dealing with animals, these sorts of things happen and should be avoided in all cases. I will just finish off here. Organisations such as Farmsafe Australia, which have a number of agricultural sector partners that span a number of states, also take communicating the importance of farm safety and risk seriously. I commend this motion and thank everyone for speaking to it. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### *Petitions*

### **PORT DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders):** Presented a petition signed by 416 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reject the Port Spencer proposal and consider the Cape Hardy multicommodity port proposal as the only suitable location for a project such as this.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **SITTINGS AND BUSINESS**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:01):** I give notice that on Thursday 2 July this year I will move that this house requires the Speaker to table and make copies publicly available by no later than 5pm on Friday 3 July this year of all country members' accommodation allowance claim forms that have been submitted from 20 March 2010 to 30 June 2020.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Point of clarification, Mr Speaker: the private member has sought to move a motion on a day when no private members' business exists, and I ask whether or not the motion is in order.

**The SPEAKER:** It is not a committee motion; it is another motion. Notice can only be given on a Wednesday, but then again, Mr Clerk, there could be a suspension of standing orders, and that could bring it on at an earlier point in time. Would someone therefore like to move that it be on the *Notice Paper* on the next Wednesday of sitting? By the way, that information might be readily available by then anyway.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** I move it, to assist the Speaker, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for West Torrens. He so moves. Is that seconded? I do not really need to, but I am happy to. We seem to have reached agreement on how to proceed. Thank you, members.

*The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:*

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

#### **ANSWERS TABLED**

**The SPEAKER:** I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:04):** I bring up the report of the committee, entitled Legislative Review Committee Information Guide.

Report received.

**Mr TEAGUE:** I bring up the ninth report of the Legislative Review Committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

#### *Question Time*

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier support a motion of this house to release all country members' accommodation allowance claims forms and supporting documentation from 20 March 2010 to 30 June 2020? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** On ABC radio this morning, in response to a question whether the Premier would join me in supporting the release of all information right back to 2010 relating to the country members' accommodation allowance, the Premier stated, and I quote, 'Well, I think that's what's going to happen in the parliament today.'

**The SPEAKER:** That is not on the *Notice Paper* yet, so it is in order. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** Thank you very much, sir. I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. It is important that we have transparency on this issue and that's why I very much support the statement that you made in this parliament earlier today, which I presume all members of this parliament are now aware of, and that is that that information as requested will be provided. I understand, of course, that there is an administrative component to that going back and getting those records over a 10-year period, and that will be provided.

My understanding is that you, sir, will be providing advice to this house as to exactly and precisely when that information can be provided. I think it is important that we look at this issue of country MPs' accommodation allowances. We know that over an extended period of time the Auditor-General has been responsible for auditing this allowance. This is an allowance which has been in place for decades. We have no information to suggest that anything is untoward whatsoever but, in an abundance of caution, I note, sir, that you have sent a letter to the Auditor-General asking him to review this and we wait for his report back to this house. If we need to take corrective action, that's exactly and precisely what we should do.

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08):** My question is to the Premier. What actions has the Premier taken to assure himself that all members of his Liberal party

room who have been claiming the country members' accommodation allowance have been doing so legitimately?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I made it very clear in the parliament yesterday that we have very strict rules regarding country MPs' accommodation allowances. They have been in place for an extended period of time. I expect all members of this parliament—whether they be in this house, whether they be in the other place, whether they be a member of my party or any individual elected to this parliament—to abide by those strict rules.

There are consequences, obviously, for those people who don't abide by those strict rules and, ultimately, what they have done, of course, will now be reviewed by the Auditor-General. As I said, we look forward to receiving that report. If there is any action that we as a parliament need to take, then that's exactly and precisely what we will do.

#### REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:09):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier's Minister for Trade and Investment failed to declare on his register of member's interest his ownership of a holiday rental apartment in the seaside town of Victor Harbor over a period of several years? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It was made public on 18 October 2018 that Mr Ridgway not only failed to declare his family home on his register of member's interest, he misspelt his name, and public reports today show that he has failed to declare an investment property in Victor Harbor.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10):** I thank the member for bringing that to my attention. I wasn't aware of that, but I am happy to look into that matter.

#### REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Minister for Trade and Investment breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct by failing to declare an investment property on his register of member's interest?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10):** I just refer the member to my previous answer.

#### DEFENCE INDUSTRIES

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the house on the commonwealth's \$270 billion investment in defence and what that means for South Australia?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10):** I thank the member for Elder for her interest in this very exciting announcement today by our Prime Minister, the Hon. Scott Morrison. He has done an outstanding job as the chair of the national cabinet, guiding Australia's response to the coronavirus. I think that we are the envy of the world in this country.

But not content with doing an outstanding job as a Prime Minister leading our country's response to the coronavirus, he is now leading the economic recovery. He is now leading that economic recovery, and we are the happy beneficiaries of some of the directions which he is taking now with a commitment of \$270 billion worth of defence expenditure over the next 10 years.

As you would be aware, sir, South Australia is the defence state. We have enormous capability, whether it be research capability within our universities or the DSTG, whether it be our shipbuilding capability, whether it be our electronic warfare or our surveillance and reconnaissance capability out at Edinburgh. We have enormous capability here in South Australia, and we are fortunate that we have a government which recognises unequivocally the strategic defence capability of having a strong defence industry—sovereign capability for our nation—and that was made very clear by the Prime Minister's announcement today.

We are very, very excited about it, especially when you start to unpack that \$270 billion announcement today and you look at some of the components and where we are here in South Australia. We already know that \$15 billion is going to be spent in terms of our cyber capability. This is an area where the government has been working virtually since the day we arrived in office. We know that this is a growth sector. The commonwealth now recognises this as a massive defence initiative for our nation, and we are ready to support that here in South Australia with the recent opening of the Australian Cyber Collaboration Centre, which the Minister for Innovation and Skills referred to yesterday in this parliament.

There was also a strong element of expenditure identified in the area of space, and in particular in the area of satellites. All members should know that on Lot Fourteen we have the headquarters for the Australian Space Agency, as well as recently it has been announced that we will have Mission Control for the Australian Space Agency. But what we also need to understand is that Lot Fourteen and Adelaide is also now the home of the largest space-related research project in the history of the country.

The SmartSat CRC is a massive collaboration between university, the private sector and government. We have companies which are members of that program and which are already building satellites on that site—satellites for the CSIRO, satellites for the Space Agency and satellites for the Department of Defence—and the Prime Minister has messaged and made it very clear today that this is an area of great strategic importance for our nation.

So is hypersonics, and we know that we've got great research capability and also great testing capability in hypersonics at Woomera. The underwater antisubmarine warfare capability that we have here in South Australia fits directly into the direction that the Prime Minister is taking, and of course we are excited that there is a further \$75 billion earmarked for a maritime build beyond the Hunter class and the Attack class that we are already working on in South Australia—so, much to be very focused on because we know this will create thousands and thousands of jobs for our state into the future.

#### REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier assure the house that all of his ministers and all of his party room members have correctly declared all of their property interests on their Register of Members' Interests, tabled in both houses of parliament?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** I think every single member in this house, whether they be a member of the government, the opposition or a member of the crossbench, has an obligation to make those interests known. There is a format, which has been in place for a long period of time. I think every member understands that they have obligations. So I expect every member of this parliament—every member of the House of Assembly, every member in the Legislative Council—to abide by those requirements.

#### REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:15):** My question is to the member for Finniss. Does he own his property in Victor Harbor?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Point of order: standing order 96, sir. This is something for which the member is not responsible to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** With respect, I think I can see where we are going on this. As members would no doubt be aware, I did make a ruling yesterday in regard to private members if they are asked questions, more so about country accommodation allowance. I have allowed questions in regard to the Register of Members' Interests. What I will do is—

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** I'm happy to answer that.

**The SPEAKER:** You are happy to answer it? Well, if it's in relation to a member's—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Do you want me to rephrase it?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, could you?

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

**The SPEAKER:** I will tell you right now that if someone is going to go to a private member again, clearly defying my ruling which was made and argued yesterday, then I'm not going to respond too favourably. So I will allow the member for West Torrens an opportunity to rephrase.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Thank you, sir. My question is to the member for Finniss. Why hasn't he declared on his register of member's interest ownership of a property in Victor Harbor?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16):** I thank the member for West Torrens for his question. All the information that is required by members of parliament should be provided on their register of interests. If the member has any issue that he would like to raise then I think that he should do so directly with you and with the parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There are obligations from time to time. There are errors, I think, on all sides of this parliament—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and I think if the—

*Mr Pictou interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Kaurana!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —member has something that they would like to raise, raise it with the Speaker. We are happy to look into this issue. There is nothing whatsoever too hard and we will provide the answers.

**The SPEAKER:** I also make the point that, if someone does want to make a comment, the other way to pursue it—whether it be about country members' accommodation allowance or another mechanism—it might be more appropriate to address these things by way of substantive motion that can be moved as well in the house.

#### REGISTER OF MEMBERS' INTERESTS

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:18):** My question is to the member for Finniss. Did he personally fill in the Register of Members' Interests forms he has tabled to the parliament two years in a row?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18):** It was very clear yesterday, sir: you made a ruling with regard to non-ministerial members of the government in answering questions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We are very happy for any member of the parliament to raise any issues that they have with regard to a Register of Members' Interests with you that can be followed up in the normal way.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: you ruled yesterday that members' register of interests—they are responsible to the house. This is not a question of the executive. This is a question to the member for Finniss, who is answerable to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier, I believe, has answered the question and we are moving on to the next question. He has completed his answer. The member for Finniss is seeking the call.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Playford!

### CORONAVIRUS RESTRICTIONS

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:19):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the further easing of COVID-19 restrictions?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19):** I thank the member for Finniss for his question and his interest in the coronavirus pandemic and the way that we have responded here in South Australia and, more broadly, across Australia. As members would be aware, we went to stage 3 on Monday of this week. We went to stage 3 because we were ready to go to stage 3 because we had done an outstanding job as a state in tackling the coronavirus head-on, dealing with it, educating ourselves about the risk, mitigating against those risks, and now we are in a position where we have been able to move back to just one person per two square metres, which I know has stood up so many businesses right across this state.

There are, of course, legitimate questions about when further restrictions may be eased and that is something that the Transition Committee in South Australia always looks at. They look at three separate issues: they look at the health issues, they look at the social issues and they look at the economic issues. They have been charged with the responsibility of providing advice to us.

One of the issues that they are very interested in at the moment is the issue of borders. We made a decision yesterday, of course, that we would not be sticking to the 20 July date. We made a decision with regard to that because we had concerns, especially regarding the number of locally acquired infections in Victoria. Again, today, unfortunately there were a high number of locally acquired transmissions in Victoria—very different from the rest of the country.

Yes, there were 14 cases today in New South Wales—all overseas acquired. They are Australians returning to Australia via the airport in Sydney, put into supervised quarantine at a hotel exactly and precisely as we do here in Adelaide. There were 14 cases identified, but that is a very different situation from the locally-acquired transmissions that are occurring in Victoria at the moment, so the borders stay in place for the time being.

What I will say, though, is that we want to help our friends in Victoria during this particularly difficult time. I make it very clear: if Victoria does well, Australia does well. If Australia does well, we do well here in South Australia. We have already reached out to the people in Victoria and we have already provided help in terms of processing some of the PCR tests that they have done in Victoria. SA Pathology has been doing what they can from that perspective.

I have already reported to this house, but I am happy to emphasise again that Dr Louise Flood, the head of the Communicable Diseases Control Branch right here in South Australia, is currently with some of her senior epidemiologists in Melbourne, working with their team to try to get on top of the current outbreaks that are in that state. More than that, though, our contact tracing team here in South Australia is working remotely from Victoria to do that work. I know that New South Wales is also helping and I know that Queensland is also helping.

This morning, there was a great moment of pride for our state when so many of our paramedics and nurses got on a plane and travelled to Melbourne to be on the front line. These are absolute heroes: 30 South Australians travelling over to Victoria at their time of need, lending that help, that assistance and that expertise that we have in abundance here in South Australia. We want to help Victoria. If they do well, we do well, Australia does well and we can stand up our economy and get people back to work.

### MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:23):** My question is to the Premier. Why hasn't the Premier instructed his party room colleague Terry Stephens to stand aside to allow a thorough, independent investigation of his country members' allowance claims?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23):** I thank the member for West Torrens for his question. This is a matter, of course, for the Legislative Council, but what I can say is that I am very supportive of the fact that the President there has referred the country member accommodation entitlements to the Auditor-General. He will look at all members' returns with regard to that matter. More than that, the President has also referred his specific taxation issues to the commissioner for taxation in South Australia.



There have been questions and there have been issues raised. We now have two eminently qualified people looking into this issue. My understanding is that the President has asked for a swift response from the Auditor-General so that we can clarify this matter. I just repeat that if there are issues that are identified in that report, either from the Auditor-General or from RevenueSA and the commissioner for taxation, then we will take the appropriate action.

#### MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:24):** My question is to the Premier. What appropriate action will he take, given his previous answer, given the Terry Stephens' scandal that is engulfing his government?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24):** I think that we all appreciate that that is a very hypothetical question. We will wait to see what comes back from the Auditor-General and what comes back from the commissioner for taxation in South Australia. You, sir, have also asked the Auditor-General to look at country MPs' travel allowances for this house and for all of the members of this house, some of them Liberal, some of them Labor, some of them on the crossbench, and he will do that analysis. He will potentially come back to us with recommendations.

From time to time, we do look at the issue of entitlements and from time to time we update those here in the South Australian parliament. Even in my short period—much shorter than the member for West Torrens, who has been here for much longer—we have had changes to those entitlements for MPs and from time to time they do need to be upgraded.

But I will reiterate the point that I made yesterday, and that is that we have people who represent the people of South Australia in this place from all parts of the state. In this house, we have 47 separate electorates, many of them in regional or remote South Australia, and it is absolutely vital that we have representation of our entire state. Those people who live outside the metropolitan area do have an added burden. They are away from their communities, their constituents, their families and their friends for an extended period of time and I think that it is correct that there is remuneration provided to offset those costs and that situation for our country members.

It has been a longstanding practice, long before this government came to power. It was in place for the 16 years of the previous government and governments before that. We have a process that is underway at the moment. There are reviews into this matter. We will look at what comes from those reviews and, if there are recommendations, we should take action.

#### MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:27):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house where Terry Stephens' primary place of residence is? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The Premier has been asked publicly on three occasions for Terry Stephens' principal place of residence. On one occasion, he said it was in Norwood. On another occasion, he said he didn't know. Today, he said it was Victor Harbor.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27):** I'm not sure what the member is referring to when I said Norwood. I think that was something that I corrected during that same sentence, so I think it is completely and utterly inappropriate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —completely and utterly inappropriate—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —but not unexpected for the member for West Torrens to put that onto *Hansard*.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Primary Industries!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Let this parliament be very clear—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —I have no doubt in my mind whatsoever that the primary place of residence for the President of the Legislative Council is in fact in Victor Harbor.

### **COST REDUCTIONS**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:28):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is lowering costs for South Australians?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28):** Today is, of course, the first day of the new financial year, 1 July, and the first of a very happy period for the people of South Australia as we again—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —go back and fulfil the obligation, the promise, that we made to the people of South Australia to lower costs. What we had over 16 years previously was the previous government with their hand in the pockets of hardworking South Australians—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —small businesses, primary producers and larger businesses that provide employment here in this state. Enough is enough. When we were elected, we made it very clear that we would focus on addressing all of those issues, which led to higher costs, whether they be for families or for individuals or for small business in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I was very proud to lead a government that removed payroll tax—

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kurna!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —for all small business in South Australia. This is a very important sector of our economy and one that was completely ignored before we came to government.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Another sector that was not just ignored but stolen from was families who had to endure the rort, the water pricing rort perpetrated on the people of South Australia by those shameless individuals opposite, who artificially inflated the asset base of SA Water—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —with one objective in mind: to put more money in their pockets and to take more money—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —out of the pockets of the people of South Australia. Again, enough is enough. When we came to government—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —we had an independent inquiry into what the real value of the regulated asset base was here in South Australia. What we found from that inquiry was that there had been shameless artificial inflation of the regulated asset base in South Australia by the former government, and that is the issue that we addressed. I am very proud to lead a government that is now addressing that rot. As of today, water prices will go down. This is welcome news to every individual, every family and every business in this state. The average water consumer in South Australia will have an annual water saving—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Cheltenham!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —of \$200 per year; the average business in South Australia, \$1,350. I have been stopped in the street when people, with great joyfulness and thankfulness, have said, 'My water bill is going down.' Some people have said it's between 10 per cent and 20 per cent. Rather than the increase after increase—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —we saw under the former hopeless government, we are now seeing those costs go down. It's not before time because we have a mighty battle on our hands—a battle with a coronavirus. We have been dealing with these dual crises in South Australia: a health crisis and also an economic crisis. Fifty thousand jobs have been lost in South Australia since March of this year, and that is exactly and precisely why we must do everything we can while we are in government to lower costs for households, so they are spending more money in the economy, and lower the costs for small business—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and larger business in South Australia so they can become more competitive. We absolutely dedicate ourselves every day that we are on the treasury bench to put the people of South Australia first—unlike those opposite.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for West Torrens, I have to announce that I am not going to tolerate that level of interjections any further. There was a cacophony of noise during the Premier's contribution, so consequently I call to order the following members: the Minister for Education; the member for Playford; the member for Lee, and he is warned; the member for Badcoe, and she is warned; the member for Kaurana, and he is warned; the Deputy Premier; and the members for Hurtle Vale, Reynell, Cheltenham, Torrens and Kavel.

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:32):** My question is to the Premier. On how many occasions and on what dates did the Premier stay at Terry Stephens' holiday house in Victor Harbor?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33):** I thank the member for West Torrens for his question. I visit the regions on a very, very regular basis. Of course, with the coronavirus, it has been impossible for me to spend much time out of metropolitan Adelaide. In fact, some weeks during this coronavirus we have had six cabinet meetings in seven days, and I would like to thank my cabinet colleagues for this. But it has had the impact that I haven't spent as much time in the regions as possible.

I have been very pleased over the last four weeks to get out into our regions because, in South Australia, we know on this side of the house that #RegionsMatter. Of course, the regions have been doing it very, very tough for an extended period of time with dry and drought conditions, which have been soul destroying for so many of those who live in our regions, especially our primary producers. We are very grateful for their stoicism—

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —during these very, very difficult weather conditions.

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order, Premier; one moment.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I have given the Premier a minute, sir. He is debating the question. The question was: on how many occasions did he visit Terry Stephens' house and on what dates was he there in Victor Harbor?

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. I believe that place may be in a regional area. The Premier is listing information about regions. It's a fair point of order. I would ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you, sir; I am building up and talking about what's important about getting out into the regions. And, yes, it is true: I have visited Victor Harbor on many occasions; in fact, I have been down there in the last few weeks actually. I was down there and out on Granite Island, which I thought was looking very, very good, although it was a little bit rainy at the time, but a very important, attractive part of our state, a very productive part of our state, and I visit on a very regular basis, like I do other parts of the state.

When I travel, often I visit local members or members of parliament who are residing in that area and also community leaders. It is not uncommon for me to go to a member of parliament or a member of the Legislative Council's house and, on occasion, I have stayed there. I have stayed with the member for Chaffey in his fine electorate. I have stayed with the member for Flinders in his fine electorate. I am just waiting for the rest of you to invite me over. It is always great to get out into our regions in South Australia. I am happy, proud, to confirm that I have visited Victor Harbor and I have stayed at the house of the Hon. Terry Stephens.

#### MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:36):** My question is to the Premier. When he stayed at the Hon. Terry Stephens' property in Victor Harbor, were Terry Stephens and his family there?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36):** Absolutely, sir. My understanding is that this occurred in early 2017. I don't have a precise date but, yes, Mr Stephens was there. Mrs Stephens was there. They are very proud of the local community down in the Victor Harbor area, and I was very, very pleased to be there.

#### MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:36):** My question is to the Premier. On that happy occasion, when the Premier stayed at Terry Stephens' property in Victor Harbor, were there family photographs, personal effects, of the Stephens family at the property, or was it set up as a holiday rental, including rental rules on a magnet on the fridge—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —and miniature toiletries—

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —in the bathrooms—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —and little biscuits on the bed?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:37):** I am happy to answer this question. It is an interesting question. I can confirm there were family photographs. There were no photographs of the member for West Torrens; I can confirm that. I was scouring every part, every part of the apartment, the house, the beautiful home that they have, that Mr and Mrs Stephens have built in their area. Of course it is their home. My understanding is that the member might be getting confused with another property owned by that member, which was available for rent, but certainly the place that I stayed in was their home. It had all their personal effects. It had no hotel-type soaps, as he refers to.

#### SCHOOLS WITH INTERNET FIBRE TECHNOLOGY PROGRAM

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:38):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the progress of the government's rollout of improved internet for schools, including economic benefits for our community?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:38):** I thank the member for MacKillop for this wonderful opportunity to update the house on what I fear—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —may be one of the last times I can update the house—

*Mr Szakacs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cheltenham!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —on the rollout of this program because it is all but complete. We are very, very, very much a proud government to say that, having announced an \$80 million partnership with Telstra in the latter stages of 2018 in the Glenelg Primary School, with the member for Morphett, we have seen the extraordinary rollout of hundreds and hundreds of kilometres of fibre-optic cable, making sure that our schools in South Australia can go from having had the slowest internet speeds on the mainland to the fastest internet speeds in Australia.

Some schools are reporting more than 1,000 times faster than they had before. And that's a critical point, to answer the member for MacKillop's question, when he also ties in the importance of the impact on the economy of this project that the Marshall Liberal government has rolled out. The economy in South Australia is dependent on jobs in the future that will fit in not only with incredible advances in technology that will see developments that we don't even know yet but also with things that we do know.

We do know that defence is going to be an enormous section of our economy. As the Premier outlined today, we are going to have a very good slice of that \$270 billion of national infrastructure building for our defence capability. Space and cyber are tremendously important parts of our economy that will rely on our students and our young people having access to the best possible education, supporting them in their opportunities to develop the skills and capacities to live in that high-tech future.

I think it is particularly important for regional economies, such as that which the member serves, because I remember when I was in the electorate of MacKillop with the member, talking with school students about their future, not every single one of them was thinking about Lot Fourteen for their own job and career future. A lot of them were talking about the ways that technology would enhance the opportunities through ag tech and other technologies on the farm to improve the productive capacity of their local economy as well. Those opportunities are no less important, that our schools are wired up to give those students the technological capacity and the understanding to maximise their future career prospects.

The fibre-optic cable is even more than that though. It enables schools to deliver curriculum and it enables professional development opportunities for regional teachers and people in locations. When I was visiting the member for Colton's electorate at Kidman Park Primary School a couple of

weeks ago, it really drilled home to me as we were talking to the students who are excited about the prospect of using their high-speed internet to engage with sister schools overseas.

We also spent some time talking to some students in Auburn in the member for Frome's electorate, who had just been connected. They were the 500<sup>th</sup> school connected, and they were able to talk about different things from a big school like Kidman Park Primary School with hundreds of students, as their experience is very different from the several dozen students at Auburn Primary School. They were able to have a wonderful connection. This is very exciting for our students.

Five hundred and seventeen sites have been connected. We also have more than 100 preschools now connected, and the second wave of the program is going to see enhanced cybersecurity and enhanced back office IT networks, enhancing what those services are delivering. More than 180,000 students, about 23,000 educators and, in the member for MacKillop's area, students at Beachport, Bordertown, Coonalpyn, Frances, Glencoe, Kalangadoo, Keith, Kingston, Lucindale, Meningie, Millicent, Mount Burr, Mundulla, Nangwarry, Naracoorte, Newbury Park, Padthaway, Penola, Rendelsham, Robe and Tintinara have all benefitted from this program.

Businesses and residents in all of those towns and across regional South Australia, from the APY lands to Mount Gambier, are going to also benefit in future as Telstra, now that that infrastructure is in place, will have further solutions for residents and businesses going forward that will massively enhance the productive component of our economy here in South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Florey, I just want to caution all members. I do ask them respectfully that we do please maintain an appropriate level of decorum for questions and answers. The member for Florey.

#### **BUS DRIVER CONTRACTS**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:42):** My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister guarantee no bus driver will lose their job as a result of the transition to the new service contracts, scheduled to commence on 4 July? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Ms BEDFORD:** On 10 March, the minister announced Torrens Transit, or Transit Systems as he said yesterday, would take over the outer north service contract from SouthLink in July. I am informed Torrens Transit gave assurances no drivers would lose their job as a result of this transition, yet I have been approached and contacted by at least four drivers who have told me they have not been given a job with the incoming operator despite that commitment.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:43):** I do thank the member for Florey for her question. I do note that the contracts, as they are being transferred across, are being transferred across based on the existing network that is in place and the existing route network that is in place. Whilst the guarantee that we have given is in relation to the number of jobs that are there, guaranteeing that each individual is given a new contract and transitioned across is a separate commitment.

The jobs are there and the jobs will continue because the bus routes are there and those routes will continue. But in terms of what the internal hiring practices are of private bus operators, I think that that is something beyond the remit of a commitment to give. But certainly the briefing that I have had is that the jobs will transfer across in their quantum, as distinct from what individuals may have happen to their individual employment circumstances; that is a separate matter.

#### **BUS DRIVER CONTRACTS**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:44):** Supplementary: if I gave the minister the names of these drivers, would he undertake to do something about their situation, and would he also look at whether these drivers and all the new drivers in the new situation would be paid at the same rate of pay and with the same conditions?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:44):** I thank the member for Florey for her question. I take on notice what opportunities and obligations I and the department have to direct private operators as

to their individual industrial relations practices. I am more than happy to take that on notice and see if there is some sort of answer that I can provide to the member.

The government contracts services with operators across a whole host of spheres, and we would be talking about tens of thousands of jobs for which private companies provide services, through government, to the public of South Australia. I am not sure that the government itself has the power to be able to direct that individual outcomes in relation to individual staff are achieved through those contracting arrangements.

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:46):** My question is to the member for Narungga. Has the member for Narungga benefited from free accommodation by staying at Terry Stephens' Norwood property at no expense and then failed to declare that on his register of member's interest? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yesterday, when I asked in the parliament, the member for Narungga said, 'I have not recorded any similar items on my register of interest regarding accommodation in Adelaide.' During this period, the member for Narungga has claimed more than \$56,000 from the country members' accommodation allowance while staying at the Norwood home of Terry Stephens.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:46):** Sir, as this parliament knows, you have made a decision to refer the issue of country members' accommodation allowances to the Auditor-General. I am quite sure he has all the requisite skills and capacities to undertake a fulsome inquiry into this matter. I believe that he will come back to this house with his analysis of the current situation and any recommendations that he believes are necessary for us as a parliament to consider. We look forward to receiving that report.

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:47):** My question is to the Premier. Now that the Premier has had 24 hours, has he now required of RevenueSA to determine if Terry Stephens is claiming a principal place of residence exemption for land tax on his Norwood property?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:47):** I think I have covered this issue on more than one occasion, and I am more than happy to cover it again today. The Premier has referred the situation of all of his arrangements to the state taxation commissioner in South Australia, operating out of RevenueSA, and we await any findings from that. Quite frankly, as soon as that information is available, I am sure it will be shared with the people of South Australia.

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:48):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier make available to the anticorruption branch of South Australia Police all information held by RevenueSA regarding Terry Stephens' land tax requirements for his Norwood property?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is called to order; it is most unhelpful. Premier, if you heard the question you can—

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:48):** I don't have any information to suggest that this would be a matter for the anticorruption branch, but if the member opposite does have any information that would suggest that this is the case, he should do that. Not only should he do it, he has an obligation to do that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** But he doesn't have an obligation to come in here with smear and innuendo, but that is exactly and precisely what happened earlier. We heard the member for—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: personal reflections and impugning an improper motive on myself. I ask the Premier to withdraw and apologise.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond and the member for Playford, you can both leave for the remainder of question time.

*The honourable members for Hammond and Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** I can't have members accuse other members of smearing, so what I am going to do is respectfully ask the Premier to withdraw that part of the comment. Can the Premier withdraw, thank you.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I am happy to withdraw that comment, sir, but I would like to update the house on questions that the member for West Torrens asked in this parliament only a few moments ago. In fact, he asked the member for Finnis why he had failed to record an asset on his register of interest. It is very clear why he has failed to record that asset on his register of interest and that is because he does not own the property in which he lives. He leases that property. Again I emphasise: it's easy for the member for West Torrens and for the grubby opposition to be throwing stones in this regard, but you do not understand what our country members go through, being away from their families, their homes, their constituents.

A small item that you should be aware of: today, the Basham family lost their dog. This is a very important part of their family. But the member for Finnis can't go home and tell his daughters that unfortunately they have lost their dog. You might think this is a small point but this is what country members have to go through all the time. They spend weeks and months away from their constituents and their family members on an ongoing basis. They make a commitment to this place, and there should be a little bit more respect coming from the member for West Torrens.

#### **GRASSROOTS FOOTBALL, CRICKET, AND NETBALL FACILITY PROGRAM**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:51):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister update the house on the benefits of the government's Grassroots Football, Cricket, and Netball Facility Program?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:51):** Absolutely. I thank the member for his question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Badcoe can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A.

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I thank the member for Narungga for his question and note what a great advocate he is for his community and sport in his community and how important it is to have sport back for the health and wellbeing of everyone in our community. It's great to see people getting out there and being active again, especially at our sporting clubs.

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The Marshall government's strong plan to support local jobs, businesses and organisations and the economy has seen the sporting sector receive \$15 million in the past few months, going through the COVID-19 crisis we have been facing. We have been smashing it out of the park. Quality infrastructure is one of the keys to a stronger community and that is why our grassroots football, cricket and netball program has been kicking goals.

This is exactly the type of program that South Australia needs right now. It creates jobs, it lowers costs for local communities and it improves services and facilities that so many love so dearly. This program addresses the sporting infrastructure issues the opposition ignored during their time in



government. This program puts money into quality projects such as quality floodlighting, better playing surfaces, new unisex change rooms to improve safety and usability, and better practice facilities.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Let's just start with the numbers. They don't want to hear it on that side but the numbers are really clear. What we have done over three rounds is—and we brought the third round forward, so we have had three rounds in two years—\$15 million, 15 worthy recipients, and another 15 clubs have finally received attention that they didn't get after years of nothing from the opposition. That means over three rounds, \$15 million, 47 quality sporting infrastructure projects over the three years and 15 more recently.

Let's take a moment to celebrate those successes and let's go through the numbers. In 2018-19, \$5 million led to—wait for it—\$15.1 million in total project value. That's \$5 million of taxpayer money into \$15 million worth of projects. In 2019-20, we invested \$5 million of taxpayer dollars which led to \$27.6 million worth of project value, and the money we brought forward, the \$5 million, led to \$16.6 million in project value. That's over \$15 million investment in this program, \$59 million in total projects. Let me say that again: \$15 million invested across two years; \$59 million in total projects. That's due to the fact that we have worked hard to collaborate with sports, local councils, clubs and associations to build sensible funding packages to stretch our dollar further.

Instead of sitting in offices navel gazing like those opposite, we have been out selling the program with local clubs and encouraging them to apply. They know that we have moved on from the bad old days and there is a new government in town, a government that wants better sporting facilities. It is a government that wants better sporting facilities. I would like to personally thank Netball SA—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —SANFL, SACA and the Office for Recreation and Sport for their outstanding collaboration and work with these sports, which we believe and know have positioned the sports so well and empowered them to assess the applications as they came in.

Not only did they give their intellectual knowledge and work with these clubs and these councils, but they actually put skin in the game as well. For you to speak disparagingly of the SANFL, the SACA and Netball SA is appalling. They put money on the table.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will be seated. I would never speak disparagingly of the SANFL when I was growing up. The member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, the minister is clearly debating.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. I ask the minister to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I will. Thank you, Mr Speaker, and the substance of the question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —was about the value that is being returned, and the fact that the SANFL, the SACA and Netball SA have put skin in the game. They put in \$1 million each—\$1 million from the SANFL and \$1 million from the SACA to add to this project. This week, quite frankly, the cheap shots and the political ploy that has come from those on the other side has been insulting. It is a smokescreen to take people's attention away from the truth of the matter.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: the minister is now debating the question and attacking the opposition.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please wrap up your answer.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Mr Speaker, we know that they have been too lazy on the other side to get involved in this project, but we have delivered. We have delivered \$59 million worth of projects—more jobs, lower costs, better services.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has concluded his answer. I would like to move to some other questions. The member for West Torrens is seeking the call.

#### **MINISTER FOR TRANSPORT, INFRASTRUCTURE AND LOCAL PLANNING**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:56):** My question is to the Premier. How many mistakes, failures, missed deadlines and backflips will he tolerate from his Minister for Transport and Infrastructure before he removes him from the ministry? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Since the last election, the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, the member for Schubert, has overseen (it is a long list) the scrapping of the promised right-hand turn of the tram to North Terrace that the Premier promised to deliver before the last election, missing the 'set in stone' deadline for the North Terrace tram extension; privatising the trams and trains despite promising no privatisation at the last election; a failure to implement a promise to return all regional speed limits to 110 km/h; scrapping a plan to close three Service SA offices; scrapping the Liberal's signature infrastructure project GlobeLink; and now scrapping his plan to cut more than 1,000 bus stops and services in Adelaide. When is enough enough?

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to allow the question. I am not going to allow points of order for debate unless they are mighty, mighty in nature. I have made a list of those comments. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57):** What a question from a member of this parliament who has been investigated by the ICAC on multiple occasions when caught with his conversational swearing directly at public servants and failure to pay dozens and dozens and dozens of speeding fines. So excuse me, sir, for not taking this criticism very seriously whatsoever. Let me tell you what we have been doing since we have come to government—

*Mr Szakacs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cheltenham!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and that is to clean up your filthy, stinking mess. What a hopeless government they were.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I commend the work of the minister—

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** To refer to you as having created a filthy, stinking mess, sir, that is beyond the pale.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier should not have done that. I will listen to the Premier carefully. He should not have done that.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure in this place has worked tirelessly since he came to government to fix up the mess that we inherited when we came to government. A classic example, and one that every single South Australian should always be thankful for is fixing the broken promise for the Gawler line electrification, the multimillion dollar bungle that cost the taxpayers of South Australia \$50 million, which we had to write off because of the incompetence of those opposite.

Rather than complain about it, our minister has got on and he is fixing it. He is also presiding over the largest infrastructure build in the history of South Australia—\$12.9 billion. I would like to personally congratulate the minister on the outstanding work that he has done negotiating with the

federal government to bring forward projects, to bring forward money to create jobs in South Australia.

We know what those opposite did over a long period of time: their ongoing faked fights with Canberra all designed to look after their own jobs. By contrast, what we have done on this side of the house is to work very hard with the people of South Australia to clean up the mess that we inherited—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —put this state back on an appropriate trajectory, deal with a coronavirus pandemic and now switch our focus to creating more jobs in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The minister is working hand in glove with his colleagues in the cabinet to do everything that we can to get as many South Australians back to work as we possibly can. That is our focus: more jobs, lower costs, better services. Our focus is to come out of this pandemic stronger than before.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries and the member for Cheltenham can leave for the remainder of question time for repeated interjections during the Premier's answer. You have both been doing it all day.

*The honourable members for Chaffey and Cheltenham having withdrawn from the chamber:*

#### MAIN SOUTH ROAD DUPLICATION

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise whether \$23 million for the duplication of Main South Road from Seaford to Aldinga was spent in the financial year which ended yesterday?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:01):** I thank the member for Mawson for his question and do note again that what we had before us when we came to government was a big promise that was a little bit short on money, a big promise of some \$305 million-odd that did not have anywhere near that amount of money in the budget. It was something that we, over the course of our first two budgets, sought to rectify so that the money was actually there in the budget to deliver the promise that the former government put on the table—\$305 million that is there now in the budget.

This is a project that has been the subject of much investigatory work and early works over the course of the last 12 months because the difficulty was that what we had when we came into government, which is what we had on a whole series of projects, was an announcement without any homework done. There was an announcement—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —there was a press release, but there wasn't the money and there wasn't the background work done on getting the project out of the ground. The same could be said of the Hove Crossing that we are now getting on board with. The same can be said of Ovingham, which again the only reference to those projects that we could find was the subject of a pre-election press release instead of being in a budget so that it can actually be delivered. This is a project that under this government is fully funded, fully costed and will be delivered for the people of the outer south. It is only due to this government and the hard work that this government has done getting this project ready to get out of the ground.

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

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order. Has the minister finished his answer?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has finished his answer, so we will move to the member for Mount Gambier who has been patiently waiting.

### FACILITIES SERVICES

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:02):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure as well. With the Facilities Services division of DPTI being privatised from next year—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr BELL:** —can the minister confirm that under the new model regional contractors will be given the same opportunities as larger city-based contractors when it comes to maintenance of regional facilities?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:03):** I thank the member for Mount Gambier for this question. I'm not responding to the interjections, but I did hear and take heed of the interjections from members opposite because this is another classic example of, 'Do as we say, not as we did.' To say that we did not have an outsourced facilities management arrangement in South Australia is a flat-out lie because 60 per cent of the facilities management work that is being done in South Australia is already working under the outsource model.

As to the member for Mount Gambier—and I do thank him for his question because it is a very important part of what we are now going to go through in terms of the procurement process to move to a fully outsourced model in relation to facilities management—the key question that we as a cabinet have needed to satisfy ourselves about, and it's part of an election commitment that we took to the last election and the now Minister for Innovation and Skills pushed for before the last election, is to improve contestability for small business as part of that contracting arrangement.

As part of the procurement process, what tenderers are going to need to substantiate to the government is the opportunity to provide contestability. As part of these changes, what we have also done is improve contestability as a result of this, the ability for there to be more contestability when it comes to soft landscaping and other what we call handyman services and the ability for agencies to undertake small construction projects outside the contracts so local schools can pick their local contractors. That is also part of these new, updated contracting arrangements.

At the moment, almost all the work that is undertaken is already undertaken by private small businesses and medium-sized businesses right across South Australia. Those opportunities will continue, and making sure that they can continue is a key part of the procurement process.

### FLAGSTAFF ROAD UPGRADE

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (15:05):** My question is also to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** This won't be good, Stephan. Be careful.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, you can leave for the remainder of question time.

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

**Mr MURRAY:** Could the minister please update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to fixing Flagstaff Road?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:05):** I thank the member for Davenport for this question and note that he is the true champion of fixing the fourth lane on Flagstaff Road and the champion in relation to this project. It is one on which members of Davenport previous have taken up the mantle. It is one that this member for Davenport is now able to show his community that he is delivering.

This is a project that we on this side of the house thought was a good idea for a long period of time and a commitment that we took to the election. We think it is important because it will improve

commute times for local residents. We think it is important because it will provide the safest possible condition for road users. It will provide efficient access for emergency services to the suburbs connected to this road, and it will take pressure off South Road.

I think those four statements are things this house could all agree are a very, very good idea. What we have seen, though, is some Johnny-come-lately supporters of this project who have been writing to me in recent weeks, trying to claim credit for this. It is interesting because I have received correspondence from the federal member for Kingston, who does keep referring to it as Flagstaff Hill Road instead of Flagstaff Road. I have suggested maybe she gets the wording of it right if she wants to champion the project.

We have also had correspondence from the member for Hurtle Vale, who claims that she is a supporter of this project, except that when a motion with those four statements I read out earlier was debated in this house she voted against it. She voted against it and all members of the Labor Party voted against that motion, so to stand in this place now and say that they support this project is an absolute joke—an absolute joke.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order: that seems like a reflection on a vote of the house to me.

**The SPEAKER:** I've got to be honest, there were significant interjections during that. Please do not reflect on a vote of the house, minister, if you were. Let's get on with it.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Yes, sir. The other great news is that, as a result of the hard work of the Marshall Liberal government, we have actually been able to bring forward this project. It is a difficult project because the SA Water connection to the Happy Valley Reservoir that sits underneath and beside that road is an important piece of water infrastructure, and the Minister for Environment and Water has a very keen interest in ensuring that pipeline is maintained for all users of water in the southern suburbs.

Having negotiated now with SA Water in relation to relocation works that may need to go ahead, we are now able to accelerate the delivery of this project. When we originally envisaged it, major construction was going to begin in 2022. As of today, we are able to announce that the construction of this project is going to begin early next year.

This is such an important bringing forward of money for South Australians because not only is the project itself important; it is the fact that it is used by 20,000 motorists a day who are now going to get the benefit of a free-flowing, four-lane Flagstaff Road and it is also the jobs that come with it. Especially at a time when we are dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic, helping to bring forward projects like this is so important.

For the 800 metres of this 3.3 kilometre length of road, we are going to see a massive improvement in something that has been a quirk of South Australian road infrastructure for decades. Something that has been championed by members of the Liberal Party for decades will now actually be delivered under this government. What I don't think we will stomach on this side of the house is the hypocrisy of those who are jumping on board, trying to claim credit for fighting for this project when they voted against support for this project in the first place.

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** And they don't know what it's called.

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

*Grievance Debate*

#### **MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:09):** I am very sorry that the member for Finnis's dog has died. My condolences to him and his family. The question I wanted to ask him was: do you own the property you live in in Victor Harbor? Obviously, the answer is, no, he rents. The next question would have been: why would you move from a house that you own in your electorate to one that you do not? There is only one difference between the two houses: one is eligible for the country members' allowance and one is not.

What is wrong with asking those questions when now we have a minister of the Crown failing to declare ownership of another property? Guess where? Victor Harbor. What is in the water at Victor Harbor? Something special is going on in Victor Harbor. It could be the people—there are good people in Victor Harbor—the views or its proximity to the GPO. There is something special about Victor Harbor. It is not that far, but just far enough. The idea that so many Liberals are populating the branch at Victor Harbor must be of concern to one faction or another and it is cross-factional.

The member for Finnis has moved from his family home of 35 years to rent in the same seat, but he has gone to Victor Harbor. The President of the Legislative Council claims a land tax exemption for his home in Norwood and has a rental property in Victor Harbor that he claims he lives in but advertises online for rent. The photographs show a lot of fridge magnets on the fridge about house rules, little nice toiletries wrapped up and little biscuits. I hope the Premier enjoyed those little biscuits and that he put all the towels into the bathtub to be washed when he was finished, as you do at any other rental accommodation. I hope he enjoyed the mints that were on the bed, too, because in all the photographs—

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** Terry's turndown service.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Terry's turndown service. All the photographs that we saw show that this is not a family home: this is a rental property. The most concerning part about the accusations now levied against two senior Liberals in the upper house is that the gatekeeper for all the information that would either exonerate them or incriminate them is held by one of the accused. In any other system in any other part of the world, if one of the accused was the gatekeeper for all the information they would stand aside, but the Premier and all these members think it is okay that the Premier stand by this man.

The Premier made a statement to this house assuring us that Victor Harbor is Terry Stephens' home. The Premier of this state stated in unequivocal terms in the House of Assembly that Terry Stephens' principal place of residence is in Victor Harbor, despite all the overwhelming evidence that it is not. We know that his post goes to Norwood. We know that his telephone number in the White Pages is Norwood. We know that during the COVID crisis, when everyone was told to stay home, he stayed in Norwood. The dawn service—Norwood. He baked homecooked meals for Crows players who were feeling homesick at his home in Norwood. We do not see many family photographs on his Facebook site from Victor Harbor.

Now this has dragged in another minister failing to declare on his register of member's interest an investment property managed by the same company that managed the Hon. Terry Stephens' rental property. The tragedy about this is that I quite like Terry Stephens and David Ridgway. I think they are nice people. I really wish it were other Liberals who were doing this because there are plenty over there I do not like, but, unfortunately for me, the ones I do like are the ones caught up in this.

But that is the point. What is more important: friendship or the institution? Friendship or fighting corruption? The idea that parliamentarians can receive secret payments of up to \$¼ million dollars per term in property they are not living in or not entitled to do so is abhorrent. It puts at risk genuine members who claim this allowance, like the member for Stuart.

From what I can tell, he has genuinely claimed this allowance—good on him. He represents a very large electorate that is difficult to represent, as does the member for Giles. It is hard—vast distances. It is hard being here. I get it. So when people rort it, I should not be angry: the member for Stuart should be angry, the member for Flinders should be angry and the member for MacKillop should be angry because they are the ones who rely on it and rely on it being done properly, not being rorted for financial gain.

### GIBSON ELECTORATE

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:15):** It is with great pleasure I rise today to speak about some recent activities in my electorate. June has been a wonderful month. It has been great to be back out again as some of the restrictions have eased. That is very much to the credit of the people of South Australia, who have done an outstanding job. Of course, the officials from SA Health and the police commissioner have done a wonderful job in giving

the directions as they have. I think the Premier and all the team have done an outstanding job to make sure we are doing everything we can to keep South Australians as safe as possible.

As these restrictions ease, it is great to be back out in the local community. On Friday last week, I was standing in a cosy room with the residents of the Sturt Palms retirement community in Brighton. We were gathered there to celebrate the very special occasion of the birthday of Sturt Palms' oldest resident, Geoffrey Edmonds, who was turning 100 years old. Sturt Palms has a lovely, warm atmosphere. The retirees who gathered for Geoffrey's morning tea ranged in age, each with their own fascinating story, like Evelyn Kellow, aged 96, who made bullets in the war. It was wonderful to hear her reminisce about that.

Born in 1920, Geoffrey has lived all over the world, growing up in Warwickshire in the UK and working for the Air Force in New Zealand before calling Adelaide home. As I sat down next to him, I asked, 'What's the secret to living a long and happy life?' With a twinkle in his eye, Geoffrey smiled at me and he said, 'The true secret is good music.' Good music—that was his response. I take that advice on board.

Good music is something that Geoffrey knows well. He was an exceptional musician who loved to play the Spanish guitar. He told me that he once played for Nana Mouskouri, which I think is quite a remarkable achievement. It was proper and fitting, therefore, that his birthday cake featured a beautiful guitar on the front. He was suitably impressed. A massive thankyou to Melissa Bowley, the Sturt Palms manager, who organised the birthday party, and all the staff who put on a delicious morning tea to contribute to the positive atmosphere.

We know that small businesses and local residents have been doing it tough over the last few months with the COVID-19 pandemic we have all been facing. Habits as normal as meeting friends for coffee have changed amid the COVID global pandemic. Gathering restrictions mean that many normal community events do not go ahead. As we move further along the road map to recovery and as life begins to resemble what we knew before, I am very keen to hear what local residents have to say and also to support businesses in the local community.

With that in mind, it was a great pleasure to hold one of my coffee catch-ups, labelled Coffee with Corey. These catch-ups are held in local cafes and give residents the opportunity to chat with me or their neighbours about whatever local issues are on their mind. Last week, I met a group of local residents in the Next Chapter Gourmet Cafe, a fantastic cafe owned by Mervin Joshua and located inside the Marion Cultural Centre. I met residents such as Alison Budimir, who expressed concerns about local housing density, and Al-Naimi Wesam, who asked for some help with his wife's visa and some Housing SA repairs as well.

It was also great to meet some of the cafe staff, including Ryan Brown, who is keen to help the community wherever he can and volunteers at St Vincent de Paul's crisis centre as a support worker for both adults and youth. It was great just to have a chat with him and hear about the wonderful work he is doing. As we deal with the impact of the last few months, our fellowship and local support matter more and more as we reach out into our community. I am hoping that these coffee catch-ups will keep people connected. It is great to be back again face to face. A lot of the work has been online and through letters and emails over the past couple of months, so it is great to be back and supporting local businesses as well.

The Queen's 94<sup>th</sup> birthday was celebrated in June. With the milestone came the announcement of many great achievements throughout the commonwealth, including in my electorate. It was a great delight, although not a surprise, for me to read in the Queen's Birthday 2020 Honours List that Robert Korotcoff from Dover Gardens had been awarded an OAM for his service to the community. I have had the pleasure of meeting Bob a number of times. His ties to the Lions club span over half a century. Bob joined Lions club in Cairns in 1961 before moving to Adelaide in 1974. He then joined the Brighton Lions before becoming a member of the Marion club in 2003.

He works tirelessly for the greater community and has served in a number of leadership positions. He has been a true champion for Lions and the values that they bring to our community and what the organisation delivers for everyone. I want to take this moment to acknowledge him and the wonderful work he has done in his community. That award is justly deserved.

**STATE GOVERNMENT SERVICES**

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:20):** There will come a time when all of us in this place are tested in our roles as members of parliament. Those challenges can be myriad in their origins and often they are completely out of our control. But as sure as night follows day, there will come a time in all our careers, whether they be short or long, when somebody comes knocking, seeking to take things away from the communities that we represent, telling us that it is in their best interests and therefore worthy of our support.

Sometimes, the person who comes knocking is from our own party. These are some of the toughest tests of character that we will face as members of parliament. To stand up to your own party and tell them that you will not sit idly by as they strip services away from your own community is, I acknowledge, a difficult thing to do. Some members of parliament choose to take a stand publicly. Others fight behind closed doors. Then there are those members of parliament who just do not fight at all, members of parliament like the member for King and the member for Newland, who take as gospel whatever snake oil the minister is selling and become willing accomplices.

There was no fighting behind closed doors when the Minister for Transport came knocking in 2018, telling the members for King and Newland that closing their local Service SA centres in Modbury was a good idea.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr BOYER:** There was no fighting behind closed doors when the Minister for Transport came knocking again in 2018, telling the member for King and the member for Newland that not progressing with the new park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza was a good idea. There was definitely no fighting behind closed doors when the Minister for Transport came knocking yet again on the doors of the member for King and the member for Newland, telling them that closing 85 bus stops in their communities was a good idea. In fact, there was no fighting at all from the members for King and Newland on any of these cuts.

*Ms Luethen interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order.

**Ms LUETHEN:** I would like to make a point of order that the member is imputing improper motives. I take offence to the statements that he is making and I ask him to withdraw and apologise.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Mr Speaker—

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —there was no imputing of any motive whatsoever.

**The SPEAKER:** What I will do is caution the member for Wright. I was dealing with matters pertaining to other issues that are being discussed widely and thoroughly in this place and the other place. I will listen carefully to the member for Wright. He should have a fair scope on what is or is not acceptable. I will listen carefully.

**Mr BOYER:** It is true that the members for King and Newland have been presented with more challenges by their own Liberal Party colleagues in their first terms of parliament than they could have foreseen. It may forever remain a mystery to everybody in this place, at least on this side of the chamber, why the north-east has been targeted by this government, but this is no excuse. This is absolutely no excuse for not standing up for your community.

We were all elected to this place to stand up for our constituents and, by my reckoning, the members for King and Newland have been tested three times now with cuts from their own party and three times they have failed that test to stand up for their constituents.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Point of order: this is an improper reflection on a member of this house.



**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** On a point of order, this is a grievance debate and the member should be free to reflect on the decisions of the government and how it affects different parts of the metropolitan area.

**The SPEAKER:** That is true. Minister for Environment and Water, if someone takes offence then it is up to the member who takes the offence at the time to make that point of order. Standing order 125 states:

A Member may not use offensive or unbecoming words in reference to another Member. Subject to Standing Order 137, if the Member referred to takes objection to what he/she considers to be offensive or unbecoming words, the Speaker requests the Member uttering the words to withdraw them.

However, this is a grievance debate and I will need to allow some political argy-bargy. I believe it is within that scope at the moment, but if the member for Wright does step out of line then I will be forced to intervene. I ask the member for Wright to perhaps consider his comments and the way that he makes them to ensure that they are, as I am sure they will be, within the standing orders.

**Mr BOYER:** Do not be fooled: doing nothing, smelling the breeze and then waiting to see what the reaction is from one's constituents before belatedly sending out a survey to them asking what they think is not standing up for your community. Some government MPs in this place did stand up.

**Ms LUETHEN:** I raise a point of order again because I object to the comments that the member is making, because his comments are not true and he has no evidence that I did not stand up. It is very clear to my community that I have stood up on all these issues, so that is my objection.

**The SPEAKER:** A point of order on the point of order: if there is an impromptu speech—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If the member for King wishes to make some contribution on this matter, she can do so by way of a grievance contribution, or she can seek leave to make a personal explanation. But, without that, these repeated bogus points of order constitute a breach of standing order 131 about unnecessary and repeated interruption to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. What the member for King can do is she can also make a grievance contribution to counter anything that is raised. I will listen carefully. My former statements do apply. The member for Wright has the call.

**Mr BOYER:** Some government MPs in this place did stand up. The members for Davenport and Kavel played a genuine role in forcing this government to abandon these cuts. They chose to represent their constituents in the most forceful and powerful way that they could. Some of the saddest words a member of parliament can hear from a constituent are, 'What's the point because it won't make any difference?'

I admit that is something that I heard on more than one occasion over the past month as we waged our campaign to stop these bus cuts. But yesterday morning, as the leader and I met with residents of the north-east on Bicentennial Drive in Golden Grove at one of the 61 bus stops that were set for the chop in the seat of King, it was heartwarming to hear those residents express their delight that their own actions had so clearly and swiftly forced this government to back down. I genuinely hope that the contributions that those local residents made to that very successful campaign motivates them to stay involved in our democratic system and remain community activists.

I hope, too, that the next time people complain about the major political parties being too alike they pause and reflect on these past weeks. They say you never know the full value of something until it is taken away and, sadly, thousands of South Australians who rely on their bus stop to get to work, to school and to the shops had to face that realisation. I am reminded of an immortal quote by Richard Neville, the editor of the counterculture magazine *Oz*, who said, 'There is only an inch of difference between us and the conservatives, but it is an inch worth living in.' It is decisions like this—decisions to disenfranchise South Australians from our public transport system—that prove that that inch is worth fighting for.

### STUART ELECTORATE

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:29):** I rise on behalf of the people of Stuart to say a few words about the very difficult drought situation that is still affecting us and many other people throughout regional South Australia.

It has been a tough year, as I am sure everybody knows. We finished last year with very difficult drought conditions, we started off with bushfire conditions and we have moved into a global pandemic with the coronavirus. All those things would have been big enough, bad enough and difficult enough on their own, but the point I would like to make is that many of the people who were in drought before the bushfires and before the coronavirus are still in drought. It should not be forgotten that those people have been dealing with that plus the subsequent difficulties that have come along.

If I think about my electorate of Stuart, I think particularly about the people north and east of Eudunda and the people north and east of Orroroo. They are not the only ones doing it tough, but there are two very clear patches that really are still struggling, and there are certainly other patches further north in the pastoral zone as well. We have had very good rains in some places—in fact, outstanding opening rains for some of the cropping areas. We have had some very good patches of rain in some of the pastoral areas as well.

Most members of this house drive around, and if some of you head into country areas you will see crops coming up through the dirt and it will look green, shiny, fresh and lovely. That is terrific, but please do not let that be your assumed impression of all country and outback South Australia. There are people who have had several years in a row of well below average rainfall. Drought is a relative thing. Drought is very much about the rainfall you get in an area compared with the rainfall you would typically expect as an average.

You could have rainfall in an outback area that is lower than rainfall in a very good cropping area, yet that outback area might be having a good year and the cropping area might be having a bad year. So it is not just about the nominal rainfall; it is about rainfall relative to what you get because what you expect to get is what you invest for. What you expect to get is what you plan for, and what you expect to get is how you spend money sometimes that is expected to last for years and years in your ag business.

There are families who are wrestling not only with having to sell stock they do not want to sell, not only with having to try to pay bills they just cannot pay and not only with the prospect of potentially having to lose their properties, some of which have been in families for generations and generations, but there are people who are on top of all of that and dealing more with incredibly stressful mental health issues. Some of those people know it and some do not. Some of those who know it are seeking help, and some of those who know it are not seeking help.

Let me tell you that it is affecting everybody, and it is not only about agriculture. When you live and work in an agriculture district, everybody is affected: the pub is affected, the servo is affected and the schoolteachers are affected with regard to having to deal with children who are grappling with stress they do not even fully understand, and neither should they. Every single part of rural and outback life is affected by drought. I cannot make this point too strongly: there are still people in South Australia in my electorate and in other parts of the state who are under severe pressure from drought.

That might seem like nothing compared to a bushfire and nothing compared to a global pandemic, but that is not true. In many cases, the people still wrestling with drought have been affected by bushfires and the global pandemic. They are dealing with three out of three. I want to be absolutely sure that no member in this house forgets about the people in regional, rural and outback South Australia dealing with drought.

### WESTFIELD WEST LAKES CAR PARKING

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:34):** I, too, rise to speak about an issue in my electorate, the electorate of Lee. This is an issue that causes an extraordinary amount of frustration for the local community, and that is the boom gates that are installed at the West Lakes shopping centre. These boom gates, you may know, Mr Speaker, were installed in 2013, the first of their type

for any large Westfield-operated shopping centre in metropolitan Adelaide. There were mooted plans to roll out boom gates also at Tea Tree Plaza and Marion.

You can imagine the community response. Residents were outraged. These boom gates were installed at a time when football was already making the transition away from West Lakes at Football Park into the city at Adelaide Oval. The need for the boom gates had evaporated, yet Westfield barreled on. They put up their plans to have the installation of these boom gates approved and, to the credit of the local council, the City of Charles Sturt, they fought Westfield in the courts to try to stop them installing these boom gates.

Literally thousands of residents campaigned and signed a petition against these boom gates being installed, yet Westfield barreled on and installed them in 2013. What we have seen for the last six or seven years since these boom gates have been installed has been a debacle for local residents. There are many elderly people in the western suburbs who go to West Lakes who are forced to contend with the difficulty of reaching for and obtaining a parking ticket, the difficulty of having to be responsible for paying for parking if they stay for more than three hours, or even if they exit the car park, having to lean out of their car and use the ticket machines.

But on top of that, of course, staff who were previously able to park in the sealed car park at Westfield at West Lakes have been forced instead to park hundreds of metres away on the now vacated land at Football Park, which means at this time of year in this sort of weather that we are told we are going to experience in the next 24 hours, when it is meant to be windy, it is going to be dark early, it is going to bucket down with rain, we have staff who have to walk hundreds of metres from that unsealed car park just to get to work.

Bear in mind that many of these staff are teenagers. Many of them are young girls with their first job—it could be in retail, it could be in food service or fast food—and Westfield has put these young members of the western suburbs community in an unsafe environment. Of course, what is happening in the car park at the moment? It is barely used. The residents who go there on any day, even on the weekend, must use up somewhere in the order of 15 per cent to 25 per cent of the car park.

Westfield claims, 'We have set aside a little area for staff to park there but we do not want them parking next to the door because that is an inconvenience for people who are coming here for shopping.' So they have created a limited-space area that does not accommodate all staff and, if staff want to park in there because they feel unsafe parking over the road at Football Park, then they have to pay up to \$35 a day to do so. It is a parking fee, which I might add has only just been increased.

Of course, it is not just staff car parking which is impacted by these boom gates. There is a bus interchange at Westfield West Lakes as well and bus patronage has plummeted since people have been prevented from parking in the car park and using the bus to get to work, study or their other commitments. To Westfield's credit, they removed the boom gates at the commencement of the coronavirus restrictions; it made sense. They do not want people unnecessarily touching the parking equipment and risking the spread of germs.

Those boom gates are still off and I wrote to Westfield several weeks ago asking them to leave them off because in the period of time that those boom gates have been off we have had both staff and shoppers park in the car park. Does the car park get full? No. Is there a lack of room for people to park at the car park? No. Are more people able to use the bus services because they can park next to the interchange? Yes. The benefits from removing these boom gates have been terrific, and what did Westfield reply to me at the end of last week and what have they confirmed to the media today? They are putting the boom gates back in on Monday 6 July.

All we would ask is that this corporate behemoth do the right thing by the very people they ask to shop in their shopping centres: remove these boom gates and start showing some respect to the residents of the western suburbs again.

#### **KING ELECTORATE**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:40):** It is with great pleasure that I rise in the house today to talk about some of the key priorities that are making progress and how I and the Marshall Liberal

government continue to listen, fight for and deliver better services for people living in King. Firstly, I will mention the terrific progress being made to improve our local health services.

Under the Marshall Liberal government, palliative care options are increasing and diversifying to increase access throughout not only King but also throughout the state. The Marshall Liberal government is making substantial investments in palliative care. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to more effectively supporting people in the final stages of their life, and \$16 million is being invested from 2018-19 and 2020-21 to:

- expand community outreach palliative care services from the current weekday service to provide a 24-hour a day service seven days a week; and
- to deliver on the \$96 million Modbury Hospital redevelopment, which will include a 20-bed palliative care unit and which is forecast to be completed in December 2021.

Additionally, a \$58 million expansion to double the capacity of the Lyell McEwin Hospital's emergency department is currently underway and due for completion in 2022, and of course we have already delivered the significant expansion of the car parking facility at Lyell McEwin. The Lyell McEwin Hospital and Modbury Hospital deserve this investment and expansion, as they provide health services for around 402,000 people living in northern Adelaide, as well as people in regional areas.

The northern area of Adelaide is currently the highest population growth area in South Australia, and by 2026 it is expected a quarter of the state's population will be living in the north. The Lyell McEwin Hospital is the biggest employer in the City of Playford, employing 5,185 people, and at Modbury Hospital we are certainly showing people in King that we have listened to their feedback. We are returning health services to and easing pressure on our emergency departments, providing access to a higher level of care closer to home, growing and strengthening surgical services, providing more privacy and a home-like environment for palliative care, upgrading facilities and enhancing the experience for patients, visitors and staff.

This major upgrade of Modbury Hospital will provide facilities that meet the needs of patients, staff and visitors now and into the future. In terms of education, it is also so exciting to see our Marshall Liberal government investing in critical local infrastructure with the \$15.5 million upgrade to the Golden Grove High School. Golden Grove High has over 1,300 students right now, and this will increase significantly in student numbers in 2022 when the year 7 transition to high school takes place.

Golden Grove High is now 31 years old, and over the past 12 months there have been significant building improvements and additions to the facilities in the surrounding Gleeson College and Pedare Christian College at the same location, and they have each successfully created more modern learning spaces for their students. We are now making a similar investment in Golden Grove High to ensure that the King community access equitable learning outcomes at this important site.

Lastly, I wish to highlight the good news about recent announcements made at Salisbury East High School. The Minister for Education paid us a visit to outline the new year 7 to high school establishment grant funding arrangements, and he chatted with our year 10 students Sharif Sharifullah, Seyyed Ahmadi and Amber Pratt about the prospect of the year 7s becoming part of the Salisbury East High School from 2022 onwards. Salisbury East High School will receive at least \$120,000 of new funding, and it will be used to update the internal environment that will welcome the year 7s to high school. This is in addition to over \$300,000, which the school received recently to update the facilities.

You can hear more about the establishment of these grants and listen to the proud way that our students' views were not only shared at the high school but also shared on 7NEWS Adelaide. I am really proud of the investment we are making in King and the fact that we will continue to deliver better services that matter.

*Matter of Privilege*

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:45):** Sir, I rise on a matter of privilege. Today in question time I asked the Premier the following:

Has the Premier's Minister for Trade and Investment failed to declare on his register of member's interest his ownership of a holiday rental apartment in the seaside town of Victor Harbor over a period of several years? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

I went on to explain it and then the Premier replied, and I quote:

I thank the member for bringing that to my attention. I wasn't aware of that, but I am happy to look into that matter.

I then went on to ask him, and I quote:

My question is to the Premier. Has the Minister for Trade and Investment breached the Ministerial Code of Conduct by failing to declare an investment property on his register of member's interest?

The Premier then replied, and I quote:

I just refer the member to my previous answer.

On two occasions I asked the Premier a question, he referred me to his first answer and his first answer stated he was not aware. In the other place, at the same time, the Hon. Kyam Maher asked the Minister for Trade and Investment, the Hon. David Ridgway, and I quote:

Supplementary arising from the original answer: minister, when did you first inform your Premier of your oversight for the second failure to declare property that you own?

The minister replied:

I thank the honourable member for his question. As far as I know, the Premier's office was aware yesterday.

I believe the Premier has deliberately and intentionally misled the parliament and that a prima facie case exists. The Premier deliberately withheld information from the house to avoid questioning. I ask that you give a prima facie case to establish a privileges committee. I ask that you give consideration to my matter of privilege and rule if a motion to establish a privileges committee should be given precedence over other business in the House of Assembly. I will furnish you, sir, with the *Hansard*.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for West Torrens. If the member for West Torrens could produce all relevant documentation to me, I will review that and come back to the house as to whether I believe that prima facie there exists a matter of privilege to be pursued.

#### *Bills*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS) (ENERGY PRODUCTIVITY) BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 June 2020.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:48):** I want to raise some points today in regard to the Statutes Amendment (Electricity and Gas) (Energy Productivity) Bill 2020. The Statutes Amendment (Electricity and Gas) (Energy Productivity) Bill 2020 amends the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997 to enable implementation of a new retailer energy productivity scheme (REPS).

The Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme (REES) is a South Australian government energy efficiency scheme that provides incentives for South Australian households and businesses to save energy by establishing energy efficiency targets to be met by electricity and gas retailers. The retailers meet these targets by delivering eligible energy efficiency activities to households and businesses.

The Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme was established by the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997, and associated regulations—the Electricity (General) Regulations 2012 and the Gas Regulations 2012. The REES underwent a review in 2019 and the review recommended that the scheme be expanded from 2021 to include energy demand management and energy demand response activities.

The proposed new retailer energy productivity scheme (REPS) will include activities that reduce household or business end-use energy consumption, reduce household or business end-use energy costs for the same household or business outcome, and/or provide broader energy market

benefits, such as reduced wholesale electricity prices, reduced electricity network costs and improved energy system security.

Amendments must be made to the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997 to ensure all energy productivity activities can be supported in the scheme, particularly energy demand management and energy demand response of the kind outlined above. The final REPS design will be contained within regulations consistent with existing practice for the scheme.

I think it is absolutely vital that we make things more efficient in regard to energy in this state, especially when we look back and see what happened before we came to power. We saw the former government rush headlong into renewables. There is no problem with transitioning to renewables as such but, when you do it far too quickly, you see situations like we had on 28 September 2016, when the lights went out right across South Australia, affecting 850,000 households and businesses.

It is outrageous that something like that could happen in this day and age—it was only about four years ago. We were actually sitting in this chamber on that day. It was sometime after 4pm when things shut down. We were fortunate, in this place, that our emergency generators kicked in and kept the place alive. We still hosted some meetings that night, but obviously the dinner service was scrapped.

It was extremely difficult, not just here in the city but right across the regions in South Australia. In fact, I think the only place that had any lights on was Kangaroo Island, because they had a generator system to keep them going. Why did we have such a cascading failure? It was because of this headlong rush into renewables and not transitioning sensibly by taking up more use of gas and just transitioning steadily.

We as a state have picked up the use of solar energy and wind energy and embraced that. I certainly have installed solar panels on my properties and they do a great job in reducing power costs, which was the main reason I did it. Many thousands of South Australians have done the same thing. We also have a massive number of wind farms, wind turbine technology and wind turbine generated power across the state.

What we saw in this headlong rush by the former government was that the coal-fired power station at Port Augusta shut down and the Leigh Creek coalmine shut down. They employed something like over 600 people between them. Not only did we lose a lot of that surety for keeping the lights on and keeping business functioning but we also lost that sustainability of the grid.

My father-in-law, Richard Abernethy, used to work at the Port Augusta power station. This is what happens when you rush headlong without taking a good look at what is going on. That is why it is so good that we as a government and the Liberal Party are looking with the regulators at the interconnector through to New South Wales, which will be about a \$1½ billion dollar project. Obviously, we have the Heywood interconnector and we have the interconnector that runs through the Riverland as well, connecting South Australia to Victoria, which then, through a backhanded way, connects us into New South Wales and Queensland.

The sooner we get interconnection built through to New South Wales, the sooner we can utilise the assets that we have here in solar generation and wind generation, so that when the sun is shining and the wind is blowing—obviously both of those things do not happen all the time—and we have an abundance of those two sources of power, we can be connected through to New South Wales, apart from the two interconnectors we have through to Victoria, and share that power far more efficiently with the grid. In saying that, when we are short on those sources of power—and obviously we have gas generators here as well—we can import power from New South Wales. There is still a significant amount of that generated by coal.

These productivity arrangements are where we need to go and the Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme will put those incentives in place for South Australian households and businesses to make sure they save energy costs. To save energy costs, it is pretty simple: you save what energy you need to use and give people those incentives and that helps everyone on a collective basis.

We have seen what has happened in the past when the former government had to rely on diesel generation. This is the government that was racing headlong into renewables and next thing there are hundreds of millions of dollars spent on diesel generators that would burn 80,000 litres of

diesel an hour. You would not need a truck servicing these generators. I think that you would want to have access to a ship. To my knowledge, we have not had to utilise these generators.

I must commend our government and the direction that the minister, the member for Stuart, has taken in regard to managing energy in this state. They are obviously cognisant of the fact that we are connected into the grid with Victoria but that into the future we need that vital interconnection into New South Wales that will give much more productivity and reliability and will reduce costs to South Australian electricity users.

It is interesting that in the past the former government were big fans of more interconnection, but all of a sudden when it became our policy coming into government they decided they did not like it. It is interesting to note that. Efficiencies that can be brought right across the state will assist household and business end-use energy costs. It will provide broader energy market benefits, such as reduced wholesale electricity prices, reduced electricity network costs and improved energy system security.

All those things are vital as we move into the future to make sure we have the most efficient network that we can have, the most reliable network that we can have and the most cost-efficient network that we can have for our households and businesses in this state. I commend the bill.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:00):** I can indicate to the house that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this matter. The Statutes Amendment (Electricity and Gas) (Energy Productivity) Bill has nothing to do with almost any of what the previous speaker was talking about. Given your silence, sir, no doubt you are allowing me to indulge in some response.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Let's see how that goes, member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Good to see it is a fair hand for all members.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes. I have said in this place before, if members can relate their contribution on a particular bill back to their electorate, then I am actually happy with that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I can first relieve the house to know that the opposition will be supporting this measure, although we will be asking some questions in committee. I understand that generally stakeholders are supportive of this measure. Let's talk about the origins of the bill. The Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme was a scheme that was started nearly 10 years ago, I think, maybe even longer. There is a scheduled 10-year review, and that review was tabled in this parliament last December by the minister, I understand, although I stand to be corrected on that.

I will just read from the executive summary of the report tabled in the parliament, Review into the South Australian Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme, December 2019. The Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme (REES) commenced in 2009 under two acts: the Electricity Act and the Gas Act. It is governed by part 4 of the Electricity (General) Regulations 2012 and the Gas Regulations 2012. The threshold consideration in the review, we are told, is whether the scheme should continue beyond 2020.

I am pleased that the review has recommended that we continue to have a form of REES to December 2030, although I note the government has introduced amendments to the bill to amend parts of it to remove the term 'efficiency' and substitute it with 'productivity' throughout the bill. The review recommended that the REES apply from 1 January 2021, and the report goes on to say it is to have the following key features:

- A ten-year continuation with two five-yearly target resets and a review to be conducted in 2029.
- Retailers will be obligated to deliver the scheme.

So we are maintaining an obligation on retailers to deliver the scheme. The report continues:

- Set the scheme objective to be: 'To improve energy productivity for households, businesses and the broader energy system, with a focus on low-income households. This will reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions, whilst improving human health.'

The opposition is pleased that low-income households are specifically mentioned in the report. I am yet to see where low-income households are mentioned in the amendment bill. That is not to say it is not mentioned in the body of the bill, which may maintain it. I will make some remarks on that when

we get into the committee stage but by and large, given that the focus will still remain on low-income households, the opposition is broadly supportive. The report continues:

- Have an energy productivity target expressed [in a gigajoule]
- Include a residential target—

I am assuming within that gigajoule target. I understand that, within the parameters of the committee stage, I can hopefully ask the minister whether he will include that or whether that is an extra requirement. The report continues:

- Include a priority...target, comprising the current Scheme priority group as well as rental households—

which is a welcome addition—

- Include a regional obligation on retailers—

which I think is very important. Regional communities deserve to have energy productivity in the REES applying to them in an equal way, given the tyranny of distance. They recommend an:

...obligation on retailers in circumstances where activity is delivered in regional areas fall below 15 per cent of the overall target, in the year following the shortfall.

So they include a regional obligation if the target falls short in that year for regional communities. Key features also include:

- Incentives for demand response activities as well as energy savings in the commercial and residential sectors—

which I think is exciting. It continues:

- Require customer co-payments for all commercial and industrial activities and residential activities except for priority group households.

I understand that that is a change, and that was not delivered to me in the briefing. My understanding of the REES is that households are levied about \$13 to \$15 per year. Audits are done on your home and augmentations are made to your home to improve energy efficiency. That is usually expressed in the most common way: changing light globes, putting energy efficient light globes in people's homes. Sometimes it is door snakes, sir. You would be surprised how much difference a door snake can make. Insulating windows with strips and all sorts of other augmentations can improve the energy efficiency of a home. In some extreme cases, there are other works that are much more expensive.

I see here that requiring a customer co-payment is a new requirement. I will be interested to know the minister's view on that and whether or not he will support it; I assume he will. I would like to understand whether that will be means-tested. What is the threshold? How does the state identify people who are low income and not low income? Are they relying on them being a part of a bracket of the commonwealth tax code rather than the state tax code, or is it people simply receiving some kind of concession, like a pensioner or disability concession? I would be interested to know who the cohort is made up of.

They also recommend, of course, transparency measures; transparency is always a good thing. The report recommends the removal of residential audits and an obligation on retailers to meet the annual energy audit target featured in the REES that apply from 1 January next year. I assume that is because it is being replaced with a productivity target measured in gigajoules. I would be interested to hear what the minister has to say about that.

The review recommends a smooth transition, which is always good. I am interested to understand how the restriction of the carryover credits from the current scheme will operate with a transition to the new scheme and whether they will be abandoned, counted. These are matters that I would like the minister to express in his closing remarks to the parliament, if he can do that or, if he cannot find that out, if he could do it between the houses and provide that to the opposition that would be greatly useful.

The review recommends the following features to be part of the implementation framework, I will read it from the report on page 3. It goes on to say, and I quote:

- No 900 GJ limit for commercial lighting upgrades—



so no threshold on commercial properties. It continues:

- Allow commercial lighting upgrades to be delivered more than once per premises, where it can be demonstrated the lamps being replaced had not previously been replaced for the purposes of the scheme.

I think that makes sense. If you have already spent some money at your premises, I think this means if there are further augmentations that can be made or further lights that can be changed, you are not excluded because you have done some work previously, which I think is okay. It also includes:

- Introduction of new commercial and industrial activities, such as upgrades of fans, pumps and motors.

One of the biggest expenses commercial operations have in maintaining lower power prices is the operation of energy intensive equipment they have, usually fans, pumps, condensers—all sorts of things.

It goes on to say that they want to align some of the scheme's activity with interstate schemes, where appropriate. That does concern me a little bit. I am not quite sure if other states are as progressive as South Australia, but I am sure the minister can outline that. It could be a completely harmless recommendation that the opposition is happy to support. The review is talking about a framework to align the scheme with interstate schemes and overcome the landlord-tenant split incentive problem.

What incentive is there for a landlord to improve the energy efficiency of a home for which they do not pay power costs? It will be interesting to see how the minister finds a way to overcome that because that is a big issue with the concerned sector, especially SACOSS. A lot of their clients are in rental accommodation and there is almost no incentive whatsoever for a landlord to put in energy efficient equipment because the landlords do not pay the power bills. It is an interesting problem to try to overcome.

I am concerned about 'assist customers with financing for deeper retrofits'. I am not quite sure I like the idea of a government-run scheme that is encouraging greater indebtedness of businesses in exchange for work being done to improve energy productivity or efficiency. It will be interesting to see what the minister's view on that is. There is also 'other mechanisms'—whatever they may be—'to incentivise deeper retrofits in priority group households', the ones we mentioned earlier.

According to the tabled report, the background is that under the REES energy retailers are set annual targets for delivery of energy efficient activities to households and businesses. Retailers with larger residential customer bases are set targets to deliver a prescribed amount of energy efficiency activities to priority group households and to provide energy audits to priority group vulnerable households. The minister currently sets the target for that to be achieved under REES and they are apportioned to each retailer with an obligation to implement a list of pre-approved energy efficiency activities that can help meet the retailer's obligation to these targets.

The review was given three points and a consultant, Common Capital, was commissioned. I do not know how they were engaged and whether that was through a competitive process or whether it was simply someone that the agency already had on their books. That is also something I would be very interested to know, because this is a very, very important 10-year review. I would be fascinated to know whether or not there was a competitive process to choose Common Capital, not that I cast any aspersions on their work.

Apparently the parliament has been informed that the independent evaluation conducted by Common Capital found that the scheme has been an effective policy tool. That is interesting, because the Liberal Party went to the election I think twice promising to remove REES to try to lower power prices, in 2010 and 2014. Here we are today with the minister tabling a report that he commissioned finding that it was an effective policy tool and scheme. I think that shows that the former shadow energy ministers—not the current energy minister but the ones preceding him—who argued to remove this scheme were wrong and that Labor was vindicated in keeping this scheme operating.

It found that it was effective at delivering its objectives, it was efficient by delivering a net economic benefit while meeting those objectives, it was equitable by delivering benefits to households and low-income households across the state, and it was administratively simple, keeping

costs in line with similar schemes. I go back to the point that on two occasions the Liberal Party wanted to abolish this scheme altogether.

The cost-benefit analysis of the scheme performance found that the scheme delivered, over its lifetime, 180,000 energy-efficient upgrades to households, businesses and low-income households from 2015 to 2017 and delivered a positive net economic benefit of \$156 million to the state's economy. It supported \$8.5 million in gigajoules of energy savings for South Australian households and businesses, and it is on track to deliver \$1 billion in energy bill savings to South Australian households and businesses over a life of implementing energy efficiency activities, from 2015 to today, over a five-year period—\$1 billion. That is not my finding, it is the government's.

There was \$328 million in energy savings for household bills, of which \$155 million in energy bills were for priority low income households; that is, because of the REES, low-income households saved over \$150 million in their power costs. This is a scheme that members opposite wanted abolished. Importantly for conservative members of the house, there was \$720 million in savings for the business community of South Australia through the REES—extraordinary numbers.

It reduced greenhouse gas emissions by over 450,000 tonnes in two years and is on track to reduce emissions by over one million tonnes from activities over five years, from 2015 to 2020. It performs well when you compare it with other Australian jurisdictions. So the scheme gets a tick on all counts: it is simple and cost-effective, it helps people who need it the most, it creates jobs, it helps businesses and households and it helps the environment, and the members opposite wanted to kill it. It is a shame, but I am pleased that we are seeing it continue in a different iteration.

There was vast consultation. I understand that SACOSS were consulted, as well as EnergyAustralia, Origin, AGL, ERM, the Australian Energy Council, the Ombudsman, the Energy Efficiency Council, Business SA, Lumo and a whole series of organisations in the concern sector, including UnitingCare Wesley, Your Energy, Demand Manager, Ecovantage and the Energy Savings Industry Association. From what I can tell from the published reports, there was overwhelming support for the scheme. You could see the self-interest of some of the retailers compared to the concern sector; it was pretty obvious. But I think that the government has, by and large, found a good balance.

I get to the findings and recommendations of the report, and this is where the rubber starts hitting the road. After the consultant found that the scheme works on all these different levels, he recommended to the South Australian government that we:

- (a) Continue to have a retailer energy efficiency scheme beyond 31 December 2020.
- (b) Commence the new REES on 1 January 2021, for a ten-year continuation with two five-yearly target resets and a review to be conducted in 2029.
- (c) Restrict credit carryovers from the current scheme to 20 per cent of the 2020 target.

I am interested to know how the minister is going to do that. The recommendations continue:

The credit carryover restriction is proposed to apply in 2021 only, and carried-over credits will be converted to reflect the credit values applying from 2021.

Given that we are no longer looking at efficiency and productivity, I am not quite sure how you carry over these credits to productivity from a scheme that was looking at efficiency, but I am sure the minister's advisers can help explain that to the house.

Most stakeholders supported the continuation of the REES beyond 2020 and some even suggested that it be longer than the six-year framework. So we have reached a threshold now where, after the climate wars, we have moved an inch where an energy efficiency/productivity scheme that levies households to fund efficiency measures is now bipartisan. That is a good outcome, and I commend the current government for seeing the error of their ways previously. They want to have a new objective. Rather than efficiency, they want to move to, and I quote:

...improve energy productivity for households, businesses and the broader energy system, with a focus on low-income households. This will reduce energy costs and greenhouse gas emissions, whilst improving human health.

That is a good objective; however, that objective has not found its way into the body of amendments before us. I understand there may be regulations the government wishes to implement after the bill has passed, but these are the questions I would like to ask of the minister.

But it is not unusual for the objectives to be amended from time to time. We did. I did, as energy minister. In 2014, it was changed to reduce household and business energy use with a focus on low-income households, providing energy costs and greenhouse gas emission benefits. So from time to time, they are changed. It is not necessarily reflected in legislation but it would be nice to know exactly how the government hopes to do that. In terms of regional and remote participation, the review recommends that the South Australian government, and I quote:

Include a regional obligation on retailers in circumstances where activities delivered in regional areas fall below 15 per cent of the overall target, in the year following the shortfall.

They also go on to recommend to avoid future network costs. The energy productivity recommendation was:

- (a) Avoid future network costs and put downward pressure on wholesale electricity prices by incentivising demand response activity as well as energy savings in the commercial and residential sectors.
- (b) Have an energy productivity target, expressed using a gigajoules (GJ) metric.

This is very important. The government went to the election promising a reduction in power prices of \$302 per annum. They are nowhere near it. The member for Newland went out to every household in his electorate and said, 'Vote for me and I will lower your power prices by \$302 per year in real terms within four years.' They are nowhere near it. The member for Heysen did the same. The member for King did the same. She went door to door and boasted about how much she had doorknocked in King, promising to lower power prices by \$302 per year. She is nowhere near that target. She should be held accountable for that by her constituents.

They should be hoping and praying that something like this may assist because in terms of network charges SA Power Networks (SAPN) have no better business anywhere in the world than they have here thanks to the Treasurer of South Australia, the Hon. Rob Lucas MLC. The contract that he signed in the 1990s last century gifting them control of our distribution network has made South Australia's distribution network the most profitable in the entire stable of SAPN's parent company. They make more here than anywhere else in the world, courtesy of members' appetite.

They make a lot of money. They have even created their own companies now to do the repair work. Get this: SA Power Networks used to employ South Australian contractors to do their line work. What they do now is they go to their regulator and they get an approval to do a certain amount of line work. They have created their own company now, which they own, and, surprise, surprise, they win all the contracts—not a bad way to do business at all.

It is not good for the consumer, not good for the long-suffering energy customer and not good for households but great for its Hong Kong-based headquarters. And Rob Lucas has a lot to answer for for that contract, which was released after the confidentiality period required in cabinet and which we were able to release publicly to see exactly what Rob Lucas signed us up to for nearly 200 years of a monopoly transfer—a transfer of wealth not risk, and not to South Australian businesses but to foreign-owned businesses that are located offshore in non-democratic countries that do not have our best interests at heart.

The member for King and the member for Newland should be very concerned if they cannot meet that target because the Labor candidates in those seats will be reminding everyone of a promise that the members for King and Newland made about lowering power prices by \$302 per year which, of course, they are nowhere near meeting. But this goes, hopefully, some way to lowering network costs, but we will see, because they are fundamentally changing this energy efficiency scheme to a productivity scheme.

We know from a review that the scheme as it is works. We know that it has saved businesses \$750 million in five years alone and households over \$150 million, so we know that, as a benefit, we have over \$1 billion and lower greenhouse gas emissions. The government has given us a scheme and a report that works, and now they are changing it and the changes will be owned by members

opposite. I do not have access to the expert advisers that the government does who are the ones advising the government on this scheme, but we must keep faith with them.

The report goes on to recommend in terms of commercial/industrial activity eligibility for the scheme that the government not include a limit for commercial lighting upgrades. I assume that means that there is no limit to the energy value of the lighting upgrades that can occur, but it is simply limited by the money in the scheme—I am just extrapolating; I could be wrong—and again, as I said, allows multiple upgrades at the same premise: if it had one before, it can have one again.

They are also recommending that the South Australian government incentivise upgrades in larger businesses by introducing new commercial industrial activities, such as upgrades of fans, pumps and motors, incentivise larger businesses by introducing new methods, such as the NABERS baseline method, the power factor correction method and the project impact assessment method. I will confess to the house, I am not an expert on those methods, and I would like the minister to provide me a briefing offline on how those methods work so that I can get a greater understanding of what they are.

It then refers to a residential target, which makes sense, and a priority group target, which includes rental households with a definition of a priority group and a review to update the scheme rules to allow for opportunities for the landlord-tenants split incentive program.

This is the part where I think it gets a little bit controversial, but I am happy to be convinced by the government. The review recommends:

- a) Require co-payment for all residential activities, except for priority group households.
- b) Incentivise residential activities that reduce peak demand or increase demand response capability.
- c) Consider options to assist customers with financing for deeper retrofits.
- d) Consider other mechanism to incentivise deeper retrofits in priority group households.

What are those mechanisms? If you are a priority group and you are a landlord, your land tax has gone up and council rates have gone up because of the bin tax. I am not quite sure what incentives the government is going to offer or can offer a landlord for a deeper retrofit in a priority group. I have concerns about co-payments for residential properties, but I am happy to be convinced by the government that this makes sense. I would like to know what is the value of the co-payment. What level do we get up to?

If we go through the actual bill, from what I can tell basically most of the amendment bill just deletes the word 'efficiency' and substitutes 'productivity', deletes 'energy efficiency shortfall' and replaces it with 'energy productivity shortfall', deletes 'REES' and deletes 'efficiency'. It does the same to the Gas Act, and that is it. That is all the bill does, and the government will release regulations later to tell us exactly how the scheme will work.

The opposition is going to support the government on this measure. We have a few concerns but nothing that I think would require any amendments or any parliamentary delays. However, I found interesting the remarks by the previous speaker about the headlong rush into renewables. I am not sure if the member for—

**Mr Pederick:** Hammond—you will work it out one day.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —yes, I will; you are easily forgettable—Hammond was here in parliament when the scheme was introduced to incentivise solar panels. The then Labor government wanted a short five-year scheme to incentivise solar panels being put on roofs with a feed-in tariff. The Liberal Party combined with the Greens to increase that scheme to make it last nearly two decades, and pay a very large tariff, and then today complained about a headlong rush into renewable energy. A cursory look at that scheme would show that the Liberal Party are guilty of what they have accused us of, but it is fair to say that people in those schemes are very pleased.

With those few words, I thank the minister for his briefing. I thank the minister for making his officers available. I do not think there will be any concerns about this legislation, other than the matters I have raised in my second reading remarks. It is going to be very difficult to get the answers I want out of committee because the questions in the bill relate to the deletion of certain words and the insertion of others. Most of the review into the Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme and the way

the government is going to operate it will be available through the regulations, which will not be tabled for a while.

I would ask for the committee's indulgence to ask a few questions of the minister. If it is not possible and the house is not up to it I would like to arrange another briefing between the houses with the minister and his officers just to go through exactly how the scheme will work and how the co-contributions will work. I am very concerned about the financing options talked about in the review. I do not like the idea of businesses entering into greater levels of debt now, when obviously commercial activity and industrial activity are weaker because of COVID, and the government is bringing out a scheme to make us more energy efficient but it is going to require co-payments and it may require borrowings. That does concern me a little bit.

But by and large I am glad the review was tabled and published. It does prove that the REES worked. In fact, it vindicates the current minister because his predecessors wanted to abolish REES, and the minister was the first Liberal minister to reverse that policy in support of REES. He deserves credit for that, for making up his own mind about the benefits of the scheme. As I said earlier, there is \$328 million in savings to homes, \$720 million in savings for businesses and nearly a million tonnes of CO<sub>2</sub> reduced because of this scheme. So we have a scheme that works, we know it works, we know it is efficient and we know it is easy to administer. People understand it and now we are changing it.

The opposition is taking a leap of faith with the government on this matter, but I think intuitively the minister is right: energy productivity and demand response measures are probably a better way to decrease network costs in the long run because building bigger and more expensive networks is not the way forward. I commend the government on this and I look forward to a speedy passage through the house with a few questions in committee. If the minister cannot answer them now, I am happy to have a briefing afterwards.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:34):** I appreciate that. I meant no disrespect by the fact that I could not be here; I just had another very pressing engagement, so I was not able to hear all the shadow minister's contribution. Yes, he is quite right: there is an enormous amount in the regulations. That is not new or different, but it is frustrating, though.

I remember sitting through this process as a shadow minister comfortable with the principles of some bills but understanding that the devil was in the detail. If the regs went one way, then happy days; if the regs went another way, it would be a disaster. That is not something that is being done deliberately, but it is something I know the shadow minister understands is often part of the process.

With the support of one of my key advisers, who will be here very shortly, we will give as much information as possible during the committee stage. If there are things that we cannot help with, then we will certainly provide the best briefing we can between the houses. It is a pretty straightforward bill but, yes, the regulations are very important.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** With your indulgence, sir, if you were listening to my remarks, which I know you do studiously when you are in the chair, by and large the amendment bill just deletes words and replaces them with new words. The bulk of my questions are on the tabled report that formulates the basis of the amendments. I do not wish to compromise the committee at any stage, so I will be asking questions about the thinking behind changing 'efficiency' to 'productivity'. If it comes in conflict with the house or with the committee, I am happy to do this between the houses. I do not want to waste the time of the parliament.

**The CHAIR:** It sounds reasonable, member for West Torrens. I assume your questions relate to the clauses?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Okay, title: how many of the recommendations into the review has the government accepted?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We have tabled the report but have not implemented them yet and have not made a final decision, but the expectation is that all of them will be delivered. I put a very clear caveat on that: all of them I am comfortable with in principle, but I reserve my right to adjust that. That is the best answer I can give you.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The government has made a virtue out of tabling regulations on other matters and other bills before other committees of the parliament as a guide for the committee to know exactly what the outcome of the bill is. I do note that the short title of the bill is 'energy productivity', which changes it from 'energy efficiency', so the government has made a threshold decision to move from efficiency to productivity. What I am confused about is that if you have made that threshold decision and it is not on the basis of the report, on what basis is it?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Where I think I can help the member is that it is not a threshold decision to change from efficiency to productivity. My view is that productivity includes efficiency, so it is actually expanding it. All the things that were available under the REES, and are available under the REES, would still be available under the REPS, so it is a broadening out, not a shift from one to the other.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The government is being advised on a gigajoule metric for energy productivity. I note that for some changes, such as lamps, it is mentioned in the report that you are not using a gigajoule target. What is the target in doing these measures? If productivity is the objective and the report recommends you express that in gigajoules—what is the productivity in terms of gigajoules?—and the report then recommends for some commercial activities to not use gigajoules, what is the measure? What is the requirement on a retailer when gigajoules is not the relevant target for a business? Is it dollars?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The answer is that all the targets would be in gigajoules and support, in regard to conversions and formulas and how to transfer an implementation of a project, if you like, towards a gigajoule target, exists and will be shared with the proponent as and whenever necessary.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Given your previous answer, and again I note you have said previously that you have not accepted the report yet, the report on page 19, point 5.6 of the recommendations, says 'not include' a gigajoule target for commercial lighting upgrades. It is not a big point. I am not trying to dig a ditch over this, but how does a retailer know how much to invest in an upgrade in a commercial premise if it is not restricted by gigajoules, or are you rejecting this recommendation and will be having a gigajoule?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Just to be sure we are not at cross-purposes here, are you talking about the Common Capital report or the government's?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am talking about the government's Review into the South Australian Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme. I am going on the document your office gave me.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I do not doubt it, but we are all human and we are just looking for page 17 at the moment.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That is alright. We can do it between the houses. I am not fussed. This report, Review into the South Australian Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme, that was tabled—

*The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It was not tabled? This one here?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Yes.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That report is the one I am quoting from. The findings and recommendations on page 20 talk about incentivising upgrades in larger businesses, such as upgrades of fans, pumps and motors, which I think is common sense. It is going to require a co-payment for industrial activities.

The body of the report talks about financing opportunities. Is the government considering establishing a financing mechanism, or is the government contemplating partnering with the commonwealth, with its financing opportunities for green initiatives? Is the government saying to retailers and their customers, 'If you wish to upgrade, your co-contribution will be X. You can finance it yourself or you can put your money up'? Is the government going to be offering its own financing model?

**The CHAIR:** Before the minister takes that question, member for West Torrens, you pre-empted some of your questions at the beginning. We are on clause 2, which deals with commencement, so it is a bit of a long bow.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The whole thing is a long bow, sir.

**The CHAIR:** It looks like the minister is preparing to answer it, but just bear in mind we are talking about a bill with clauses. I am prepared to take the question. You understand; you pre-empted it yourself—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I am a digger down on my luck, sir.

**The CHAIR:** —that some of the questions would come from the report that you are referring to now.

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

**The CHAIR:** Your question really should be how the government intends to deal with those recommendations, if at all, in relation to this bill.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We are not suggesting that there will be a government funding program, but we are suggesting that we will do our very best to find partners who might be willing to work in with this. A good example of that is the Home Battery Scheme, where the state government has money towards the subsidy of the purchase price of the battery, but some federal money came in from Clean Energy Finance Corporation, which is administered through RateSetter, which supports loans for the balance of the purchase price of the battery and potentially the solar as well.

It is early days. We are consulting on that. It will not be taxpayers' money going towards it, but it will be taxpayers' effort, if you like, to try to put some support package like that together for these businesses.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** On a matter close to your heart, sir, regional communities—

**The CHAIR:** Indeed.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** —on page 15, the report states 'include a regional obligation on retailers'. I imagine that will be expressed in the regulations that will be ultimately introduced. This is a part I am struggling to understand. The report recommends that the South Australian government:

- (a) Include a regional obligation on retailers, in circumstances where activities delivered in regional areas fall below 15 per cent of the overall target, in the year following the shortfall.

I am guessing you are setting a statewide target. How does the government know how much of that target is to be assigned to regional communities? Is it on the base of power use? Is it on the base of population? I would love to know exactly how that is done.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Good question. This issue is very close to the Chair's heart and very close to my heart as well. What the member probably understands is that, for the providers, it is a lot easier to be in the metro area and a lot easier to deliver in the metro area. We have found—and I am sure that, in previous years, your government found it too—that it was

sometimes difficult to get this work done in regional areas not because the regional businesses did not want it but, if you have a choice, a region-based supplier goes there.

We considered that in regard to the REES and in regard to saying: should we set a target? We are looking at it now with the productivity adjustment. It is not finally determined, but I am minded to try to develop a sensible, responsible target to be sure that we can overcome what is often the reluctance of the supply side to go out to regions so that regions do not miss out on the opportunity.

**The CHAIR:** Last question on clause 2, member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The report tabled by the government is now recommending a co-payment for all residential activities. It is my understanding that REES does not allow for co-payments in residential activities. I could be wrong, but that is my understanding. This is a new requirement the government is considering introducing. I understand the minister said he has not adopted it yet, but it seems as though we are all heading in that direction.

Given consumers are already paying for the scheme out of their bills—and I assume that levy will not be removed, and that there is nothing in the amendment bill that removes that levy—why would consumers pay twice, I suppose: once out of their bills and then a co-payment again with the retailer? Can the minister explain to the house what his thinking is?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Yes. What we are considering is helping with the larger, more expensive, deeper retrofits that otherwise would not happen without some sort of a co-payment. In principle, it seems the right way to go. If we decide, if I decide, if the department decides that you could do five things over there or you could do this one, maybe we will not go that way. The intent is to look very seriously at whether there is a genuine benefit in offering a co-payment for projects that would not go ahead without it. Is there enough benefit in that project going ahead to warrant the co-payment?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Supplementary question to that, before we move the clause: will the minister means test that co-payment? That is, will you have to reach a threshold of wealth before you are required to make a co-payment or will the priority target households be exempt from that co-payment?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I have just been advised that if we do it, it will not apply to the priority customers, but, again, it is early days, how that would work.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The perennial problem with energy efficiency schemes is: how do you incentivise landlords, especially in a cohort of priority groups? Landlords do not pay power bills and they do not pay network costs: they are all borne by tenants, unlike water and council duties, so it is a very difficult situation. The report recommends that you do it. I still do not know how you should do it. I was never able to grapple with it, so I would be interested to know what the minister's thinking is on how he can overcome this burden.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Yes, the member is right. As a government, we wrestle, as I am sure your government did, with how to support the people who need it, when they do not have the capacity to do it. The work that is being done with the priority group of household renters, who can be in the program for other reasons too, is very much about finding ways to incentivise—and perhaps stern incentivisation—retailers to contribute.

We see the threshold issue with regard to the landlord being about giving permission, or not, not asking the landlord to invest. It is about the tenant and the retailer investing. It is still an open question whether we could make it happen anyway if for some reason the landlord does not want the upgrades on his or her property. We are looking at that. I think that would be very difficult even if we did want to do that, but we want the tenants to get the benefits of that, so that is where we are going with that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Will the government need to legislate to give them that authority to compel landlords to allow work to be completed on their homes, or can they do it by regulation?



**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I did not say that we will compel landlords. We need to determine what the process would be first and then we would know the answer to that question.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** On page 21 of the report it talks about a residential target. Does the minister have an idea of what that target will be?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** No, not yet, but that is part of the consultation that is happening at the moment.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The minister just said 'consultation that is happening'. I thought consultation had ended.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** There is subsequent consultation going on on the targets.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Can I ask when that will be open, when it will close and how do you make a submission?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** It is the consultation on the principles that is open at the moment, as you probably know. The consultation on the targets has not commenced and that is why that information is not available, but we have made it clear that that will happen.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** My final questions are on the cost recovery of the scheme, that is, the levy that will be on consumers. Will that be decreasing, will it be increasing, what is the split between C&I customers and residential customers, and can you give the committee or me between the houses an estimate of what you think the scheme will raise each and every year until the next review?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I am not going to be able to help the member with this in too much detail because, as you would understand, we have to actually determine the targets first before we know what the levies will be. I would be very happy to give you as much information between the houses, even things you have not asked for today, if there are subsequent questions, but we will not have this part determined by then because obviously the levies flow through from the targets and that is step 1.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Can the minister guarantee to the committee that the scheme, as amended by the bill today, will not collect less than it has previously?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** It will not collect less?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Less. If it is now collecting on average \$13 a year per customer, so everyone's bills are levied as a percentage per kilowatt cent, the question I am asking is: will the total amount collected from the scheme be less with the new productivity measures, or will it be less than it was with the efficiency measures? I would like an assurance from the minister that you will not collect less or that you will not cut the amount collected, which will probably mean it will do less work.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I would love to give the member that assurance, but the reality is that we are still working through that. It does depend on the targets and then it does also depend on the proposals that come from the retailers. So you set your targets, you look at the types of work you want to have done and then you actually get the concrete proposals from retailers that come with costs.

We want to achieve as much as possible, and we do not want to charge any more than necessary, and that is why I was surprised by the suggestion that we should not charge any less. I understand what you are saying, that you are not going to do any less work, but we want to do both: we would like to charge less and we would like to do more work. We need to set the targets, look at the blocks of work and then get the serious proposals from the retailers before we can know what the targets would cost.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** This is more a statement than a question. If the minister can indulge me for two or three minutes, I will not keep him much longer. The reason I asked that question is that the retailers do not like the energy efficiency scheme and they will not like the productivity scheme. They do not like any scheme. As far as they are concerned, they are retailers. Their job is to produce power and sell it. Anything else they have to do is an imposition this parliament puts on them because of this scheme.

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** Or buy it and sell it.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, exactly. My concern is about the ability for a retailer to use any change in the definition—changing 'efficiency' to 'productivity'—to give them an excuse to do less. You might say that they cost recover what they spend, so it does not really matter, but I think that the administration costs and the other costs associated with the scheme are pretty simple. They are understandable, and if we do make a change I would hate to see retailers take advantage of it.

I suppose I am expressing faith in the minister to watch this, but I will be conferring with my colleagues between the houses and in the upper house about whether or not we need to introduce an amendment of sorts. That is not what I want to do; I would much rather have an assurance from the minister that he will be vigilant and make sure that the retailers do what they are supposed to do in the intent of the scheme and that there are plenty of provisions within the scheme to protect households from retailers who are trying to escape their obligations under the scheme.

That is a statement; I do not need an answer on it. I will have a talk to the minister between the houses on it, but I can flag that we may be considering an amendment between the houses.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (6 and 7) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:03):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**CORRECTIONAL SERVICES (ACCOUNTABILITY AND OTHER MEASURES) AMENDMENT  
BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 May 2020.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:04):** I rise to speak to the Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Amendment Bill. It makes quite a range of amendments in regard to correctional services in this state. I note that in my electorate in Murray Bridge we host Mobilong Prison, which has been there since 1987, and I will discuss that a little later in my contribution.

The first of the matters that have been dealt with in this Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Bill is the disclosure of information relating to criminal history. Amendments have been made to the criminal intelligence provisions in section 7 of the Correctional Services Act 1982 in connection with new section 85CB which now allows the chief executive to obtain certain information which may include information in the nature of criminal intelligence from the Commissioner of Police. The Department for Correctional Services consulted with South Australia Police to ensure these provisions were operationally feasible for both agencies.

The use of remotely piloted aircraft, or drones, being flown over prisons is obviously a security issue for all correctional jurisdictions, even more so now with remotely piloted aircraft becoming increasingly advanced in technology and more accessible to the general public. While the commonwealth regulates airspace, it is a matter for each state to decide how to deal with remotely piloted aircraft in relation to prison security. This bill now makes it an offence to operate an unmanned aircraft within 100 metres of a correctional institution without the permission of the chief executive. The remotely piloted aircraft can also be seized if found in a prison environment.

The bill will introduce prison buffer zones for the purpose of possession of drugs under the Controlled Substances Act 1984. Buffer zones will prove to further prevent the introduction of contraband into prisons. Currently, the point where a person becomes guilty of an offence is when the contraband is already inside the prison. The penalties in this section have been determined based on the seriousness of the offence of bringing drugs and contraband into a prison. These offences in the community are serious offences but the intent and action required to introduce these items into a prison is a clear and deliberate decision by a person to introduce dangerous and prohibited items.

This type of calculated and conscious decision deserves the increased penalty. The amendment is specifically worded to ensure that people who have a legitimate excuse to possess or introduce an item are not captured in this section. The introduction of buffer zones in this section has been carefully considered to ensure the protection of those people who are lawfully conducting their business while specifically targeting those with the intent to introduce dangerous items and substances into our prisons.

Penalties will also be increased for possession of unauthorised mobile telephones within a prison buffer zone. The intention is for these zones to be similar to school zones in which the sale, supply or administration of a controlled drug is prohibited. In regard to official visitors, significant amendments have been made to provisions relating to the inspection of prisons. Section 20(1) of the current act provides very basic provisions enabling the appointment and visiting functions of independent inspectors to visit prisons.

The changes will mean that the Department for Correctional Services will continue to be supported by an independent contemporary and transparent scheme. Current inspectors, known as visiting inspectors, are volunteers who carry out independent regular inspections across all South Australian prisons. Whilst a critical program in its current format, the bill will now ensure that South Australia complies with the inspection requirements of places of detention under the United Nations Convention against Torture and Other Cruel and Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment 1984 and the associated optional protocol to the Convention against Torture, which the commonwealth government ratified on 21 December 2017.

The official visitors scheme will establish a group of independent, appropriately skilled visitors who meet the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture requirements, which will also meet the contemporary needs of a prisoner population, including specialists in mental health and wellbeing and Aboriginal representatives. In regard to the Parole Administrative Review Commissioner and the prescribed class, currently a decision of the Parole Board in relation to the release of a prisoner serving a sentence of life imprisonment is subject to review by the Parole Administrative Review Commissioner (PARC) on application by the Attorney-General, the Commissioner of Police or the Commissioner for Victims' Rights.

The bill introduces an important change that will expand the definition of a reviewable decision of the board by introducing a prescribed class of prisoner, which in addition to including prisoners serving a sentence of life imprisonment for an offence will also include prisoners sentenced to offences including conspiring, assisting or soliciting to commit murder (section 12 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935), as well as offences of impeding investigation of offences or assisting offenders as an accessory (section 241(1) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act) if the offence established by the principal offender is the offence of murder.

This amendment will provide greater protection to victims and the community by providing a further level of review in regard to decisions to release on parole offenders who have been sentenced in relation to serious offending relating to the offence of murder. Restraints are to be used on prisoners in certain circumstances. There are currently no provisions for the use of restraints on

prisoners during their transfer and/or movement within or outside of the prison system to ensure their own safety, the safety of staff and the safety of the public.

This bill provides for the circumstances in which restraints may be applied to prisoners. This inclusion allows the Department for Correctional Services to use restraints in some circumstances without constituting a use of force. This will allow restraints to be used during the transporting of prisoners, or if they are temporarily detained in a non-secure location—for example, during hospital treatment or while attending a funeral—in addition to an internal movement.

In relation to management of officers, employees of the department, the provisions for the additional powers of the chief executive are aligned with those found in other legislation. In regard to the obligation to provide an honest account of an incident, this does not remove the right for an individual to remain silent if incriminated, nor does it diminish an individual's rights as a public servant. The bill does, however, provide protection against staff and the 'blue code of silence' for officers not reporting on a colleague's errors, misconduct or a potential criminal offence. The bill gives power to the chief executive, where he has been previously unable to act, to remove and reassign an officer if he has lost confidence in the suitability of the employee to continue working in the correctional institution.

That is essentially the substance of the bill, and I just want to make a few comments about some of the history of Mobilong Prison in my electorate. Mobilong opened way back in 1987. It is a male prison with low to medium security prisoners. It has a capacity now of 472, with quite a few independent-style living units, and you must be drug free to have the ability to live in these units. My understanding is that, when it opened, the prison had a capacity of 150, so it has increased significantly. Some of this increase was through the former treasurer and former member for Port Adelaide, Kevin Foley, and his 'rack 'em, pack 'em and stack 'em' days, and so obviously the capacity has gone up significantly.

There was a recent build in the last few years of some more of these independent units. A group of prisoners lives in this accommodation. They have allowances paid to them on a weekly or fortnightly basis and they manage their own budgetary affairs in regard to purchases of food supplies, etc., and manage their own catering. It is teaching them life skills along the way. The accommodation-type, cottage-style independent living units can accommodate up to eight prisoners, and I know a lot of these were built with I think five separate rooms all in the one caged-off unit. There has been more capacity created by doubling up some of the individual rooms in these cottages. The prison is now smoke free, and that is no mean feat in the modern age with prisoners.

A range of programs is delivered at Mobilong, which includes case management services, education and vocational training, the Making Changes Program, the Alcohol and Other Drugs: Medium Intensity Program, and the Violence Prevention Program. It has been interesting on visits there as a local member and on a voluntary basis (I have always been let out) to see the prisoners attending these programs. Some of them have been quite happy to discuss how these programs are going and helping with their rehabilitation.

The prison also provides for up to 16 greyhounds to be trained for reintegration as domestic pets through the South Australian Greyhound Adoption Program.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Excuse me, member for Hammond. Minister for Correctional Services, I have to inform you that there are not to be any staff members in the gallery at the moment because that is reserved for speakers during this time. So could your staff member go around to the attendants and work it out that way. Thank you for that. Member for Hammond.

**Mr PEDERICK:** This Greyhound Adoption Program is a fantastic program that is not only instituted in prisons but across South Australia at various venues. The greyhound track in Adelaide works with this, and Greyhound South Australia, and obviously the new facilities at Murray Bridge. Great work is done to rehome the greyhounds, and I have witnessed it myself in Mobilong Prison.

Also, in regard to industry, the prison has a large workshop and assembly area, a kitchen, a bakery, electrical component assembly, building products, metal fabrication, workshop products, e-waste recycling, plastic component assembly and firewood and kindling packaging. Back in the day, the prison used to do external catering for Murray Bridge and Districts. I remember, although it is quite a few years ago now, my sister was an entrant in the Miss South Australia Quest and we ran

an event in Murray Bridge. The prison did the catering, and it was very good catering, for that event. My sister organised a fashion parade that night I think at the community club in Murray Bridge and I was one of the so-called male models for the evening—

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** If she didn't win it was your fault.

**Mr PEDERICK:** The minister indicates that if she didn't win it was my fault, so I will wear that. I think you are correct. It was quite a funny night from memory. It was a long time ago—decades ago—and it was quite amusing, as we had friends lined up to be models, whether female or male, and no-one had any airs or graces. We had to get changed in the same room and everyone just roared in, got changed and got back out there with whatever they had to wear. Sadly, I was probably the reason she did not win. It just goes to show what used to happen inside the prison. They used to have basketball games there with the local community—obviously, they played all home matches—but that has not happened for quite a long time.

It has been a place that has also supplied massive employment for Murray Bridge and surrounding districts. People are obviously concerned about the impact a prison can have on a community and people had those concerns pre-1987, with the prison being built. I think a lot of concerns are exemplified in what happened in 2006, the year I was elected. I am pretty sure the budget that year was laid down in September. It was interesting that the former member for Croydon, Michael Atkinson of blessed memory—

**Mr Odenwalder:** May he rest in peace.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** He is not dead yet, as far as I know.

**Mr PEDERICK:** Well, of blessed memory to this place; I know he is alive and well. The announcement that the new men's and women's prisons were to be built on land at Mobilong turned up in *The Advertiser*, and that land is still there. It created a lot of controversy and it was quite disgraceful actually.

This was the 'announce and defend' policy of the former Labor government and these projects were worth hundreds of millions of dollars. The mayor of the Rural City of Murray Bridge at the time, Allan Arbon, contacted me and he said, 'What the hell?' I said, 'I know as much as you do.' Even as a new member, I think I got to ask three questions that afternoon in question time on what was going on.

We know what happened in the running of this. This was supposed to be a public-private partnership and a big reason it failed was the lack of consultation. In fact, I remember going to council meetings in Murray Bridge. This was supposed to be the replacement for Yatala Labour Prison, so a lot of the prison guards came down and certainly voiced their disapproval. These were guards who worked here in Adelaide at Yatala and they were not amused either, that they had not been informed of what was going on and they were not happy about moving. I am sure, over time, we could have found plenty of prison guards in the area, but it just showed the angst.

What happened in the longer term was that tens of millions in compensation had to be paid out to bidders because the whole show fell over. It was a complete disaster. I note that, in more recent times, many millions of dollars have been spent on upgrades across the state and part of that is the internal upgrades to Mobilong. There have been upgrades right across facilities, whether they be at Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, and probably Cadell—I am not so sure about Cadell, but I am sure there have been upgrades there.

There may have been—and I say 'may have been'—the opportunity, if it was done properly, to build these facilities out at Mobilong but it would have taken a far better discussion with my community, my constituents, on this proposal because a women's prison would have been built there as well as the so-called Yatala Labour Prison replacement.

It did create a lot of reaction and a lot of angst, and it certainly shows you how not to make a policy announcement and think it is not going to come back to bite you just because it is not in a seat held by your party. I think that is a good lesson for people on how things should be managed.

As I explained, Mobilong does provide a lot of work opportunities and a lot of people gained good employment there. I know the perennial candidate for Labor, Mat O'Brien, works there and it

does provide that surety of employment for a lot of people in the Murray Bridge community. I must say that when I have been there for functions—I have not been there for a while—I always try to make time to talk to the lads in green, the prisoners, and just have general conversations about life. I think they take on board that someone in our position takes the time to talk to them. I commend the bill. It will make our prisons safer and more secure into the future.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (17:24):** I rise to make a contribution to the Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Amendment Bill 2020. I indicate that I am the lead speaker, perhaps the only speaker, for the opposition. From the outset, I want to make it clear, as I have already indicated to the minister, that we will not be delaying this bill unnecessarily. We will be supporting it.

My view and the view of the opposition is that it contains some eminently sensible measures that will make our prisons safer and, hopefully as importantly, work towards reducing recidivism over time. The reason we will support it is largely because most of the measures have already been debated in this place several times. I will go over some of the history behind this bill. I will not start with the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody in 1991, although I will reflect a little on that body of work later when I talk about some amendments that I have brought to this place.

In August 2016, it is fair to say there was a shift in the emphasis of our corrections policy as the former Labor government. A strategic policy panel was announced by the then minister to reduce reoffending 10 per cent by 2020. This aspiration has lasted into this government and I am pleased to see that. It remains to be seen how well that will pan out. The strategic policy panel was charged with investigating best practice and strategies that would reduce rates of reoffending and promote rehabilitation and reintegration outcomes, which is very worthy, and this bill is the penultimate expression of that aspiration.

There were 36 recommendations and six strategies coming out of that policy panel. All up, nearly \$80 million—no small amount of money—was dedicated to some of the measures to be implemented, but a key pillar of course was legislative change: an amendment of the Correctional Services Act. These amendments, which were flagged and recommended by this panel, would 'support a reduction in reoffending through a greater emphasis on individual case management, access to rehabilitation and vocational training for people on remand, and enhancements to prison security'.

We go forward then to 2017. The then minister, the member for Kaurua, introduced the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2017. This bill, a fairly comprehensive body of work, addressed the recommendations of the strategic policy panel. Independent of that, it also contained some measures to allow for drug testing of staff and prison visitors in an attempt to reduce drug use and drug trafficking within our prison system.

Of course, then there was an election. That bill was lost for whatever reason due to prorogation and then the now Minister for Correctional Services introduced in 2018 a bill by the same name with a different year, the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018. This was for good reason—and I do not criticise the minister for this—touted in the media as being about honouring commitments relating to serious and organised crime, alcohol and drug testing, and alcohol and drugs in the prison system. That is all fine, but a lot of it was largely lifted (and again this is no criticism) from the 2017 bill.

But, importantly, nothing in that 2018 bill, unlike the 2017 bill, addressed recidivism—addressed reducing reoffending. That was the overarching aim of the strategic policy panel in 2016. That was what all the recommendations were aimed at and that whole body of work was not reproduced in the 2018 bill. Despite the lip-service we have seen paid to bipartisanship around the principle of 10by20—reducing recidivism rates by 10 per cent by 2020—we have seen no real action up until this point.

As you may be aware, Mr Deputy Speaker, it is in fact 2020 now. It is fair to say that we have seen a trend downwards in recidivism rates as they are measured. We will know in December 2022 or January 2022 (the minister might correct me on that) when the final review of government services figures comes out whether we have been successful in reducing the recidivism rate by 10 per cent by this year. It seems unlikely.

It seems to me that, if your aim is to reduce reoffending by a significant amount by the year 2020, you would want to put some measures in place before 2020 in order to make that happen. As I said, there has been a trend downwards, so some of those other measures implemented non-legislatively have obviously had some impact, but it still begs the question, and indeed it is my only overarching criticism of this bill and of this minister today: why has it taken so long to get these measures in? It is not as though the work had not already been done.

There are some minor changes and there are some new parts to this bill, but so much of this work, particularly the work aimed at reducing reoffending, was already there in the member for Kaurna's bill, the then minister's bill, in 2017. When the 2018 bill was introduced, I took it upon myself to go back to the 2017 bill and introduce some amendments based on that bill, retaining its principles, to the 2018 bill. These were preventing automatic parole for drug traffickers, protecting victims from mail contact from prisoners and preventing contact with co-offenders and establishing buffer zones around prisons, where drug offences are essentially amplified.

I will go into more detail about those measures because I notice they have been included this time around. They were opposed by the government for whatever reason in 2018, but those measures now have reappeared in exactly the same form, as far as I can see, in this bill today. There are measures here that were in the 2017 bill, which was lost. They were brought into this house in 2018 by the opposition, but they were opposed by the government. Now they reappear and we are in the process of voting on them today.

Again, those measures include limiting prisoners' use of mail in certain circumstances for the obvious reason that a prisoner should be prevented from contacting victims, alleged victims or indeed any person associated with their offending. The bill now does prevent automatic parole for offences of dealing or trafficking drugs. This is obviously a good thing.

Currently, prisoners who are sentenced to less than five years' imprisonment for offences of dealing or trafficking drugs are eligible for automatic parole. I think this is a good reform. I thought it was a good reform in 2017. I clearly thought it was a good reform in 2018 when I suggested it, and I think it is a good reform today. The bill also introduces buffer zones for the purposes of possession of drugs, which essentially increases penalties within a zone around a prison.

The government has now completed the work of the strategic policy panel, the 2017 bill, the 2018 bill and the amendments therein. This is the final culmination of that work. It need not have taken so long but, as I said, it is a good bill. I have some amendments that I will get to soon. The opposition will not be delaying it or opposing it in any way. We will certainly have some questions in committee. As always, the caveat is that we reserve our right between the houses to reassess those things, but we certainly will not be delaying it in this house. As I said, it is largely work that was done in 2016-17 by the previous government.

So we get to the current bill. This has already been laid out fairly well by the member for Hammond today, in fact, and by the minister previously. The member for Hammond did a good job in laying out what this bill does. First of all, it introduces an objects and principles section to the act, a section that is designed and intended to guide the application of the act so that it becomes more than just a simple management tool of a system and so that decisions made within the system fit within a certain range of guidelines. Again, it is an excellent idea, an excellent measure, and we support all of it.

Obviously, community safety is the primary objective. I note that the previous shadow minister in the 2017 debate was confused by the term 'community safety' and there was quite a substantial debate about the meaning of the words 'community safety', but I think we will avoid that today. I think we are all on the same page on what community safety means and that it should be the main priority of any corrections act.

It also compels the CE and the department to provide safe and secure management of prisoners. This should be a given anyway, as indeed most of these objects and principles should be, but it is important sometimes to legislate and codify these things so that there is a reference point when things go wrong. It has regard to the rights of victims of crime, which is a very important principle and one that that again you would hope the corrections system takes into account at all times. This compels the system to do so.

Another focus is on supporting the reintegration of prisoners in the community as part of their rehabilitation. This grew out of the strategic policy panel, the overarching mission of which was to reduce reoffending, reduce recidivism, by 10 per cent by the year 2020. Of course, there are measures about the management of officers and employees, which the member for Hammond covered quite succinctly. I have some questions about that in committee, but essentially we will not be opposing that.

While we are still on the objects and principles section, I have flagged several amendments, indeed additions to the objects and principles section. This harks back to the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody from 1991. There are some 400 recommendations, I think. I could be wrong about that, but there are certainly hundreds of recommendations, many of which have been implemented by various jurisdictions, not just in Corrections but in police, attorney-generals' departments and across government generally.

The amendments I am bringing in today give expression to one particular recommendation of the royal commission. I have spoken to the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement about this in recent days. They are very supportive of it, and they think that a measure based on this recommendation would very much improve the rehabilitation prospects of Aboriginal offenders and reduce recidivism. Recommendation 168 of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody from 1991 states:

That Corrective Services effect the placement and transfer of Aboriginal prisoners according to the principle that, where possible, an Aboriginal prisoner should be placed in an institution as close as possible to the place of residence of his or her family. Where an Aboriginal prisoner is subject to a transfer to an institution further away from his or her family the prisoner should be given the right to appeal that decision.

I think that is a very important principle. I am not sure why it has not been addressed by Corrections in the past. I am not sure why it was not addressed in the 2017 bill or in this bill. As well as introducing my amendment, I will be interrogating that a little bit in the committee stage. Out of that grow my amendments. I will try to be brief. I wish to insert in the objects and principles a new principle, and that is to recognise the particular importance of family and community involvement and participation in the rehabilitation of prisoners, parolees and probationers who are Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons by ensuring so far as is reasonably practicable that:

1. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons are placed in a correctional institution as close as possible to the place of residence of their family.
2. An Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person and their family are entitled to seek a review of a decision to transfer the person from one correctional institution to another further away from their family.
3. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander communities are adequately consulted in relation to any community service that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons are required to perform to ensure that the community service is regarded as having value to the relevant Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander community.

The royal commission believed, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement believe and I believe that a measure like this, as a guiding principle in the way that we treat Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander prisoners, will have a positive effect on recidivism rates over time. Of course, we cannot know that, but I think that all the evidence is there that there is a particular importance placed upon family and community involvement that is believed by all reasonable commentators to be a significant factor in the rehabilitation of Aboriginal prisoners.

There is another amendment related to that, which allows for a review of a transfer of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander persons, which is also outlined in recommendation 168 of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody; that is, if the CE orders the transfer of a prisoner who is an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander person from one correctional institution to another, the CE must provide a copy of that order, the prisoner must not be transferred until after the period within which an application for review of the order under this section may be made, and then it outlines how a review may be made by the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

Those amendments will come up later, I am advised, and I had a fruitful and frank discussion with the minister's advisers earlier today. I am advised there is a government amendment to the first of my amendments and I am advised that the government will not be supporting the second of those



amendments. We probably will not get to the committee stage today, but I look forward to that particular debate and seeing whether or not the amendments that the government is bringing to my first amendment maintain its spirit and maybe even strengthen it in terms of its goal of reducing Aboriginal reoffending.

The bill goes on to place emphasis on end-to-end case management as part of prisoner offender assessment. Of course, this is very important. This was the whole crux of the 2017 bill, which unfortunately did not go through this place. There are other measures that are perfectly reasonable, such as remuneration of the Parole Board, to be determined by the remuneration tribunal, as occurs with other government boards. There are other streamlining of parole processes. I was tempted to insert some other amendments along the lines of some of the things I have been thinking about the way the Parole Board might operate more efficiently, but I will save that for another day.

Of course, the visiting inspector scheme was foreshadowed in the 2017 legislation. There have been some slight changes around the names and the terms we use to describe such people, but we are told by the minister that this means that South Australian prisoners will now be in compliance with the inspection requirements under the UN Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment and the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture.

There has been some speculation in the media—and I have not tested this and I intend to test it during the committee stage—about whether there are other demands placed upon corrections systems by OPCAT. There have been some suggestions by the media—I do not know either way and I will be interrogating that during the committee stage—about whether we are indeed, following the passage of this bill, compliant with all of our obligations under the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, but that remains to be seen.

Of course, I support the provisions around drones and all the provisions designed to limit the inflow of drugs into our prisons. I do note that, since the Remand Centre's privatisation, there have been some reports that drugs are flowing quite freely from the Remand Centre into the rest of the prison system. This is yet to be tested. Several good reasons have been put to me as to why this may be so, but of course we need to recognise that the Remand Centre is the gateway to the rest of our prison system. If we cannot ensure that the Remand Centre is adequately staffed and resourced to tackle drugs and other contraband, we are going to face a losing battle in protecting the rest of our prison system from those things.

The last thing I will say about the bill is that it introduces some new criminal offences which were not foreshadowed in the 2017 bill and which I will be asking some questions about. On the face of it, they seem perfectly reasonable. They are offences around the unlawful assembly of prisoners and around riot provisions within a prison. I must confess that I thought the offences that we will be discussing, and the need for these provisions, already existed in other acts, but I am prepared to be convinced that they are not. I think they are probably very good measures in terms of keeping prisoners safe from each other and keeping the employees of the prison system safe.

With those few words, I look forward to the committee stage. I look forward to debating the merits of the amendments. I think they are important amendments. They are certainly amendments that reflect the recommendations of the Royal Commission into Aboriginal Deaths in Custody and are supported by the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement, among others, so I look forward to that debate. I commend the bill to the house. It has been a long time coming, but these are important measures. I hope, when the 2022 figures come out from the Review of Government Services, that we have indeed made a significant dent in the recidivism rates of South Australian offenders.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:47):** It has been a long time since we have spoken about Corrections twice in one day. I would like to declare up-front that I am the member for Florey, which is the home—it is a strange word to use, but it is a euphemism—for the Yatala prison and the Women's Prison. I must also declare I have been to just about every prison in this state except for Port Lincoln, which is a place I should try to go to, and then I will have a full house, so to speak. I have always had a concern for the criminal justice system and those caught up in the custodial area.

I thank the minister and his department for their work on this very important bill. To all the staff who work in Corrections: it is an almost thankless job. However, as I go to visit these prisons incognito, as the ultimate mystery visitor, I do have some suggestions to make at some stage. One of these will relate to the long overdue automated prisoner booking system. October is far too long to wait for that to happen in this day and age, particularly post-COVID when everyone is doing everything online. I really think we need to zip along a bit faster there because, as we know, family support for prisoners and people in custody is a very vital component of everything, notwithstanding the obvious problems with how drugs come into the system and other things.

It is very good to see this bill before the house. Almost every person has the potential to be a productive member of society; some just take a little longer to realise how they are going to be productive in society. Peggy Fulton Hora said during her time here as a thinker in residence—I think was her actual role—that there are always going to be a small number of people we are never going to be able to do much with.

So it is our role to find all the other people we can assist in the system as much as we can. I have seen some very strange things in prisons, and I would not really like to be involved in serving a custodial sentence at all. I do not know how I would cope, but obviously people have to come out after a prison sentence and be productive members of society, and it is our job to make sure that is exactly what they do.

I commend any measures we have to assist prisoners in rehabilitation, and reducing recidivism and reoffending. I have realised firsthand, having tried to support someone for more than 14 years, how difficult it is to keep people on the straight and narrow. It would be fair to say my observation relates to the fact that most of the people in the prison system lack formal education and the ability to read and write and be numerate. It is very hard to get a job if you cannot do that.

It has been a term-long interest of mine to find ways we can improve on delivering education, not only in the prison system but also in the Remand Centre which, as the member for Elizabeth said, is now privatised. During my time of intense interest and visiting the Remand Centre, my friend was one of only two who completed an educational course of any variety there. I just do not see how we can keep people on remand—I am not sure what the current length of remand is; it was pretty long the last time I looked—you cannot have people sitting on remand doing nothing, so that is exactly what I am getting to. I cannot wait to see what you are going to be up to with education.

I will have some questions, of course, on educational opportunities, some matters relating to the Parole Board and, again, as I have indicated, matters relating to the automated prisoner visit system. It is for everyone who is in prison, including the juvenile corrections system, the Aboriginal people, both men and women. I think some of the worst things I have seen have related to Aboriginal women in prison on a couple of sites. I cannot believe what I have seen in this day and age.

Of course, anyone who is involved in corrections knows we have to try to make sure everybody has an opportunity to have a fulfilling life outside prison. Most of them have families and people who love them and care for them, so it is up to us to give them every opportunity to do the right thing because it is very easy when you get out of prison not to be able to make a go of it. So anything you can do in this bill, minister, I am sure will be fabulous. I look forward to listening to the debate and taking part in the committee.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr McBride.

## **TEACHERS REGISTRATION AND STANDARDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 7, page 5, lines 4 to 19 [clause 7, inserted section 9(1) and (2)]—Delete inserted subsections (1) and (2) and substitute:

- (1) The Teachers Registration Board consists of not less than 11 and not more than 14 members appointed by the Governor of whom—

- (a) at least 6 must be practising teachers, of whom—
  - (i) at least 4 must be nominated by the Australian Education Union (S.A. Branch); and
  - (ii) at least 2 must be nominated by the Independent Education Union (S.A. Branch); and
- (b) at least 1 must be a person nominated jointly by the Association of Independent Schools of South Australia Incorporated and Catholic Education SA; and
- (c) at least 1 must be a person employed in the field of teacher education nominated jointly by the universities in the State; and
- (d) at least 1 must be a person nominated by the Chief Executive of the Department; and
- (e) the remaining members are members nominated by the Minister, of whom—
  - (i) at least 1 must be a legal practitioner; and
  - (ii) 1 must be a parent of a school student appointed to represent the community interest.

(2) At least half of the members appointed under subsection (1) must be registered teachers.

No. 2. Clause 7, page 5, after line 34 [clause 7, inserted section 9]—Insert:

- (5a) The Minister must ensure, as far as practicable, that the persons appointed under subsection (1) consist of equal numbers of women and men.

No. 3. Clause 8, page 6, lines 10 to 27 [clause 8(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

No. 4. Clause 15, page 8, after line 24 [clause 15, inserted Part 3A]—Insert:

19B—Teachers Registration Board to survey teachers

- (1) The Teachers Registration Board must, at least once in every 5 year period and in accordance with any requirements set out in the regulations, conduct a survey of registered teachers in this State to ascertain their views on—
  - (a) the curriculum for initial teacher education in this State; and
  - (b) the quality and effectiveness of initial teacher education in this State generally.
- (2) On completion of a survey under this section, the Teachers Registration Board must prepare a report on the results of the survey and provide a copy of the report to the Minister.
- (3) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving a report under subsection (2), have copies of the report laid before both Houses of Parliament.
- (4) Nothing in this section requires a teacher to take part in a survey conducted under this section (and, to avoid doubt, a teacher cannot be compelled to do so).

No. 5. Clause 20, page 9, after line 37 [clause 20, inserted section 26A]—Insert:

- (2a) Without limiting any other circumstances in which the Teachers Registration Board may reduce or waive an annual fee under this section, if a teacher pays the annual fee in advance in relation to the full term of their registration period, the Teachers Registration Board must cause the amount payable to be reduced by at least 5%.

No. 6. Clause 26, page 12, lines 21 and 22 [clause 26, inserted section 31B(1)]—Delete 'or adopt codes of conduct and professional standards (or both)' and substitute 'codes of conduct'

No. 7. Clause 26, page 12, after line 22 [clause 26, inserted section 31B]—Insert:

- (1a) Sections 10 (other than subsection (1)) and 10A of the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* apply in relation to a code of conduct published under this section (and a reference in those provisions to a regulation will be taken to be a reference to the code of conduct).

Note—

These provisions allow Parliament to disallow a code of conduct.

No. 8. Clause 26, page 12, line 25 [clause 26, inserted section 31B(2)]—Delete 'or adopted'

No. 9. Clause 26, page 12, after line 25 [clause 26, inserted section 31B]—Insert:

- (2a) Before publishing a code of conduct under this section, the Teachers Registration Board—
- (a) must call for submissions from—
    - (i) registered teachers; and
    - (ii) the Australian Education Union (S.A. Branch); and
    - (iii) the Independent Education Union (S.A. Branch); and
    - (iv) the Chief Executive of the Department; and
    - (v) Catholic Education SA; and
    - (vi) the Association of Independent Schools of South Australia Incorporated; and
  - (b) must have regard to any submissions made by a person or body referred to in paragraph (a) during the period specified by the Teachers Registration Board (being a period not less than 1 month); and
  - (c) must consult with—
    - (i) the Australian Education Union (S.A. Branch); and
    - (ii) the Independent Education Union (S.A. Branch); and
    - (iii) the Chief Executive of the Department; and
    - (iv) Catholic Education SA; and
    - (v) the Association of Independent Schools of South Australia Incorporated,and may consult with any other person or body the Teachers Registration Board thinks fit.

No. 10. Clause 26, page 12, line 26 [clause 26, inserted section 31B(3)]—Delete 'or adopted'

At 17:53 the house adjourned until Thursday 2 July 2020 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***HOSPITALS, CAR PARKING**

**142 Mr PICTON (Kaurua)** (1 July 2020). What is the expiry date of the free car parking for public hospital staff?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised the following:

Free car parking at metropolitan public hospitals to support hospital workers as they deal with the COVID-19 pandemic will last for the duration of the major emergency.