

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 10 September 2020

The **SPEAKER (Hon. J.B. Teague)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

MEMBER'S REMARKS

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey, I understand—

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:01): I seek your indulgence and assistance. I rise on what I think is a point of order, 125 and 127, and I refer to the remarks I made yesterday at the beginning of parliament. Unfortunately, this is the first opportunity I have to raise this point with you. During the discussion, the member for Unley was interjecting and one of the remarks he made was recorded on *Hansard*. He said, 'Straight out of the Trump book. Donald Trump would be very proud of that.' I tell you, Mr Speaker, I am deeply offended by that remark and I seek your assistance to have the member for Unley withdraw and apologise for it at the first possible opportunity.

The SPEAKER: I thank you, member for Florey, for bringing that to my attention. I understand that is the first possible opportunity for you to do so. I do not have the *Hansard* before me, but I do not at this stage require reference to it. The member for Unley is not present in the chamber. What I propose to do is to ensure that the matter is brought to attention and that it may be responded to at the first possible opportunity.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: RECYCLING INDUSTRY

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:02): By leave, on behalf of the Morphett I move:

That the fourth report of the committee, on the Inquiry into the Recycling Industry, be noted.

On 13 May 2019, the Environment, Resources and Development Committee resolved to conduct an inquiry into whether a current crisis in waste management exists in South Australia as a result, at least in part, of China's National Sword policy. The China National Sword policy stated that China would no longer be importing certain kinds of solid waste from other countries, including Australia.

Indonesia and Malaysia shortly thereafter indicated they would be adopting similar policy positions. The committee sought to engage with the South Australian waste management and resource recovery industry and other stakeholders to better understand the impacts of China's National Sword policy and, as such, the committee considered a wide range of evidence from 54 submissions and 39 witnesses. The committee also visited waste management resource recovery sites in the northern and north-western metropolitan areas, conducted regional visits to Whyalla and the South-East, and the committee held public hearings in Adelaide, Whyalla, Mount Gambier and Millicent.

When the committee resolved to commence this inquiry, the Australian government and governments from other jurisdictions, including South Australia, were already responding to the challenges represented by China's ban on the importation of waste. Parliamentary inquiries have commenced in Victoria and in the Senate, with a further Senate inquiry launched in October 2019. A National Waste Policy was published in 2018, and a National Waste Action Plan was released in 2019 to help meet the targets in the National Waste Policy.

A meeting of environment ministers in 2019 also committed to a ban on some types of waste being exported. At a local level, the South Australian government commenced a review of the South Australian container deposit scheme, released for consultation—and has now introduced—its

Single-use and Other Plastics Products (Waste Avoidance) Bill 2019, published an Energy from Waste discussion paper, and released for consultation its draft waste strategy for 2020-25.

The committee was heartened to note that governments across all jurisdictions were keen to address legislative and policy challenges that have been facing the industry for many years and that the commonwealth was taking the lead in coordinating a national approach through the meeting of environment ministers. The committee found, as a result of its inquiry, that there was desire from stakeholders to decouple the state from external markets and to provide self-sufficiency for future generations.

A waste management and resource recovery industry based on a circular economy model was widely supported by submitters and witnesses. The committee found it was important that any such transition be supported by economic and legislative tools to encourage best practice, strategic planning and action that is underpinned by better knowledge about product and packaging flows. The committee also found it was important to consider energy from waste in the context of a circular economy model as well as the best possible use for waste. The committee found that submitters and witnesses all recommended that government policy focused on the creation of local markets for recyclable and recycled products.

In late 2019 and early 2020, this inquiry's momentum was interrupted dramatically as Australia experienced severe bushfires in every state and territory except the Northern Territory, with South Australia experiencing bushfires throughout many parts of the state. The trauma of these bushfires was closely followed by the COVID-19 global pandemic and the resulting socio-economic restrictions.

Local and state government resources have, quite rightly, been put towards dealing with these unanticipated and traumatic events. This has meant that the committee's findings and recommendations for the industry, although important, must now be viewed through the lens of a post bushfire and pandemic recovery. COVID-19 has also revealed the challenges associated with fragile global supply chain and business models, making some of the committee's recommended improvements to the legislative and policy environment to support the domestic waste management and resource recovery industry even more pertinent.

The committee's findings, such as moving the South Australian economy towards a circular model for waste management, are well supported by stakeholders, and are consistent with a post COVID-19 recovery plan for South Australia. Success for the waste management and resource recovery industry is, however, likely to be contingent upon a collaboratively developed statewide strategy and action plan that is embedded within nationally agreed objectives. The committee makes 16 recommendations in this report, which I believe will address many of the issues raised by submitters and witnesses.

I wish to thank all the stakeholders who gave their time to assist the committee with this inquiry. I also wish to thank current and former members of the committee for their contributions to this report: Mr Adrian Pederick MP and Mr Stephen Patterson MP, former presiding members of the committee; Mr Tony Piccolo MP; Mr Michael Brown MP; the Hon. John Dawkins MLC; the Hon. Tung Ngo MLC; the Hon. Dennis Hood MLC; and the Hon. Mark Parnell MLC. I would also really like to thank the committee staff, Ms Joanne Fleer and Dr Merry Brown, for their assistance.

I would like to finish up with a couple of things regarding this inquiry. The inquiry was, exactly as I have explained, about the China Sword policy and other countries dealing with Australia's waste. You would have to ask, after China and other countries refused to take on a lot of Australia's recycling waste, what was to happen to it.

The inquiry was probably only 12 months down the road from the China Sword policy, and we now find ourselves about two years down. The government has implemented a further tax on landfill, first, obviously, to create some revenue, which goes towards coastal erosion issues up and down the South Australian coast. However, the intent was also to help manage and encourage further recycling rather than seeing that waste go to landfill.

We heard that recycling and landfill play an important role. In other words, recyclers do require landfill. We heard on our visits and through submissions that when recycling is taken and used, and obviously processed, two issues arise: not all product that comes in for recycling can be

used, so there is a waste component, and then the number one foundation from beyond that is to find a worthy and economical product to then take it further to use. In fact, we saw at least two cases where a product was being recycled into plastic pellets with no commercial value, with no market and nowhere to go. This is an example of where further investigation into technology, science and development needs to occur.

On the other side of that, there is also a product from recycling. We saw that particularly in the hard rubbish of construction recycling, where it was alluded to that at least 20 to 40 per cent of their product had to still go to landfill. With landfill being so expensive, the whole recycling process becomes expensive, because that is a cost. Even though they are using 60 to 80 per cent towards recycling to be re-used later on for other products, it still had to go to landfill. Landfill is expensive. It incurs freight and certainly causes some massive issues for recycling, as we heard.

I come back to my regional experience in looking after the regional area of MacKillop. We also went to Whyalla and right down to Mount Gambier. We saw recycling in Mount Gambier and we saw landfill down in Mount Gambier. The landfill site in Mount Gambier is one of the most expensive landfill sites in South Australia—I will not say Australia because I do not know that. One of the reasons is that Mount Gambier has a magnificent underground watertable, and it needs protecting. According to legislation, rules and the EPA, to protect the underground water system the landfill site needs to be protected by the largest amounts of clay of any landfill site.

This means that Mount Gambier and the Wattle Range Council, I believe, use the Mount Gambier landfill site, but no other councils do. I imagine the Naracoorte Lucindale Council, Kingston council, Robe council and the Coorong council, I would imagine, would all be going towards the Murray Bridge landfill site because it is more affordable. Obviously, when you start moving landfill and rubbish like that a great distance transport becomes a massive issue for regions, and we did hear that on a number of occasions, even at the metal recycling site at the Whyalla Steelworks. Obviously, freight is a major component of getting that metal to Whyalla for recycling. It all plays a role. It was not just steel but it was also nonferrous metals and all the other things that they try to re-use in different ways.

It was very eye-opening to go to the Whyalla Steelworks. Some huge technology is there, but there are also some very fundamental, basic starting foundations. In other words, it is just beginning. One would hope that with technology, investment and obviously the better use of and the more throughput we can get into those sorts of recycling businesses, as happens at Whyalla, the better they will be, not only on a local level and a national level but on a world level, because they have to compete. When they have that finished product for the market, they will be competing on the world market for steel and nonferrous metals.

One thing that also came into play when we talked about the recycling of light metals is that there is a world market for iron ore, there is a world market for scrap and there is a world market for recycled product, and our businesses in South Australia have to compete with those as well.

Coming back to our regions and the other issues about recycling, we did go down to see Van Schaik's—a massive recycling business for organic matter. We heard that the forestry industry uses Van Schaik's a significant amount. Van Schaik's are crying out for product from the forestry industry. The forestry industry are torn. I know of at least two mills, possibly three, where they use a lot of their own waste product for reproducing energy and creating heat and steam for drying. We also saw at the Mount Gambier site where they used to make electricity from wood waste. Van Schaik's are crying out for as much forestry waste product as possible, plus they also receive all the local government waste recycling from green waste. We are now seeing a lot more food waste.

Another thing that came into recycling was the education required for recycling to work well. It was pointed out that in some suburbs in Adelaide (I do not need to name them) recycling is so bad that they can barely use it because of the lack of cooperation and education that exists in relation to the use of bins, the colour of the bins and what should be going in them. It is just not working, and recycling becomes too expensive.

There are a couple of things I will highlight, and I come back to my initial point about, first of all, regional areas. They are going to suffer transport costs. They are going to suffer with small quantities, the tyranny of great distances and the fact it then has to go on and be of value. The second

point I will make is that we have to have a greater level of education, cooperation and collaboration between our community members, local government, state government, perhaps even federal government, with businesses, making sure recycling works on all fronts. When it does not work, we certainly see how it does not take much to break the camel's back.

It does not take much to make recycling too expensive to carry out, and when that happens the first thing looked at is it goes straight into landfill. So there are a number of barriers to work through, and the number one barrier that really stood out most of all is that it has to be economically achievable. There is no point in trying to do all this if it breaks the budget and breaks the cost of trying to achieve what we are trying to achieve with recycling and waste and creating a circular economy, where we try to turn as much as possible of what we buy, use and waste into recycled product.

There is a lot to be gained. It is only early days. I thank all the members who were on this committee for their participation. We got on well. We were well led, as I have already said, by the two presiding officers, Mr Adrian Pederick and, later, Mr Stephen Patterson. We got on very well. This was a very busy committee that looked at this recycling industry. I was very pleased to participate, and I think there are many more outcomes that are going to be positive in the future.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:17): I rise to support this Environment, Resources and Development Committee report because a sustainable environment is a key concern for my constituents young and old. As one Golden Grove High School student Bella Walden said on her poster that she gave to me, 'The earth is not recyclable, so we must save the one we have.' I am so very proud our Marshall Liberal government's plan is delivering in a practical and sustainable way for our environment.

This poster from Bella is now proudly displayed in my electorate office, and her picture is on the front of my cards that go out to constituents because this is such an important message. I am also very proud in my local electorate of the many constituents who are making good use of their rubbish and adhering to the Which Bin activities. South Australia is leading the nation on tackling climate change and we are leading the nation on renewable energy with the most ambitious plan set to slash emissions. This week we are the first state to ban single-use plastics. This is a credit to the leadership of our Minister for Environment and every member in this house who supported this legislation.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to South Australia continuing to be the national leader in recycling and resource recovery. We see this as a key plank of the government's environmental agenda, which is focused on delivering practical, on-the-ground environmental outcomes. As South Australians, we have such a proud history of being the national leader when it comes to waste management. In 1977, we were the first state or territory to introduce the container deposit scheme. In 2017-18, we recovered almost 603 million containers—that is 42,913 tonnes—for recycling.

Once again leading the nation, in 2009 South Australia became the first state or territory to ban lightweight plastic bags from supermarket checkouts, and now we are the first state to ban single-use plastics. This deliverable means that on commencement of the legislation single-use plastic straws, cutlery and drink stirrers will be banned from sale, supply or distribution, and 12 months from the commencement date the distribution of expanded polystyrene cups, bowls, plates, clamshell containers and oxo degradable plastic products will then be prohibited. There will be further analysis and consultation on takeaway coffee cups, plastic bags another takeaway food service items.

On 13 May 2019, the Environment, Resources and Development Committee resolved to conduct an inquiry into whether the current crisis in waste management exists in South Australia as a result, at least in part, of China's National Sword policy. The committee considered a wide range of evidence. I commend the committee, which visited waste management and resource recovery sites in the northern and north-western metropolitan area and conducted regional visits to Whyalla and the South-East.

In 2017, China announced to the World Trade Organisation that it would no longer be accepting certain kinds of solid waste, including plastic waste, unsorted wastepaper and waste textile materials. Other Asian countries indicated that they would be adopting a similar position. Australia's

response to the bans on waste exports has been encapsulated in the National Waste Policy 2018 and the subsequent action plan 2019.

In recognition of China's restrictions on importing recyclables, the state government (Green Industries SA) released a \$12.4 million package for local government and the resource recovery industry. This package was intended to be directed towards improving sorting and processing and enabling industry investment in remanufacture. Challenges and opportunities existed prior to China's National Sword policy, but this policy has helped highlight a community desire for reform within the waste management and resource recovery industry.

Submitters provided many possible solutions to the issues and challenges as they saw them. Potential solutions tended towards global and transformative change, such as shifting the state towards an industry based on the circular economy model, while other solutions were behavioural, such as increased education to reduce contamination. Increased government transparency and accountability and certainty and clarity for industry were also important to stakeholders. Economic and legislative tools were suggested to encourage best practice in product stewardship and to minimise production of non-recyclable or hard to recycle products.

The committee also heard that better and more equitable risk-sharing partnerships and collaboration at regional levels will result in a more level playing field. An issue that was important to all councils and local government associations was the state government announcement of an increase in solid waste levies for the 2019-20 budget. Councils and LGAs called for increased transparency and accountability for expenditure of solid waste levies. Overwhelmingly, there was a desire to decouple the state from external markets and to provide self-sufficiency for future generations.

A waste management and resource recovery industry based on a circular economy model was widely supported. It was important that any such transition be supported by economic and legislative tools to encourage best practice and strategic planning and action that is underpinned by better knowledge about product and packaging flows. It was important to consider energy from waste in the context of a circular economy model and also to consider the best possible use for waste. Finally, submitters and witnesses all recommended that government policy focuses on the creation of local markets for recyclable and recycled products.

I thank the ERD Committee, chaired by the member for Morphett, for their work on this most important environmental topic, and our Minister for Environment for his ongoing work to introduce change which continues to put South Australia in a leadership position with regard to environmental strategy and delivering real change for South Australia. I thank the 54 people and groups who made submissions, and the 39 witnesses. I commend the report and its recommendations to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:24): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I have not had the opportunity yet, but I congratulate you on rising to that esteemed position in the chair. I know that you are doing and will do a fantastic job for the parliament in this state.

Today, I rise in regard to the fourth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee's inquiry into the recycling industry. I was very proud, as the initial chair in regard to this inquiry, to work with the committee to get this inquiry underway. We looked at many and varied parts of the recycling and waste industry to investigate how they could be more efficient and how more waste could be recycled. The China Sword policy obviously made not just South Australia but Australia and other countries focus on what they are doing in regard to exporting waste offshore.

Waste is a huge issue in society. In the visits we went on, we saw the ingenuity exemplified by the creation of jobs and industries around recycling and waste management, because there are many opportunities. Part of that opportunity comes about because of the obvious cost of dumping rubbish. The cost is amplified the closer you get to Adelaide into more urban areas, but you hear of quotes of \$130 for a 6 x 4 trailer load of rubbish—6 x 4 in the old language, whatever that is in metres. That is a very expensive way to get rid of rubbish, so recycling is extremely important.

Those charges for waste can be quite counterproductive. Several years ago, we were holidaying at Geelong and talking to some families from Sunshine in Victoria, where the famous Massey Ferguson 585 and 587 headers were produced, apart from others. They were very famous

in their day. But in this area at the time, and this was several years ago now, it cost \$100 to dump a mattress, so they all ended up on the side of the road. People here have had issues where rubbish has been illegally dumped, whether it is on the way to a dump or somewhere else.

I guess it also relates to hard rubbish collection, which used to be a chance to go shopping for hard rubbish. You could drive down the road, and it depended on how big a vehicle you had as to how much shopping you did. One of my boys was very enterprising and used to do up pushbikes that he found and he would resell them. He had quite an industry going, recycling—

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Regularly called 'Mitre 11'.

Mr PEDERICK: 'Mitre 11'—I like that from the Minister for Energy and Mining. They say one person's trash is another person's treasure and that is certainly true. Rules have been tightened up around that. It used to be quite novel, especially in large towns or in urban areas, where you could drive up and down for several weeks. I can understand why they have tightened it up because there are just rows and rows of hard rubbish. But it was a bit of a shopping frenzy. I think it is technically illegal to pick up hard rubbish.

There is so much innovative work being done, and I look at companies like Peats Soil and Jeffries, to name a couple in South Australia. Peter Wadewitz was in this place last night. As I have indicated on my register of interests—and I know he is over 18, but I put it down anyway—my eldest son does two days a week for Peats Soil out at Brinkley near Langhorne Creek. They have a major composting activity out there. They have contracts with a wide range of people. I know they deal with the Zoo and with a whole range of dead animals and plant produce that can all be recycled into compost.

Also in my electorate, up Kanmantoo-Callington way, I acknowledge Neutrog and their expansion plans. I am trying to think of their most famous manure, which they sell in a bag. I cannot think of it offhand, but they are doing very well. All these companies, especially on the organic side of things, are finding ways to get material, especially organic waste—obviously animal waste, dead animals, etc.—and turn it back into something that can promote life in gardens and farms. I know that they were looking at pellet production for fertiliser at Peats Soil. Neutrog have a vast range of products. These are industries that are only going to grow in the future. From memory, I think the product from Neutrog is called Whoflungdung.

We also saw inorganic material, as the member for MacKillop mentioned in his contribution. I note that we went to the Fulton Hogan yard in Dry Creek. My brother Chris works there, under contract with another company under Fulton Hogan, in recycling bitumen. It is great work. It causes the crusher a fair bit of grief, but obviously with the 1,000 kilometres of roadworks that we are doing as a government throughout this state that company is very busy recycling bitumen.

It is only when you drive around the urban areas, as you do when we are here on sitting weeks, that you realise how much bitumen gets chewed up at night here in the city when roadworks are done so that they are not being done during peak hours. That is great work, and the odd few loads that cannot be milled for whatever reason—it could be out of spec for the bitumen recycling—can be sold for a pretty good rate. I know that a lot of farmers can put it in their driveways or gateway entrances, so it can all be used in a recycled manner. As the member for MacKillop indicated, a lot of the concrete, steel and building materials used in construction are re-used time and time again. We saw this right around the state.

It was great to visit Whyalla and see the work they are doing at the steelworks, as well as seeing Peats Soil's new yard in Whyalla. Down at Millicent and Mount Gambier, we saw a company in Robe (the member for MacKillop will help me with the name) that is very innovative in what it is doing with recycling plastic bread tags. It is doing fantastic work. Anything, even a bread tag, can be recycled. I think a few years ago the Meningie Area School did a project where they collected a million bread tags so that students could see what a million of something looked like. That would have been an effort in itself.

An honourable member: That's a lot of bread.

Mr PEDERICK: It is a lot of bread. What we saw in the main is that efforts need to step up. There is a vast range of recommendations, but one thing that really stood out was a recommendation

from one of the biggest recyclers at Mount Gambier. I know that we do recycling with the coloured bins and that it does get a bit confusing the more coloured bins we get, but his biggest issue was the amount of broken glass from wine bottles that ends up with the paper in the yellow bins. Glass can be recycled, so it is a lot better if you take your wine bottles or other bottles to the bottle collection depots, of which there are many here because of our world-class container deposit legislation in this state. It gives a lot better outcome for the re-usable glass, instead of it contaminating the paper waste.

In the last few seconds, I would like to commend everyone on the committee and everyone in the industry for their work in this space. When really you look at it, you can recycle just about everything. I commend everyone's work in the field.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:34): Firstly, may I congratulate you on your appointment as the Speaker of the house. This is the first day I have been able to speak in the house since your appointment. Congratulations and all the best.

It has been a pleasure to be a part of this environmental report. I thank the member for King for her contribution. She spoke about climate change, global warming, carbon and all of those things that I imagine are very dear to her heart, and also the constituents of King and other Adelaide residents.

Where I come from down in the country, those sorts of things do play a part in our psyche and thinking, but there are probably other things at play. With the tyranny of distance and living in a regional area where we are sparse and few in population compared with city centres, sometimes those things are not as high on the priority list as they are for some country members.

I would also like to thank the member for Hammond for his contribution and for both speaking to this report and supporting it and also his guidance as Presiding Officer of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. We made 16 recommendations. They are all there to be noted for the parliament to work through if it chooses.

I would like to highlight two things that are noted in the committee's recommendations and findings. Energy from waste is one of those opportunities, if recycling does not work and if it does not have any commercial value, and it cannot or it does not at this stage in the cycle and development of recycling, that we as a committee considered; that is what Japan, Europe and some of the Norwegian countries are doing in turning waste into heat and energy.

It is a high-heat type of incineration. It has low-pollution elements to it. Yes, there would be a carbon aspect to it and, yes, it would not be the purest way of using and recycling waste but it certainly may play a role in the future. I raise this because there is a large turbine and boiler in Mount Gambier that runs off a sawmill. The turbine has not worked now—and I am going to have a guess, and the member for Hammond may correct me—for at least 10 years, since the turbine got out of control and nearly blew up the whole station. This turbine used to produce power for the City of Mount Gambier. It used to run on woodchip and waste.

The boiler now only produces steam and heat to dry timber for this mill. If you look at the way in which it works—and I think it was developed in the fifties and sixties, maybe even the forties—it uses woodchip waste, but if we could use other waste forms like plastics and other products that are hard to recycle in the regional areas and turn it into energy, it might be a great thing. Without speaking any further, I am happy to move the fourth report of the Environment, Resources and Development Committee and commend all the recommendations to the house.

Motion carried.

Motions

MODERN SLAVERY

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:37): I move:

1. That in the opinion of this house a joint committee be appointed to investigate and report on—
 - (a) the prevalence of modern slavery in South Australia and the reasons for it being experienced;
 - (b) who experiences modern slavery and slavery-like conditions and why;

- (c) the experience of women with modern slavery and sexual servitude;
 - (d) the interconnection between temporary visas and the experience of modern slavery and slavery-like conditions;
 - (e) the effectiveness of existing industrial instruments in addressing modern slavery and slavery-like conditions;
 - (f) the interconnection between being engaged on an insecure, casual or labour hire basis, outsourcing, economic settings and the experience of modern slavery;
 - (g) the potential role of government, business, community organisations and educational institutions in preventing and eradicating modern slavery and slavery-like conditions; and
 - (h) any other matters.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
 3. That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting concurrence thereto.

Modern slavery and slavery-like practices are occurring in South Australia. They are a shocking reality and a terrible blight on our community and on our economy. A recent Australian Federal Police report showed that there were 15 cases investigated in South Australia in the last financial year alone, one of the highest per capita incident rates in the country. By the very secretive hidden nature of this terrible scourge, sadly we can safely assume the real figure is much, much higher.

Flinders University's Associate Professor Marinella Marmo's 2019 report, 'Slavery and slavery-like practices in South Australia', provides a very disturbing snapshot of the issue, and is the catalyst for the need for us in this place to raise awareness about and better understand it and to commit to doing whatever we can, whatever is within our power, to end these utterly unacceptable practices. I heartily thank Dr Marinella Marmo for her outstanding report and for her integrity and her values, which are a key impetus for this report.

It is a report that provides an important picture of these practices, a report that is steeped in compassion for people who are exploited and a report that encourages us to thoroughly explore these issues and to consider how we can provide avenues for those who are experiencing them to seek support, advocacy, safety and security.

I also thank the wonderful Alexandra Baxter and Sister Anne Twomey for their excellent contribution and for their campaigning towards the establishment of this inquiry. As Dr Marmo also does in the report's foreword, I offer my gratitude to Sister Meredith Evans for her encouragement and her energy. I also acknowledge ACRATH and Flinders University for their support of this work and the many service providers, unions, churches and very brave people they have supported, whose voice inform this report, whose voice must be amplified and heard and for whom we seek to establish this inquiry.

An inquiry into modern slavery and slavery-like practices in South Australia is the key recommendation of this fine well-received and respected report. Like many South Australians, I was deeply shocked when I read the media reports and found out more about the exploitation and abuse of people, so many of them women, outlined in Dr Marmo's report. Given the nature of this exploitation and abuse, and the fear engendered in people engaged in extraordinarily precarious employment by perpetrators, it is widely held that the examples outlined in Dr Marmo's report are sadly, shockingly, just the tip of the iceberg.

Modern slavery is a complex crime, which is estimated to impact around 40 million people worldwide. Because these practices reduce a person to a mere commodity and dehumanise people, modern slavery and slavery-like practices violate human rights. The practices include domestic labour and sexual servitude, which trap people in a cycle of vulnerability, poverty, violence and voicelessness. If left unchecked, these shocking practices will continue to see people harmed, exploited and devalued.

Any existence whatsoever of these practices is a blight on South Australia's reputation as a safe, welcoming place to work, study, visit and live. In the long term, they have the potential to have

a terrible debilitating impact on many South Australian industries, including education, tourism, hospitality, cleaning and agriculture, that heavily rely on international students, tourists and migrant workers, industries that we must support at this time, and always, to grow.

Workers, principally within the hospitality supply chain, cleaning and agricultural industries, are being physically, financially and sexually abused whilst working in our state. No person in Australia, or indeed anywhere, should ever be forced to work against their will or be subject to any form of abuse or exploitation. Modern slavery is a human rights issue, and a health and safety issue, and gives rise to multiple labour force and industrial issues. All these issues and their terrible impact on our fellow human beings deserve to be thoroughly inquired into.

It is imperative that we deeply understand that impact on people, people such as the group of Taiwanese female backpackers whom the report referenced following a 2018 story raised by the then National Union of Workers, now United Workers Union. These women were working more than 40 hours per week in the Riverland and paid just \$16 per hour. Eight of them lived in a three-bedroom house, which would have generously attracted rent of \$350 per week.

Despite that, each of these eight women was required to pay \$120 per week rent, as well as additional money for internet usage and transport to get to work. The report states that if they wanted to get to work and/or get more hours, they were expected to perform sexual favours. These are women treated in this appalling way and exploited right here in South Australia, just two years ago in 2018.

Previous global shocks, such as the 2008 global financial crisis and the 2014 Ebola outbreak, led to sharp increases in exploitation, including human trafficking, modern slavery and slavery-like practices. Our current circumstances could increase the risk of an upturn in modern slavery and slavery-like practices across Australia, including in South Australia, over the next few months.

With one of the country's highest unemployment rates and little support available for temporary visa holders and international students, it is feared that the increased demand for jobs will create an environment in which exploitation could grow and thrive in our state. Temporary visa holders could be particularly vulnerable to unethical employers in a tightened job market. This cohort of people can already face low wages, unsafe working conditions and abuse.

Crises traditionally push people toward making riskier decisions about what work they will do, which does make them vulnerable to exploitation. What we absolutely do not want to see is already low wages and conditions eroded further because people are so desperate to work and look after their families that they feel they have no other choice than to accept this sort of abuse. It is absolutely critical that we grow awareness and support for change.

This joint committee is a firm step in the right direction. It gives us an opportunity to explore these very complex issues to respond through recommendations in relation to them and then to act. Other jurisdictions that have considered these issues, have explored remedies, including requiring companies to report on modern slavery risk in supply chains, mechanisms to track perpetrators and to better share data amongst agencies. As has happened in other jurisdictions, as a parliament we must work together to make strong and urgent recommendations about how we can resolve these issues.

New South Wales was the first Australian jurisdiction to legislate against modern slavery and the second jurisdiction in the world to provide for an anti-slavery commissioner. The New South Wales act, which I understand will soon be implemented, sets out state-based mechanisms to address modern slavery and signals that state's commitment to ensuring New South Wales is a safe and fair community for all.

A New South Wales government website sets out some of the act's directions which, once their Legislative Council's Standing Committee on Social Issues considers its inquiry, will include establishing an anti-slavery commissioner to combat and raise awareness of modern slavery in New South Wales, developing a responsive approach to support victims and setting out guidelines for business and New South Wales government agencies to acknowledge and address modern slavery risks. It is clear that this state has legislated to ensure both public and private organisations take

responsibility to eradicate these practices, practices that are absolutely an affront to all who care about people being treated with dignity and respect.

Given progress in other states, the contents of Dr Marmo's report, the recent arrests by the AFP, the capacity for increased exploitation as we face our current challenges and the many church groups, individuals and other groups who have urged the Marshall Liberal government to support this thorough inquiry, I fervently hope that they will. Those people who are being exploited are relying on them to do so. They need this government's support.

I understand the Attorney-General recently wrote to community members who raised the need for an inquiry with her, fobbing off their concerns by attempting to shift responsibility solely on to the commonwealth. In this correspondence the Attorney also claimed that existing domestic violence services could deal with modern slavery and that previous inquiries have examined it.

We strongly and utterly reject those assertions. Many cases within Dr Marmo's report showed key South Australian agencies were not equipped to deal with incidents of forced marriage and domestic, sexual and labour servitude. It is more likely that South Australian police, local community organisations, church organisations and other state-based organisations encounter these issues than their federal counterparts. No previous or current inquiry has looked at forced marriage, forced labour, deceptive recruiting and domestic, sexual and labour servitude in any meaningful way in South Australia.

We must find out who is benefiting from these practices and make sure there are proper deterrents in place. To do this we need an inquiry. It is crucial that the South Australian parliament follows the lead of New South Wales and Victoria in establishing a state-based inquiry. On this side of the house, we will relentlessly advocate for those whose stories can be heard through this inquiry. I urge members not to turn their backs on those to whom we should listen, on those whose circumstances make it so very difficult for their voices to be heard. I urge members to support this inquiry.

Let us together ensure that this is not another motion or bill that sits on our *Notice Paper* but, rather, an inquiry that we commit to in a bipartisan way, in a way that matters, in a way that gives us the best opportunity to listen and to help make a difference in people's lives. Let us together ensure that the establishment of this inquiry enables people who have been exploited to see that there is hope for meaningful change. I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:52): I rise to indicate that the South Australian government strongly condemns all slavery and slavery-like practices; however, we will not be supporting this motion to establish a joint committee for the reasons I will outline. The member has identified that this motion comes out of a report regarding slavery and slavery-like practices release last year by Dr Marinella Marmo, Associate Professor at Flinders University, who, together with the member, has now formed a Facebook group called Stop Modern Slavery SA.

That is commendable, no question about that; however, it is important to note a number of things. The definition of modern slavery as examined, in fact, in Dr Marmo's report is very broad. It encompasses circumstances such as forced marriage, forced labour, domestic or sexual servitude within familial relationships and broader concerns of exploitation of temporary migrants. We know about exploitation: we have had the sex worker legislation debated in this house and how in some workforce circumstances people are in a power imbalance and are shockingly exploited.

Dr Marmo, however, identified several indicia rendering victims more vulnerable to slavery-like practices: temporary migratory status, isolation and a lack of a reliable support network, poor understanding or access to the Australian legal system, poor English skills and an inability to leave the exploitative environment, due to a real or perceived fear of repercussions. Fear of losing their job, fear of being expelled, fear of being put out on the street, fear of being sent home to their country of origin are all real circumstances; we know that.

The first recommendation of Dr Marmo, of course, is to establish this parliamentary committee; however, the other recommendations largely talk about issues of raising awareness, and the mover of the motion has identified the importance of continuing to do that.

The situation, however, is this. Firstly, the commonwealth Modern Slavery Act 2018 has passed. The Criminal Code Act 1995 and the South Australian Criminal Consolidation Act 1935 contain measures or offences to combat slavery or slavery-like practices. In South Australia we, together with the more recent advances at the commonwealth level, have been leaders in relation to legislative protection for these circumstances.

The Modern Slavery Act requires certain entities, including the commonwealth government, to publicly report annually on the risk of modern slavery in their global operations and supply chains, including entities owned and controlled by the principal, and their actions taken to address it. The act was designed to drive a race to the top as entities compete for market funding and investor and consumer support, and to raise awareness of modern slavery risk among business.

The commonwealth identified the risks are highest in the manufacture of bricks, coal, cocoa, cotton, coffee, floor coverings, footwear, garments, jewellery, natural rubber, rice, seafood, sugar and textiles. Importantly, a review is required to be done three years after its commencement. I commend members to have a look at those publications in this regard and disseminate them for public education if they are prepared to do that. I would certainly endorse it.

Divisions 270 and 271 of the Criminal Code Act contain significant penalties for slavery, which is inclusive of the circumstances as defined by Dr Marmo and is inclusive of debt bondage and trafficking, for example. These offences are investigated by the Australian Federal Police, on whose statistics Dr Marmo relies in her report. While there are cases in South Australia, they are relatively low as opposed to the whole of the percentage of the national total; for example, from 2004 to 2019—the data is all there—there were 18 suspected cases in South Australia referred to the AFP's Support for Trafficked People Program out of 449 federal cases.

In addition, the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 (SA) contains serious offences for commercial sexual servitude and child marriage. As the member would know, we do have pioneering legislation in this state to take away the passports of children if there is a fear that they are going to be removed from the country to be traded in a child marriage. The government runs and funds numerous programs that assist people experiencing domestic and family violence, which is a common factor examined by Dr Marmo in circumstances of slavery.

Further, there is already a Legislative Council select committee considering slavery-like practices in relation to wage theft. Just look at today's paper about whether that has been effective or not. I hope the committee also considers the prosecutions that have proceeded against two people who have consistently underpaid a large number of their employees in a food outlet here in South Australia. The committee's terms of reference were amended to include slavery-like work practices on 3 June 2020 to address these concerns in the context of labour. Again, I wish that committee well in adding to that term of reference and undertaking that work.

With respect to the particular vulnerability of temporary migrants, I wrote to the Minister for Immigration on 9 January this year, following representations from migration agents, to recommend legislative change to incorporate safeguarding provisions for temporary migrants to disclose exploitation without fear of visa cancellation. This is a real and pressing issue and, no doubt, we need to get the commonwealth on board to take that action. My executive team has been in contact with the federal department and, in addition, the justice policy and analytics team consults with Immigration SA on these issues.

In light of the above, the government does not support establishing a joint parliamentary committee into slavery and slavery-like practices in South Australia. It is the government's position that the broader issues of slavery and human trafficking are principally commonwealth matters, but we are doing the heavy lifting here in South Australia. We are proud to do it. We have pioneered it and our government will continue to do so.

I thank the member for bringing to the attention of the house the importance of managing and continuing to manage these issues, prosecuting where appropriate and having policies and programs to support them, but we do not need another committee of inquiry.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:58): Mr Speaker, I am just trying to think about where to start in terms of responding to the comments from the Attorney-General. Both the Attorney and I have

pointed out the research of Associate Professor Marinella Marmo and her team at Flinders University, which was also supported by ACRATH and has been endorsed and supported by many churches, support community organisations, unions, and women's organisations.

What I find extraordinary is that the key recommendation in that fine, outstanding research—as I said, it is research that is deeply underpinned by compassion, values and a desire to make sure that people live their lives free of exploitation—from that incredible, wise body of people is to be ignored by—

The SPEAKER: Does the member for Reynell wish to seek leave or to call the matter to a vote?

Ms HILDYARD: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER (12:00): Before I call on government business, I make the following statement with regard to the matter of privilege raised by the member for West Torrens in this house on 23 July. However, before raising that matter, I outline the significance of privilege as it relates to this house and its members. Privilege is not a device by which members or any other person can seek to pursue matters that can be addressed by debate or settled by the vote of the house on a substantive motion.

McGee in *Parliamentary Practice in New Zealand*—and I have particular regard to the third edition, chapter 48 at page 661—in my view articulates the test as to whether or not a matter is a matter of privilege by defining it as a matter that can 'genuinely be regarded as tending to impede or obstruct the house in the discharge of its duties'.

By the matter raised by the member for West Torrens in relation to answers given by the Premier to questions in the house on 1 and 21 July, the member for West Torrens alleges that the Premier deliberately and intentionally misled the house. More specifically, on 1 July the Premier provided the following answer to a question asked:

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.

Further, on 21 July the Leader of the Opposition asked the following question to the Premier:

If members of the Premier's cabinet have made errors that the Premier believes are unacceptable, what recourse or what reprimand has the Premier imposed upon his ministers for wrongful claims of the country members' allowance?

The Premier provided the following answer:

...the government has written to the Auditor-General, and let's not forget for one second that it is indeed the Auditor-General who provides oversight of this parliamentary allowance. It's not a government allowance: it's a parliamentary allowance, and it's the Auditor-General who has responsibility for making sure that members act in accordance with those guidelines.

The Premier then went on to say:

We have asked the Auditor-General to provide a greater level of scrutiny; in fact, we have suggested to the Auditor-General that he may choose—we cannot direct him, but he may choose—to conduct random audits of country MPs' accommodation allowance claims. This will assure the people of South Australia that, when we spend a cent of their money, it is done in accordance with those strict guidelines.

In raising this matter of privilege, the member for West Torrens contrasts the Premier's answers referred to above with the public statement made by the former Independent Commissioner Against Corruption on 23 July and alleges that the Premier has wilfully and intentionally misled the house by implying to the house that the Auditor-General was investigating the matter.

The member for West Torrens quoted the following passage from the former Independent Commissioner Against Corruption's statement:

I have discussed with the Auditor-General any activities he may be conducting relevant to the matter to avoid duplication. The Auditor-General has advised me that he does not intend at this time to investigate the matter in light of his office's statutory responsibilities to audit the financial statements of all statutory public authorities.

I have had the opportunity to carefully read the Premier's answers and compared them to those parts of the former independent commissioner's statement identified by the member for West Torrens. I cannot find any inconsistencies between the two. While the Premier makes reference in his answer on 1 July that the Auditor-General 'will look at all members' returns with regard to that matter', there is no suggestion that the Auditor-General will be investigating the matter.

This is confirmed by the Premier's answer on 23 July, where the Premier makes it quite clear that the Auditor-General cannot be directed to undertake any course of action to look into this matter. In the Chair's opinion, this is not a matter of privilege for the reasons I have set out. Accordingly, I do not propose to give the precedence which would enable any member to pursue this matter immediately as a matter of privilege. My opinion, however, does not prevent any member from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2020.)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (12:06): I can indicate to the house that the government's legislation is part of a COAG process, I have been so briefed.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, not to interrupt at this stage, by indication are you the lead speaker?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I was about to say I am, indeed, the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. The government briefing to me is a bit light on detail, but that is the choice of the minister, I suppose. I was given a one-page briefing with seven paragraphs on the national energy laws enforcement bill. I will read it into the *Hansard* as it is the briefing the opposition is relying on to allow a swift passage of this legislation through both houses of parliament. It states:

At the COAG Energy Council meeting on March 20 2020 Ministers agreed to the Statutes Amendment (National Energy Laws)(Penalties and Enforcement) Bill 2020 (attached).

The Bill updates the enforcement regimes for the National Energy Laws.

South Australia is the lead legislator for National Energy Laws.

It continues:

The COAG Energy Council (Council) recognises the importance of a robust enforcement regime underpinning the National Energy Laws. This gives all participants, especially customers, the necessary confidence to participate in the energy markets.

The Bill includes a three tier civil penalty regime and indexation of penalties in line with CPI:

- Tier 1 consists of penalties of either up to \$10 million, or 10% of turnover or three times the benefit gained for certain breaches (whichever is greater)
- Tier 2 consists of penalties of up to \$1.435 million.
- Tier 3 consists of penalties of up to \$170,000.

The Australian Energy Regulator's (AER) information gathering powers are enhanced—
which is a good thing—

under the bill and it is provided with the power to compel the giving of oral evidence.

That is a long overdue reform, and I congratulate the COAG Energy Council. I suppose it is fair to say that this is the COAG Energy Council's final meeting. I will ask the minister in committee about whether or not, given the new national cabinet arrangements, the COAG Energy Council will continue post national cabinet. The briefing continues:

The Bill also expands the orders the AER can seek from a court. This includes non-pecuniary orders (such as community service orders) and an order requiring compliance with a compulsory notice.

And that is it, sir. That is what—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They have been found. It was the one good news story of 2020.

The Hon. S.J.R. Patterson: What about Liverpool?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, that was inevitable. I did a bit of research on this, and the briefing was helpful. I would like to thank the officers for the briefing. That was fine. It occurred to me that I hope I was not as scant with briefings to the then shadow minister as he is with me. I am not assigning any blame. I am not assigning any ulterior motive. I just think that there could have been some more information.

I went on the COAG Energy Council's website and found some information that was a little bit interesting. I found a consultation draft paper that was issued in July. What I find interesting, and my understanding, is that the legislation was drafted and accepted by the COAG Energy Council and the South Australian government agreed to pass that legislation and then began consultation on the bill. I am not sure if that is standard practice. I might be guilty of the same thing. I do not know, but I find it interesting that the national energy laws' civil penalty provisions are being consulted on after the act has been drafted. The act has been decided, the laws are being passed and now we are going to go out to talk to industry.

There might have already been widespread consultation beforehand, which would explain that, and these could just be some explanatory notes going out afterwards, so maybe there is nothing wrong. I am just going to pose the questions, which is what our job is. I always enjoy having the member for Morphett in the chamber. He always has a great smile on his face. He is a happy bloke.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: He's a great minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, we will see. He was a very good member of the Public Works Committee—exceptional, diligent and read all his papers. He asked good and interesting questions, and I look forward to him in the house. Hopefully, he will be better than he was at Collingwood and, hopefully, the career lasts longer.

The Hon. S.J.R. Patterson: It was an 11-year career.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right: it was a good career. I remember watching that first game. You should be very proud of playing for Collingwood. Someone needs to be proud of playing for Collingwood.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Who did you play for?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's just a joke, Dan, calm down. I have found some overview online (which was not given to me by the department) talking about the penalties and the decision matrix, which is all very fascinating reading. I am sure the minister has read all this thoroughly as well and understands it all perfectly, and when I ask him questions on it he will have all the answers.

I would like to say again that the opposition will be supporting this bill through all stages. I imagine I will be the only speaker on the bill from the opposition, but I would not mind going into committee, if we could, just to ask a few questions. With those few remarks, I commend the bill to

the house. I look forward to asking a few questions in committee and, after we finish those questions, the bill's speedy passage through both houses.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (12:13): I also take the opportunity to speak here in parliament today about the Statutes Amendment (National Energy Laws) (Penalties and Enforcement) Bill 2020. This bill seeks to amend three laws: the National Electricity Law, in part 2; the National Energy Retail Law, in part 3; and the National Gas Law, in part 4. Amongst them, these three laws provide the regulatory framework that really does underpin our energy market. The rules that are set up in these laws put obligations on all the market participants, whether that be generators, the retailers or the networks.

The energy market itself, particularly in relation to electricity, is certainly undergoing a substantial transition, none more so than what we see in the National Electricity Market. The National Electricity Market was designed at a time in the 1990s when electricity generation was based predominantly upon what could be described as large centralised base load generators, which then had gas peaking plants to cover the differences between the minimum and maximum demand that occur during a 24-hour cycle.

We are now in a time where we have moved away from those large, centralised base load power stations. The mix of electricity generation into the National Electricity Market certainly includes much more electricity that is coming from intermittent sources such as wind and solar. At times, they really do have quite a large difference in their supply, even over a day.

Just on that, the Australian Energy Market Operator released a report in October 2019, entitled 'Maintaining power system security with high penetrations of wind and solar generation: international insights for Australia'. On page 9 of that report, it states:

Australia is experiencing some of the highest instantaneous levels of wind and solar generation in the world. Synchronously interconnected power systems have operated for periods where wind and solar energy was larger than demand—including Denmark (157%) and South Australia (142%).

I make that point to show that South Australia is leading the way in terms of how it generates its electricity from renewable sources. It is now based a lot more on weather. Not only does the weather affect electricity customer demand, it now also affects the supply side of electricity significantly.

Unfortunately, prior to the Marshall Liberal government being elected in March 2018, this transition was reasonably unmanaged. This came at a significant economic cost to electricity consumers in South Australia. Fortunately, since that time, the energy minister, who has brought this bill to parliament, has been working really hard to get that back on track and get an orderly transition to renewable energy—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Did your office write this for him?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: —there is more—whilst reducing bills to South Australians even further and growing our economy. This does require the right mix of interconnection, storage—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: —no, no—generation and smart technology to balance supply and demand. This mix is encapsulated in the energy solution action plan that was released in June of this year. The plan addresses the very serious issues this government inherited, and one of those is the very real prospect of a negative operational demand. We need to make sure we get on top of that to ensure that we have a secure system and energy supply in place.

One very important aspect of that is fast-tracking the South Australia-New South Wales interconnector by underwriting early works to that really important project. The Australian Energy Market Operator has made it clear that delivering on this interconnector is critical to our power system security. We are certainly doing it the right way in terms of the transition being undertaken in South Australia and we are hopeful that it will encourage other jurisdictions as they go about their transition as well.

I frame that because we need to update the laws that will regulate this transition so that they can adapt to what is, as I said, a really significant technological change. At the same time, we need

to make sure that these laws allow for that electricity to be affordable, reliable and, importantly, very secure as well.

In terms of how this bill got here—the member for West Torrens did ask about that—the Council of Australian Governments Energy Council is responsible for these key national reforms in the energy sector, these three laws that we are amending today. The energy council recognises the importance of the national energy laws being underpinned by a very robust enforcement regime, which is what this amendment bill is all about. It will give participants, especially customers, the necessary confidence to participate in these markets.

It is the Australian Energy Regulator's role to monitor this, investigate, and also enforce compliance with these national energy laws. The genesis of this bill began in 2010 when the Energy Council agreed to:

...a comprehensive review of the enforcement regimes across all the national energy laws to ensure that the interests of customers continue to be protected, and the integrity of the energy market is maintained.

Unfortunately, the speed of electricity is certainly much faster than the speed of legislation and it has taken quite a while to get from 2010 to where we are today. Along the way, there have been various reviews and recommendations around this, culminating in July 2018 when the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission released its retail electricity pricing inquiry, entitled 'Restoring electricity affordability and Australia's competitive advantage'.

The recommendations here span the entire energy supply chain and focus on four main areas: boosting competition, lowering costs in the networks, enhancing customer experiences and outcomes, and also improving business outcomes. A number of recommendations from this report were in relation to the existing penalties that were in place at the time and then result in what we have here today in the bill. In terms of some of the comments from the ACCC, they include:

The ACCC considers that the current civil penalty amounts are insufficient to impose a credible level of deterrence and provide meaningful consequences to businesses. Therefore, the ACCC considers that the penalties should be increased to provide that the Australian Energy Regulator (AER) with a greater level of flexibility in its response to address breaches of the national energy laws.

Out of the report there were a number of recommendations. This was again consulted on, which goes to the point the member for West Torrens made. After the consultation on this report by the ACCC, the COAG Energy Council met on 20 March 2020, and at that meeting the ministers agreed to this bill we see before us. Once agreed by that energy council, South Australia is the lead legislating body for the making of legislative amendments and regulations, hence why it is in the parliament here and we are debating it at the moment.

Overall, the proposed changes detailed in this bill are aimed at strengthening the Australian Energy Regulator's enforcement powers and also the penalty regime under which the national energy laws operate. The idea is that it will provide a strong deterrent against breaches of the law and their rules, particularly in the case of significant breaches or breaches that will impact on the integrity of the energy market.

In summary, the key changes that will be implemented in this legislation include adopting a three-tier civil penalty regime into these laws, increasing the civil and offence penalty levels and indexing them in line with the consumer price index and also enhancing the AER's information gathering powers. I will talk a little about the penalties framework in these national energy laws. The bill has three main effects, which will be to increase the penalty rates, create a new tiered civil penalty framework and also provide for the penalties to be indexed into the future.

As an example, the current corporate civil maximum penalty rate of \$100,000 was introduced when the first laws were made in 1996, and it has not been increased since that time. Most of the penalties applied for offences under the existing laws are set at this level currently, so in terms of today's dollars that is approximately \$170,000 to \$180,000. In some cases, these penalties may not actually work as an adequate deterrent for participants breaching their regulatory obligations. Certain provisions of the national energy laws, regulations and rules are said to be civil provisions if they are so identified in the laws or in associated regulations.

If a person or a corporation does not comply with or breaches the requirements set out in the civil penalty provision, the AER may either take action resulting in the court applying a civil penalty

or issue an infringement notice. Each of the national energy laws specifies the monetary penalty amounts which may be applied in the case of a breach of civil penalty provision. In the case of a matter that the AER does take to court, the law specifies the maximum civil penalty a court may apply, but it should be noted that the court has discretion to apply a lesser amount.

In the case of an infringement notice, however, the amount of that penalty specified in the law is not subject to the discretion of the AER and so infringement penalties are generally much lower as a result than the court-imposed penalty would be. The bill itself, as I discussed earlier, adopts a three-tier civil penalty regime, which is aimed at ensuring that the AER has a sufficient level of flexibility to adequately respond to breaches of those national energy laws.

What that means is that the structure would allow specific provisions of the laws, regulations and rules to be either subject to lesser or greater civil penalties depending on what the nature of the breach is. With respect to those levels, those tiers, breaches of a tier 1 provision do incur a maximum penalty of the greater of:

- a monetary penalty of up to \$10 million;
- a monetary penalty reflecting an amount calculated to be three times the financial benefit gained as a result of the breach; or
- a monetary penalty reflecting an amount calculated to be 10 per cent of the annual turnover of the corporation that actually engaged in that breach.

This tier 1 reflects the ACCC's recommendations that the maximum penalties under the national laws become more aligned with those that are in the current Australian Consumer Law. If I talk about the other tiers, a breach of a tier 2 provision carries a penalty of up to \$1.435 million and breaches of tier 3 provisions incur penalties of up to \$170,000. That roughly equates to the original \$100,000 I mentioned that was first set up in 1996. I should note that most of the penalties and breaches would be covered in that tier 3.

We must also make sure that the value of these penalty increases is maintained into the future, so the amendments in this bill also allow for the penalty rates to be indexed by CPI in the future. As I said before, the existing penalties had not been increased since 1996. The timing of the indexation that is set to occur in this bill will have a first adjustment being made on 1 July 2023 and from then on from 1 July every three years after that date.

As I said, if all those existing civil penalty provisions were carried across to the new structure, they are mostly going to fall into the tier 3 area. However, there are certainly two breaches that are subject to the higher tiers. One of those relates to the Retailer Reliability Obligation, which was passed here and brought in by the energy minister in the early days of this Marshall Liberal government. Again, it was designed to try to get security of energy supply and increased capacity into our electricity market.

Importantly, if a forecast supply shortfall is identified by the modelling into the future, this would trigger an obligation on electricity retailers to demonstrate that their contracting can meet their share of peak demand one year in advance. By doing that, as I said, it acts as a bit of a capacity mechanism that will integrate into the existing energy market. It is really aimed at ensuring that electricity is available when it is needed and we are not having to ramp up emergency electricity generation, which of course becomes very costly during those peak times of demand, usually in the high-energy demand months of summer.

Presently, the Retailer Reliability Obligation provides a civil penalty provision up to amounts but not exceeding, for a natural person or a body corporate, \$1 million for a breach relating to a reliability gap period and \$10 million for a breach that relates to a second or subsequent reliability gap period. What that means is that the original penalty regime will now be updated to fall within tier 2 for the first offence and then move into tier 1, upwards of \$10 million, for a second or subsequent reliability gap period.

Another serious breach that is subject to the tier 1 offence relates to breaches of the rebidding provisions. In terms of how that plays out, generators either offer or bid to supply certain amounts of power at a particular price up to a day and a half before that power is needed. In so

doing, those generators must be genuinely prepared to honour that bid if AEMO calls on them to actually supply at that price.

Of course, if there is an unexpected need for more or less supply as the time draws nearer, then generators are able to submit a new offer or a rebid. Naturally, rebidding allows participants to adjust their bids in response to new information as it becomes available—maybe if another generator had gone off line or if the wind conditions were not as high as first forecast. That allows them to adjust.

Acceptable rebidding would actually promote efficient outcomes for a consumer. If it were a case of more wind being available, that would allow prices to come down. Unfortunately, where this can be a concern is when a generator tries to game the system, either by rebidding its supply at a much higher price than they originally bid right before the dispatch time without any real reason to do that, or when they know in advance that they intend to rebid but delay announcing it until the last possible moment, therefore again putting up the prices.

These actions are reprehensible and we need to crack down on them. They are a serious breach of the rules in place at the present time. Reflecting on the fact that these actions will have an impact on seriously distorting the market and jacking up the wholesale costs, which then flow on to the general consumer in South Australia, these rebidding offences will be classified as a tier 1 offence. Penalties can be up to \$10 million or three times the benefit gained from breaching the rules, or 10 per cent of their annual turnover.

I have gone through the penalties, and it is important that these act as a serious deterrent. This bill provides that. It will enhance the Australian Energy Regulator's information-gathering powers as well, which is the other aspect of this bill. The idea is that it can then act to make sure that allegations such as I have outlined around rebidding, etc., can be fully investigated.

Powers that currently do not exist but that this bill seeks to add include implementing the oral evidence power. This will ensure that the Australian Energy Regulator will be able to report on and use that oral evidence in its powers when it conducts investigations. Of course, there need to be safeguards put in place, so at the same time as it being allowed to exercise this oral evidence power and uncover evidence orally the Australian Energy Regulator is also required to prepare and publish guidelines on the exercise of these information-gathering powers.

The bill also expands the orders the Australian Energy Regulator can seek from a court. This includes non-pecuniary orders and orders requiring compliance with a compulsory notice as well. The idea is that the courts can also provide community service orders as part of the penalty regime; that might include communicating their breaches of these acts to the general public.

In summary, this bill will establish a more flexible and sophisticated three-tiered penalty regime that is more closely aligned to the Australian Consumer Law. In so doing, the bill will help to reduce energy prices by significantly increasing the maximum penalties, as well as providing for periodic indexation of those penalties, that can be incurred by marketing participants for serious breaches.

This will impact on wholesale prices which, again, flow through to South Australian electricity bills because it provides a serious disincentive for generators, network providers and retailers trying to put up prices. Rather, it makes them much more efficient so that we have a much more efficient and competitive market, resulting in costs being kept down for the end user.

Again, I commend the minister for bringing this to the house. It is another way that the Marshall Liberal government is lowering costs and helping to reduce energy prices for all South Australians.

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (12:33): I am happy to rise to speak in relation to this piece of legislation, the Statutes Amendment (National Energy Laws) (Penalties and Enforcement) Bill, and endorse the comments of the shadow minister on this. Clearly there is more information we need to receive rather than the very short briefing he was provided, and it is pretty disappointing that the opposition—which has generally been very supportive in relation to these national energy law bills and working in a bipartisan way—would not provide us with more fulsome information to enable us to reach a considered opinion on this.

If the minister has nothing to hide about this legislation and has nothing to hide about the process that was undertaken, then he would make sure there is a significant amount of briefing material available to the opposition to enable the parliament to form a considered opinion. The fact that only a few paragraphs of information were provided is quite telling of the way this government view their approach to briefing the opposition and to parliamentary debates. So that is disappointing.

In relation to energy more broadly, the people of South Australia remember one number very clearly in relation to energy policy, and that is a promise that was made by the Premier before the last election. That number is \$302. The promise was made that there would be a reduction in electricity bills of \$302. That has not happened. I have not spoken to any member of my electorate who has informed me that they have had a \$302 reduction in their electricity bill. Clearly, we know how that promise came about. Clearly, we remember the very embarrassing press conference where the now Minister for Energy was correcting the Premier during the course of that press conference.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It made a great ad.

Mr PICTON: It did make a very compelling advertisement. We also remember how the Electoral Commission viewed some of their promises in relation to energy, and we also remember that the government's own modelling showed that the vast majority of what they promised was going to happen anyway without any action on behalf of them. We have not seen that promise fulfilled and South Australians will be judging over the next 18 months.

I noted the Premier was saying yesterday in question time that it is a very long way to the next election, but it is not that long. It is sooner than you think. Eighteen months to bring in force the promise of a \$302 reduction in electricity bills is a big task that is going to fall on the Minister for Energy's shoulders. He will be judged on whether he has met that commitment or not and whether he has delivered that promise to the people of South Australia or not.

What have we seen in relation to the energy policy of this government since they were elected? They inherited what was a very strong plan that we had in place in relation to securing our state's energy future, taking control of our state's energy future, and what has this government done since then? The first thing that happened was that under your watch, the solar thermal plant for Port Augusta has fallen over. It has fallen over under this minister.

Under this minister, the promise of solar thermal, which was contracted and which was in the works, has fallen over. No support has been provided by this government to ensure that that would continue. This was a significant opportunity for people of Upper Spencer Gulf. This was a significant opportunity for our energy future here in South Australia. Contracts were in place, as the minister says, and now that project has fallen over. The government have done nothing to try to make sure that that project would happen, and it is completely off the agenda now.

The benefit of this project was going to be that we would have a renewable project that would provide base load power, it would provide employment to the area and we would be once again leading the world. Now it is completely off the table. There is no prospect, as I understand it—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Think of the ads in Port Augusta.

Mr PICTON: That's right. There is no prospect that the government is doing anything about reviving that potential for Port Augusta. That is certainly something we will be talking about over the next 18 months, that up in the Port Augusta region a lot of promises were made to people and nothing has been delivered.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who promised a solar thermal plant in Port Augusta, Dan? You did.

Mr PICTON: That's right. There was a promise made by the Minister for Energy, the current local member, that this would happen. Not only is he the local member but he is in charge of the energy portfolio. He had the ability to make that project happen and nothing has been done, the project has fallen over, and I think people will very significantly remember that over the next 18 months. We will certainly be doing our bit to inform people of that over the next 18 months.

What else has happened in relation to energy policy under this government? Well, we had in place a state-owned power plant for the first time since the current Treasurer sold ETSA. The

current Treasurer, when he was the former treasurer, sold all our power plants. For the first time since then, we had a state-owned power plant in place. This was a significant change in our energy future when, for the first time since the Hon. Rob Lucas and his Liberal colleagues sold the Electricity Trust of South Australia, we would have the government owning a power plant.

That has now been flogged off. That has now been privatised by this minister and this Premier, and that is very significant because it means one additional step where we are no longer having the control that we were seeking to have in the market. The benefit of this plant was not that it was going to play a day-to-day role in the energy market but that it was going to provide the reserve capacity so the government would be able to intervene if that were necessary.

Now, by putting it back into the market, there is no additional reserve capacity available. That significant power that the government would have has gone, that role that we have as the public of South Australia collectively in our government, saying, 'We actually believe that this is a public good. We actually believe that this is a public utility service that the government should be involved in,' is now just flung back to the market under this government. That is a significant weakening of our state government role in the energy market.

Another thing that has happened is that the state government are putting all their eggs into the basket of trying to get an additional interconnector to New South Wales. Where is that interconnector? There is no interconnector being constructed. There is in fact not even an interconnector that is fully funded. There has been an amount of funding that has been provided through the regulatory processes, which will be paid for by the consumers in their energy bills, but there is a significant gap.

The cost of that interconnector has significantly blown out, and there is not a solution for where that remaining amount of funding is going to be sourced from. That means there is no construction happening of this interconnector. We do not know when construction will happen on this interconnector, and we do not know if the Minister for Energy and member for Stuart's solemn promise that this interconnector will be in place by the time of the next election will happen. Once again, the Premier says the election is a long way away. Well, it is getting closer.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Like Mike Rann used to say, 'It's later than you think.'

Mr PICTON: It's later than you think, and there is no construction started. There are no proper funding arrangements in place to get this happening. Another issue with the interconnector is that, even if eventually they put in place some arrangement to get this happening, which seems a long way away now, there are significant risks to our state in terms of our own sovereign base load capacity due to this interconnector.

There is a significant risk that, because of this additional interconnector, we will see the shutdown of South Australian generators, which is an absolute risk for the future of our supply here in South Australia. If we do not have the capacity to generate our own power the sovereign way here in South Australia around the clock and we are reliant upon interconnectors, then that is absolutely a risk for our supply. Clearly, one of the hallmarks of the fact that this interconnector will be built is that there will be a lot of mass coal-fired plants in New South Wales delivering a lot of our energy here, into South Australia.

What does that mean for the future of Torrens Island? What does that mean for the future of Pelican Point? What does that mean for the future of Osborne? What does that mean for the future of the state-owned power plant that you are now privatising? The base load supply to South Australians of all those plants will now be up against much larger coal-fired power plants in New South Wales. Market economists have pointed out that this is a risk to South Australia and the security of our supply. It has not been sufficiently answered how that will be addressed and how we will make sure that we still have sufficient generators in operation in South Australia.

The last element of the government's energy plan, such as it is, that we have heard about in recent weeks, is that the government is now embarking upon changes to the rules that will enable them to turn off solar panels and batteries that people have installed on their own properties. That is causing very significant concern in the community. People have invested a lot of money in their solar and batteries on the basis that they will be able to use them and be able to export power when they

want to. These are very fundamental changes to what has been in place and there is a significant amount of concern about that.

I think that if we see these changes come through, there will be a lot of anger. When you go over the crest of a hill in my electorate and see the roofs of houses, well on 50 per cent now have solar panels. Those people have invested their money on the basis that they will be able to get a return from that. The rules proposed by the energy minister are a fundamental change in that they will be able to be switched off when the government chooses. We are very concerned and we will continue to raise people's concerns about these rule changes and what they will mean for ordinary South Australians.

Here we have a government that has promised the world on bill reductions, promised the world on solar thermal, promised the world on the interconnector being up and running, but we are seeing nothing delivered. We are seeing privatisation. We are seeing the interconnector not being delivered. We are seeing solar thermal that was promised by the minister in his own seat off the table, and we are now seeing these rule changes brought in for people's own solar panels and batteries in their homes. Those elements combined are not what was promised.

When this government took office they thought they would have an easy ride on energy. They have done nothing positive; in fact, they have done a number of detrimental things that we will keep raising again and again in the lead-up to the next election.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:47): There is a bit to discuss there. I will start with the shadow minister's comments. I appreciate the fact that as lead speaker he said, true to his word, that this has come from COAG so the opposition will support it, exactly as I did when I was a shadow minister and, the same thing, it was reciprocated. If nothing else, that is a positive for the South Australian parliament. It is a positive for our successive governments and oppositions that we will support decisions, that we will allow decisions of COAG to come through our parliament.

Another thing that the shadow minister said was to do with what he described as a 'light briefing'. Let me be very clear and put on the record that, to the best of my knowledge, he receives these briefings largely from the same people who used to work in the department when he was minister. He receives them in the same way that I used to receive them. In fact, I can assure the house that I have made it very clear to departmental and ministerial staff that the opposition should get the same treatment that I did when I was shadow minister; no interference from me. Whatever the appropriate briefing is is whatever the appropriate briefing is.

If the minister believes, as he says, that it was a light briefing, implying that it was too light and there was not enough information and potentially some was being withheld, the shadow minister could have asked some questions. In the briefing, he could have asked some questions. Since the briefing, he could have asked some questions. Of course, today, he has the chance to ask some questions. So we will find out exactly what it was that was missing from the briefing.

My opinion is that it is a pretty straightforward bill. I also have an opinion that, if there was not a great deal of content, albeit 100 per cent accurate and all that was necessary, if there was not a great deal there, the shadow minister would have said it was not enough. If we gave him as much as anybody could possibly think of, he would have said it was too much. That is just the way things work here. But I refute any suggestion that the briefing was inappropriate in any way whatsoever. The shadow minister has the opportunity to ask the minister here in parliament as much as he wants and he could have asked questions since the briefing.

Consultation on the bill was another thing that the shadow minister mentioned. Consultation has been going on since 2010 by COAG. It has been thorough, and in fact still continues, and that is not at all unusual. In consultation on the bill, it was entirely appropriate to have the government and COAG support the bill. Consultation on matters that are reflected in the regulations has been going on since then, and that is standard practice; it has been forever, it was under the last government and is under our government.

Let me come to the shadow minister for health trying to talk on energy. He is not much of a shadow minister for health, to be quite blunt. He was involved with the previous government's failed

Transforming Health debacle. Nonetheless, he is the shadow minister for health. I can only assume it is not because of his knowledge of health, it might just be because he is a person they like to send out to make statements on things. But he should stick to his knitting because the things that he suggested are completely misleading.

The first thing that he mentioned was about the \$302 commitment and, yes, we stand by that. We stand by that regularly and it is on track. We have had it independently assessed by ESCOSA. In fact, we did not have it independently assessed by ESCOSA. ESCOSA took it upon itself to independently assess it.

ESCOSA's findings are that, in the last couple of years, there has been a \$158 decrease for the average household electricity price. With \$158 so far, out of a \$302 commitment, we have our nose in front. We are doing a bit better than we said we would. I think people have every right to investigate how we are going in regard to that. An independent assessment says that we are actually on track, so for anybody in the opposition to suggest that is not the case is either deliberately misleading or is just uninformed.

With regard to the suggestion of solar thermal, the shadow minister for health's suggestion that this is somehow a broken promise—not only by the government, not only by me as Minister for Energy and Mining but also by me as the member for Stuart—is absolutely disgracefully inaccurate and misleading, and he should be ashamed of himself. He should be absolutely ashamed of himself for saying things like that in this place which are so deliberately wrong. They are completely inappropriate. The truth of the matter is—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: A point of order, sir: I do not mean to interrupt the minister, but he has used the word 'misleading' now I think three times in reference to the member for Kaurna's comments. The only way you can accuse a parliamentarian of misleading the house is through substantive motion. I ask the member to withdraw the accusation 'misleading' and use another term more applicable to the decorum of the debate.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes. Minister, are you happy to withdraw that term and be very careful about the wording you use? I uphold the point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I accept that technical point of order and withdraw the word 'misleading'. It was inaccurate, and I do not think it was a mistake; I will put it that way. It was inaccurate, and I do not believe it was a mistake on his part. I think he meant to say what he said. Let me tell you what did actually happen. I certainly was a very strong advocate—in fact, before anybody in the then government, the current opposition, ever knew what solar thermal was, I was a strong proponent for the fact that Port Augusta would be an outstanding place to host a solar thermal generator.

In fact, I advocated to the then minister and the then premier to investigate that possibility to see what could be done. I asked them to weigh up the costs and the benefits and to look into it. In fact, when the previous government entered into a contract with a company called SolarReserve to build that power station, I gave them credit for that. I said that they did a good job in doing that, based on the knowledge that I had as a local member of parliament and as a member of the opposition.

You can imagine my disappointment, frustration and more when I came into government and found that the previous government knew, in advance of the last election, that the company that they had contracted with had gone back to them before the election and said, 'We are not going to be able to do it.' But the previous government did not tell a soul about that. They did not tell a soul about that. The previous government were told very plainly by the company that they had contracted to build this solar thermal plant that that company could not deliver on that contract. The previous government knew that, but they chose to keep it quiet, to not tell anybody and just hide the facts and hope that it would not come out and hurt them.

The reality is that after the election it did come out and it has hurt them. It has been a great shame. With our department, with my office, I did an enormous amount to see if we could help this company deliver, but the reality is that the previous government, possibly knowingly, entered into a contract with them that they could not deliver on. They could not deliver on that contract.

You can only imagine the disappointment for the people in Port Augusta when they found out that the previous government deliberately and knowingly entered into a contract that was going to be incredibly difficult. The company told them that they could not do it, and the previous government kept it quiet. So that is exactly what happened there, and when that happened we did everything that we possibly could to try to help that company, and local people know that.

The next thing that was mentioned was the diesel generators. In my office here in Parliament House, I have a copy of a cartoon that was in *The Advertiser*. On the one hand it shows 'Jay's fantasy world', as it was described, with the Tesla battery in bright light, in green and light blue, in a lovely environment, but right next to it is 'Jay's dirty world', which is a picture of a dark diesel generator pumping out steam, with a pit bull terrier or something like that guarding a locked-up gate. That shows, very clearly, the two-faced energy policy of the previous government: show the fancy, glowing, glossy stuff that all looks good; tell everybody about that, but, by the way, try to avoid the background.

The background, in this part of the energy policy that the member for Kaurana referred to, was the fact that the government committed over \$600 million of taxpayers' money for diesel generators that they did not ever use, at the same time that they were saying they wanted to get away from dirty fuel. They were only to be there as backup. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Condolence

KENEALLY, HON. G.F.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:00): By leave, I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Gavin Francis Keneally, former member of the House of Assembly, former deputy speaker and former minister of the Crown, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Gavin Keneally was a member of this house for almost 19 years, from 1970 until his retirement in 1989. He was a rarity in the modern Labor Party, a member who had represented a regional electorate for a long period. He first won the seat of Stuart based on Port Augusta in 1970. On his retirement, he had successfully defended the seat on six separate occasions.

Mr Keneally was an important voice for our regions in the Dunstan and Bannan governments. Before that, he worked for the former commonwealth railways. Apparently he came to this parliament reluctantly. I am told on all sides of politics Mr Keneally was regarded as a gentleman and a very reasonable person to deal with as a member and, subsequently, as a minister. He was a minister for the first nine years of the Bannan premiership. He held the portfolios of chief secretary, tourism, local government and transport over that period. Before that, he had been chairman of committees and a diligent participant in the public accounts committee.

Mr Keneally was a noted sportsman before he entered this parliament, obtaining local legendary status as a footballer for Central Augusta. He was well under six feet tall but often played at centre half-forward. One of his greatest memories was lining up for Centrals against Barrie Robran during Barrie's first senior game of football at Whyalla.

On his retirement from this parliament, Mr Keneally continued to be very active in his local community. On behalf of all members of my government, I express appreciation to Mr Keneally for his service to this parliament and to his electors and express our condolences on his passing to his wife, Judith, and their family. Vale, Gavin Keneally.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): I rise to second the Premier's motion. The very full life of Gavin Keneally was one that will be rightly remembered for great service and commitment to his community. That service encompassed his time as the MP for Stuart not only as a long-serving minister in the Bannan government but also representing Port Augusta in a range of sports and local community activities, as the Premier mentioned.

He was an accomplished footy player and a gun cricketer by all accounts, and he also represented his city in tennis, table tennis and basketball. He also wrote for his local newspaper and produced his own radio program. A native of Quorn, he was transferred to Port Augusta in his role with the commonwealth railways, and it was there his political career commenced when he became secretary and president of the Port Augusta sub-branch of the Labor Party—a great branch, I might add.

Gavin Keneally won preselection for the seat of Stuart for the 1970 election and was thus one of those Labor MPs swept to power when Don Dunstan was elected 50 years ago for the first time in his own right. In his maiden speech, his passion for Port Augusta was apparent as he reflected that the city's reputation should be principally about its best all-round weather all year and that its untapped tourism potential must be realised.

He also set out what would continue to inform his participation in many debates over the following 20 years: his deep and sincere concern about the quality of life of every single South Australian, particularly those people who were continuing to live in poverty. He asked why so many people did not receive a decent education, why it was that growing old was seen to be a crime and why it was that people could not afford to become ill in South Australia. His concerns very much represent many true Labor values to this day.

His time on the backbench was interrupted in 1977 when he became the new deputy speaker. The *Adelaide News* reflected then:

Since his election to parliament in 1970, he has become one of the most popular on either side—with either side.

By all accounts, Gavin Keneally was a modest man. According to another newspaper article, entitled 'Modest habits make a minister', he led Labor MPs in support of the tobacco control act, declaring he was fortunate not to have been encouraged to smoke cigarettes when he was young. He said, and I quote:

You are speaking to someone who is so pure he has never smoked a cigarette in his life...I didn't drink alcohol until I was 30 and I have not made up for it since.

Gavin Keneally's work in public office often focused on public safety measures. On his first day as transport minister, he encountered a protest on the steps of parliament by the drivers of the well-known Dino's pizza delivery cars, which were topped with red telephone-shaped lights, said by the road traffic board to be hazardous. The minister announced he would personally go along on delivery runs to see for himself what dangers, if any, those signs posed.

During his time as transport minister, some of his accomplishments included overseeing the sealing of the Stuart Highway between Port Augusta and the NT border, commencing planning for tunnels to improve road safety through the Adelaide Hills to the freeway, introducing the state's first red-light traffic cameras, overseeing an increase of security on public trains, streamlining vehicle registration and car ownership transfer, making baby safety capsules mandatory—that is an interesting one—as well as establishing a pool of capsules for hire to make the measure affordable for all South Australians, and introducing a pre-licence training scheme for motorcyclists to combat a rise in motorcyclist deaths.

In the debates leading to the decriminalisation of homosexuality in South Australia, Gavin Keneally was amongst those who argued the law should not encroach upon private consensual behaviour. In his final speech in the House of Assembly on 26 October 1989, he reflected strongly on an incident involving a Liberal candidate at the upcoming election. At the conclusion of his speech, the former Liberal MP the Hon. Jennifer Cashmore stood to rebut his speech but, before doing so, acknowledged that she regretted it was the last time she would hear from him and that she did indeed like him, a view it appears was shared by many in this chamber in times past on both sides of the house.

He was one of the longest serving ministers in the Bannon Labor government, and when he stepped away from politics he was just 56. The passing of the Hon. Gavin Keneally allows us to look back to another time, when the state faced another set of challenges. He played an important role in a Labor government stepping up to those challenges.

The Hon. Gavin Keneally enjoyed a rich life outside politics. Married to Judith, he had five children, six grandchildren and ten great-grandchildren. He was committed to his family, to his friends and to the community he loved. The parliament extends its condolences to his family, acknowledges his enormous contribution to the city of Port Augusta, to the state of South Australia and to the wider labour movement.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:08): It is a pleasure to rise to support this motion; it is obviously not a pleasure that a former member for Stuart has passed away, and a very popular former member for Stuart. I certainly did not ever know the Hon. Gavin Keneally as a member of parliament—he was elected 40 years before I was elected and retired 20 years before I was elected—but I did know him as a person around Port Augusta.

I can assure people that as a local, as I am, many of the things that have been said are very true. He was a very genuine, down-to-earth, straightforward, local Port Augusta person, with no airs and graces but not scared of anything either. He was just his own man and he was a pleasure to engage with. I would have met Gavin perhaps five or six times, so I am not suggesting that we were close friends, but I certainly remember the first time we ever met each other when I was an inexperienced candidate going to my very first election. Gavin was a very strong local Port Augusta Labor man long after his retirement from parliament, but he was also a very, very good Port Augusta man.

He treated me in a very friendly manner. He treated me with great respect. It did not have to be even joked about whether or not he was going to vote for me. That was not going to happen, and he was going to encourage as many people as he could to vote against me, but within that reality we lived he was warm and he was genuine. He even gave me a bit of advice about what a new candidate ought to be trying to do and how to go about their business.

Judith was equally courteous and polite, but she did have—and I am sure she will not mind me saying this—that slightly steely reservation (which we would all appreciate our partners often have) when coming across somebody who was one way or another potentially on the other team to their own partner. She was very friendly, no doubt about it, but she made it clear that I was on the other team, perhaps in a slightly more direct way than Gavin actually did, but perhaps for him it just did not need to be said.

He was a very good sportsman. In fact, I was at the Centrals footy club two weekends ago, which was his home in Port Augusta, and he is still a revered person there. He led a combined country team at a state level as well. Up until, I think, about eight or so years ago he was still playing competitive tennis. I only came to know this because I bumped into him and another local Stuart person who I happened to know then whose political views were completely contrary to Gavin's. They were good friends. They played tennis together—with each other and against each other—for many years, and at that stage they were still playing. He enjoyed his sport and enjoyed, perhaps more importantly, sportsmanship well into his later years.

I add my voice to this motion. I add my appreciation to Gavin as one of my predecessors as a member for Stuart, and there have been a few. I thank him posthumously for his very decent treatment of me as a Liberal candidate and as a Liberal member of parliament and for his friendship as it was whenever we bumped into each other, and I certainly wish Judith, their five children, the grandchildren and the rest of his family and friends all the very, very best.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:12): I will just add a few words. It is an honour to rise to speak about Gavin Keneally because he was a special person. He epitomised all that is good about regional South Australia. He was a son of Port Augusta and Quorn, but you could also say that he was a son of Upper Spencer Gulf. The seat of Stuart for a time included Port Pirie, and during its population heyday the seat of Stuart also included a sliver of Whyalla.

It was in that context that I first met him. I didn't know him from a bar of soap. I was a youngster, but my dad was active in the Labor Party and a unionist, and he and his mates came to love Gavin Keneally. They respected him for the work he did as the member for Stuart, and they respected him for the values that he brought to this place, which were good, solid, decent Labor

Party values—an incredibly strong sense of equality that we are all equal, that we are going to look after everybody in our community, and that is what he did.

When you go back and read his speeches you read about the deprivation people suffered, especially back in the 1970s and before, and people who were on pensions then. They were far worse off than they are now. He spoke about the plight of the Aboriginal people in Port Augusta at the time and their inability—even when you went through school, even when you went through training—to get a job in that community. These were things that he passionately felt deeply about.

He was instrumental in ensuring the rail link between Port Augusta and Whyalla, connecting Whyalla to the national system. That has generated benefits forever and a day since. That was a really solid achievement. It was mentioned that when he was the transport minister the road just north of Port Augusta to the Northern Territory border was a dirt road. It was a dirt road all the way. This is part of our national highway system, and you would be choking in dust when you travelled on that road. It would have been a proud moment for a transport minister to oversee that particular work.

When he was the corrections minister, he was not an advocate of the rack 'em, pack 'em, stack 'em school of thought. He actually initiated some incredibly important changes to the penal system in this state. It was under his watch that he closed the old Adelaide Gaol. It was under his watch that the remand centre was built here in Adelaide and Mobilong, and also money was put into Yatala. Back in the seventies and early eighties it was not uncommon for riots to take place in our gaols nationally and also in this state. He actually did something about it and it led to an improvement in those facilities, so he can be proud of that.

His sporting prowess has been mentioned. I am a Westies supporter, so I am not a North Whyalla supporter, but we all recognise that Barrie Robran came from North Whyalla. When Central Augusta came down to play North Whyalla, it was Gavin's misfortune to stand Barrie Robran. Barrie at the time was 16. He was described as tall and gangly. At the time, Gavin was 29. Even though he was a great player, he was totally outclassed, and that 16 year old dominated that game. Of course, Barrie went on to be, I think it is widely conceded, the best football player that South Australia has ever produced, so no shame—

Members interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: Okay, we can have an argument about that but, hey, it is true. He was from Whyalla; he must have been. Of course, he played all sorts of sports.

When my dad spoke about him, that warmth did shine through. He was an incredibly decent man. He had a lot of integrity. He did have some annoying habits, though. I was speaking to one person who had the misfortune to work for him. I say 'misfortune' because he would have to get into the car with Gavin and go up to Port Augusta from Adelaide. Day in day out, every time they got in the car Gavin would play the Italian sopranos on a continuous tape cycle—and he would not play anything else. It drove the other two people in the car absolutely mad.

Gavin was an incredibly decent man. He has left a very large family—grandkids, great grandkids, and I think he has seven kids of his own. The contribution he has made to our state and the community of Port Augusta and the seat of Stuart is exemplary. Vale.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:18): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker, and congratulations on your elevation to the job. It is the first time I have had the opportunity to pass on my congratulations.

I knew Gavin Keneally when he was a minister and I was a young journalist at the *Adelaide News* and *The Advertiser*. He was always a very modest man. The story was never about him. It was always about what it was that he was bringing to South Australia. Every time he brought in some reform, it was for the good of the people of South Australia. He never wanted to leave anyone behind. He wanted to make sure that everyone had safer vehicles, safer roads and a better South Australia.

He was terrific to interview and I did catch up with him around four years ago when we had country cabinet up in Port Augusta. We talked about those days and about the politicians and journalists of the eighties and how things had changed a little bit. Gavin still had that passion for

things like fishing rules and how you protect the fishing stocks. He was proud that he had worked with the government of the day, as the local MP, to make sure that he had done the best he could for his local area.

People have mentioned the sealing of the Stuart Highway; what a great change that was. I was driving up there just a few weeks ago and it has made such a difference to getting tourists to the South Australian outback. There are still people in Adelaide who think you have to have some really high-powered, specced-up four-wheel drive to be able to explore South Australia's outback. The sealed Stuart Highway, the Oodnadatta Track, the Birdsville Track and Strzelecki Track are in good nick. They are not red sandhills that you have to go after.

A lot of those reforms came through Gavin Keneally's time because he knew the roads. He knew the areas up there and he was fortunate to be in that position, as transport minister, where he could make a difference to the lives of the local people in the outback and also to the people of Adelaide and from interstate and overseas who wanted to get out and explore that beautiful part of our country. To Judith and the rest of Gavin's family, I extend my deepest condolences.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

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

Sitting suspended from 14:22 to 14:32.

HERON, MR V.S.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:32): I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of Mr Victor Stanley Heron, former member of the House of Assembly, and places on record its appreciation of his meritorious service and that, as a mark of respect to his memory, the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Vic Heron was a member of this house for four years, having been elected in 1989 as the member for Peake. During his service to the house he was also a member of the Social Development Committee.

In his maiden speech in February 1990, Mr Heron spoke at length about industrial relations, expressing his very strong support for a centralised wage fixation system. This reflected his experience as an official of the Federated Miscellaneous Workers' Union for the 15 years prior to his election to this house. Mr Heron also spoke passionately about the need to upskill the workforce to meet the changing nature of industry and advances in technology, a challenge that continues to face us all today. He also took a strong interest in the extension of childcare services.

During his parliamentary service, Mr Heron was as committed a representative of the electors of Peake as he had been of his union members. At the 1993 election, he faced Heini Becker as his Liberal Party opponent. While Peake was regarded as a seat requiring a 5 per cent swing to change hands, Heini was a formidable opponent, already having been a member of this house since 1970. While Heini prevailed, the contest in Peake was considered one of the most spirited at the 1993 poll.

On behalf of all members of my government, we acknowledge the service of Mr Heron to this parliament and his electors, and express our condolences at his passing to his family. Vale, Mr Vic Heron.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): I rise to second the Premier's motion. Vic Heron was the Labor member for Peake in South Australia, as the Premier mentioned, from 1989 to 1993. Vic entered parliament at the age of 50, having already achieved a great deal in the Australian Labor movement. Prior to his election, Mr Heron was the president of the ALP state executive and an organiser and secretary for the Missos for some 15 years—no mean feat. He was also a president and executive member of the United Trades and Labour Council—again, a very robust organisation, particularly during that era.

Mr Heron, who had previously been a Senate candidate in the 1987 federal election, delivered his maiden speech in the House of Assembly on 13 February 1990. In that speech, he reflected upon the need for training to update the skills of workers, particularly those in the state

manufacturing base as it continued to evolve. He also reflected upon the challenges of wage indexation, occupational health and safety, and the challenges faced by single working women—challenges that, indeed, exist still today.

He entered the parliament along with other new Labor MPs, including the former Speaker the Hon. Michael Atkinson and the former minister the Hon. Paul Holloway. During his term in parliament, Mr Heron was a member of the Social Development Committee, as mentioned by the Premier. He is survived by his partner, Maxine, and his sisters, Patricia and Ros, and was preceded in death by his brother Bill.

We take this time to reflect and thank him for his extraordinary contribution to the parliament but also, again, to the labour movement, particularly the union movement, in the state of South Australia. Vale, Vic Heron.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:35): I, too, rise to make a few brief remarks about the life and achievements of Victor Stanley Heron. A stalwart of the South Australian Labor movement, Vic—as he was widely and affectionately known—was a compassionate, committed representative of his community and for working people. As has been said, Vic, who was the Labor member for Peake from 1989 to 1993, sadly passed away on 1 September in New South Wales.

Vic entered parliament at the age of 50 after a long career supporting and empowering workers as an organiser and, later, state secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union—now the United Workers Union. I had the pleasure of spending time with Vic in my very, very early days of being a Labor Party member. I was struck by a number of his qualities. For someone new to the Labor movement and to the party at that time, Vic was kind and generous with his time and with sharing stories that helped deepen my understanding of what it mattered to fight for and how collectively we could win.

When I think about Vic, what most comes to mind is his lovely combination of simultaneously being strong and gentle, steadfast in his values, and funny. When I first met him, he was busy campaigning, but he always took the time to ask for my opinion and the opinion of others, to share a joke and, importantly, he took the time to listen. I know that he also always took the time to listen to workers in his role in his union, the Miscellaneous Workers' Union—the Missos, as it was called at the time, and now the United Workers Union—which represented workers from diverse industries who were often in low-paid jobs. Vic was passionate about them being afforded fairness and equality of opportunity.

Vic spoke up, including in his inaugural speech, about the need to recognise in a formal way the many skills that people learned on the job, whether that be on the factory floor, cleaning or as a security guard. Vic knew that skills recognition and wages linked to skills enabled workers to have better mobility of employment and a strengthened career path. He knew the difference that these opportunities could make in people's lives.

Vic was passionate about retaining a strong safety net of wages and conditions for those who most relied on it, and he was a fierce advocate for health and safety at work, for access to the training that enabled health and safety, and for accessible, affordable child care. He recognised the barriers to women's equal participation in the economy and he was generous in his contribution to the fight for change for gender equality.

Vic had a deep understanding of how changes in the labour market, which increased casualisation and part-time work, would affect the future of our economy and young people's ability to access apprenticeships, decent jobs and career pathways. As a South Australian Labor Senate candidate in 1987, president of the ALP state executive and an executive member of the United Trades and Labour Council, Vic was very well liked and always appreciated for his values, integrity and desire to ensure that others were treated fairly.

Vic is survived by his partner, Maxine, and his sisters Patricia and Ros. He was preceded in death by his brother Bill. My heartfelt condolences to his family members and friends. Vale, Vic, and thank you very much for your generous and wise contribution.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:39): The sad news of the death of Vic Heron, who died on 1 September in New South Wales, travelled far and wide among those who knew him before and

after his time in this place. Victor Stanley 'Vic' Heron became the member for Peake in the South Australian House of Assembly at the age of 50 after an already long career defending the rights of working people to continue to serve them here in this place from 1989 to 1993.

He delivered his maiden speech on 13 February 1990, when he highlighted the circumstances of the childcare and security sectors and spoke about the need for better national standards for occupational health and safety. His former colleague and former state premier Lynn Arnold remembers Vic from his MWU days and as the member for Peake, and I quote:

I greatly appreciated his sterling work as a local MP who served his electorate well in the mould of those great local MPs who came from good membership service in the unions.

I will break off here and say the tidal wave of the State Bank election certainly swept many good members away, and of course redistributions, as we all know, do not always help to retain your seat in parliament. Lynn concluded his remarks by saying:

The great sadness is that people like Vic who were stalwart servants of a fair go are often forgotten to the collective memory, yet so much is owed to the likes of such unsung, loyal workers for the cause. Vale Vic

Another tribute came from his friend Gay Walsh, and I quote Gay:

I have so many memories of Vic...I remember teasing him endlessly about his confirmed bachelorhood, including on one occasion when I rushed into his office before the Monday morning staff meeting and excitedly congratulated him on his announcement—telling him I saw the marriage bans posted on the Port Adelaide church.

Then, another time:

As the first woman appointed in the Branch, I remember when I went into his office dressed in a pin stripe suit on my way to the Commission, with all my papers/exhibits in a beer box and watched his face go pale as he nervously asked me if I [intended to take that stuff] into the Commission! I was really fond of him and he was awfully good to me as a new mum and he was supportive of me as a lesbian activist. I share my respect for him with all who knew and loved him. Vale dear Victor Stanley Heron.

Another former parliamentary colleague Peter Duncan remembered Vic well, and I quote:

I hadn't been in touch with Vic for maybe 25...years. The fact that we were out of touch is no reflection on the high regard in which I held him. He had been a union organiser and it was in that capacity that we met. Vic was always a dedicated servant of the members and always showed the qualities of honesty and loyalty.

Vic was involved in all of the great issues of the time—whether of direct interest to his members welfare or more broadly to the community at large. He was opposed to the war in Vietnam—and to my knowledge, when he took a stand he was always on the right side of history.

Vale Vic Heron a true servant and leader of the working class.

Along with everyone here, I am sure, I add my condolences and pass them on to his partner, Maxine, his sisters, Patricia and Ros, and all his wider circle of family and friends. He will certainly not be forgotten.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:42): Vic Heron: member for Peake, trade unionist, workers' representative, man of the people, proudly of the western suburbs. I had the good fortune of getting to know Vic when I joined the Labor Party as a 20 year old. He welcomed and encouraged us young ones to be actively involved in the broader Labor movement. In his role as president of the Trades and Labor Council, as the South Australian secretary of the Miscellaneous Workers' Union and as an MP, Vic was dedicated to serving his members and those in the community he represented.

He was loyal and he held dear Labor values, which he would confidently speak of in any forum, and he was committed to many of the significant issues of the day. A dedicated representative of the working class, Vic was always looking to secure the future. He truly believed in equality. My deepest condolences to his partner, Maxine, and his family. Vale, Vic Heron.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:44): There are five members of this house who had the honour of being the member for Peake; Vic Heron was one of them—as was I, the last of the members for Peake. Vic unfortunately did not get to have a long parliamentary career. Circumstances were taken out of his hands with the justifiable backlash against the State Bank disaster of the 1990s. We saw a tidal wave of support taken away from the Labor Party and given to our opponents to form a new government, and Vic was one of those casualties.

It is fair to say that Vic's first calling was the trade union movement, not necessarily politics here. He believed passionately that people here are the political wing of the trade union movement. That has evolved over time, but he was passionate about the people he served. He sought to serve people on the factory floor, in their workplace and then here on the parliamentary floor.

I do not know what kind of career he would have had had he been able to withstand that tidal wave. The Liberal Party put up against him someone who I think is the best campaigner the western suburbs has ever seen: Heini Becker. Heini Becker was a remarkable campaigner, and I know he is also very sad at the passing of Vic.

I think it is fair to say that Heini had had enough of being in parliament in 1993 and was probably doing the Liberal Party a favour by running in Peake, which had always been a traditional Labor seat. Of course, the tidal wave was a lot larger than anyone imagined, and Vic was defeated. It is also fair to say that Vic was a champion of the left wing of the Labor Party, so he was not exactly enamoured by my candidacy for the seat of Peake in 1997. He would have preferred someone more pure.

But, to be fair, he was generous, he was warm, he was funny and he was helpful. Never once did he not offer to help retake the seat in 1997. Indeed, even in 1993, when John Rau was running for the seat of Hindmarsh and Bob Catley was defending the seat of Adelaide—we were unsuccessful in both those campaigns—Vic again was at the tip of the spear doing all he could to try to mobilise people to support Labor in a cause that was ultimately futile here in South Australia but successful nationally. It was a great night. Seeing Vic celebrate that night was very nice.

I am sorry that he has passed and I am sorry that he did not have a longer political career. God rest him and comfort those who loved him. He will always be one of the five members for Peake, and no-one can ever take that away from him.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

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

Sitting suspended from 14:48 to 14:57.

Petitions

NEWTON BOULEVARD

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light): Presented a petition signed by 470 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to extend Newton Boulevard, Munno Para from Peachey Road through to Stebonheath Road.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

GOVERNOR'S COMMISSION

The SPEAKER (15:01): I have to report that I have received from the Governor a commission, under the hand of His Excellency and the public seal of the state, empowering me to administer the oath of allegiance or to receive the affirmation necessary to be taken by members of the House of Assembly.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Ombudsman SA—Investigation in relation to issues surrounding the death in custody of Mr Wayne Fella Morrison, 2020 [Ordered to be published]

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

Fair Trading (Small Amount Credit Contracts and Consumer Leases) Amendment Bill 2020, which is a bill to amend the Fair Trading Act 1987

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Highways Act 1926—Leases granted for properties held by Commissioner of Highways, Annual Report 2019-20

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)—

Coronial Inquest—Report of Actions taken by South Australia Police into the death of Ms Martina Morgan, 2020

Ministerial Statement

MORRISON, MR W.F.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:04): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Today, the South Australian Ombudsman, Mr Wayne Lines, has published his final report into the death in custody of Mr Wayne Fella Morrison. Mr Morrison passed away at the Royal Adelaide Hospital on 26 September—

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for West Torrens on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I apologise for interrupting the minister, sir, but no ministerial statement has been distributed to members as is the common practice of the house.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I may assist, sir; I have it right here.

The SPEAKER: I note the point of order. I think that the matter has been immediately rectified.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Today, the South Australian Ombudsman, Mr Wayne Lines, has published his final report into the death in custody of Mr Wayne Fella Morrison. Mr Morrison passed away at the Royal Adelaide Hospital on 26 September 2016 following an incident at the Yatala Labour Prison on 23 September 2016.

The Ombudsman's final report follows a lengthy and comprehensive investigation that commenced in 2016. There is absolutely no question that the safety and wellbeing of our prisoners in the custody of the Department for Correctional Services is paramount. The department has previously publicly acknowledged the pain and the grief experienced by the family of Mr Morrison, and I also provide them with my sincere condolences.

Given the publishing of the report, I am of the view that it is important to highlight that, throughout the investigation, a thorough, genuine and proactive response was provided by the Chief Executive of the Department for Correctional Services personally and as part of the agency response.

To date, the Department for Correctional Services has provided support for 16 of the 17 recommendations, and a review of one recommendation is in progress. It is noted by the Ombudsman in his report that the Department for Correctional Services has made significant steps towards meeting the majority of his recommendations with some changes already implemented or in the process of being implemented. To this end, I also take the opportunity to highlight some of the improvements made by the Marshall Liberal government relevant to the Ombudsman's final report.

Firstly, the significant reform as part of the Better Prisons Program: Better Prisons has delivered the largest investment in the prison system in many years that is ultimately aimed at

improving the quality, safety and efficiency of the state's prison system. This includes construction and commission of the highest number of beds in the metropolitan area for over a decade, with a further 270 beds and critical supporting infrastructure at Yatala Labour Prison and 40 beds at the Adelaide Women's Prison.

The construction program also includes a new state-of-the-art prisoner admission building, which will replace the aged and not fit for purpose facility referenced in the Ombudsman's report. Additionally, since the beginning of this year the Adelaide Remand Centre has become the primary place of admission for male remandees in the Greater Adelaide area. The site has put in place an agreement with the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement to ensure that all newly admitted Aboriginal prisoners have access to the Aboriginal Visitors Scheme. The final report also includes a recommendation with regard to body-worn cameras. The Adelaide Remand Centre has already introduced this technology for some aspects of their operations.

Since coming into office, the Marshall Liberal government has not only committed to investing in additional high-security accommodation at the Yatala Labour Prison, we have also committed \$10 million to upgrading the security systems to a modern digital platform. This includes upgrading and expanding the deployment of CCTV across the site. This measure enhances the safety and security of the site for staff, visitors and prisoners. This house would also note the relevance to this matter within the Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Amendment Bill 2020.

As there remain significant commonalities between the matters under consideration in the related coronial inquest and the matters considered by the Ombudsman, I must respect the ongoing coronial inquest. As such, I am unable to provide any further comment with regard to the Ombudsman's findings, and for the same reason the Department for Correctional Services is also restricted with regard to a response to the publication of the report.

I can assure parliament this issue is of the highest importance to the government and the Department for Correctional Services. All efforts have been taken to participate in the investigation process.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:08): I raise a point of order in relation to sessional order No. 3, in regard to questions being answered within 30 days, particularly in relation to questions 191 and 192 I asked the Premier on 2 July 2020, which remain unanswered, and questions to the Minister for Education, Nos 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202 and 203 asked on 3 July 2020, which remain unanswered well after the 30 days set in the sessional orders.

The SPEAKER: Those questions have been identified, member for Kaurna. I will endeavour to speak to the ministers concerned. The matter and the timing of the response is now on the *Hansard*.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:10): I bring up the 113th report of the committee, entitled Para Hills High School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 114th report of the committee, entitled Wild South Coast Way Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 115th report of the committee, entitled Clare High School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 116th report of the committee, entitled Flinders Medical Centre Emergency Department Expansion Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 117th report of the committee, entitled Highgate School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 118th report of the committee, entitled Mount Gambier High School Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 119th report of the committee, entitled Hamilton Secondary College Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 120th report of the committee, entitled Reynella East College Redevelopment Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 121st report of the committee, entitled Adelaide Super-Drome Upgrade Project.

Report received and ordered to be published

Question Time

LIBERAL PARTY COUNTRY MEMBERS DINNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:12): My question is to you, Mr Speaker. Did you tell the country members gathered at a dinner at the Cathedral Hotel who are subject to an ICAC corruption investigation that you, as Speaker, if elected, would support the claim of parliamentary privilege on documents ICAC had lawfully instructed them to provide?

The SPEAKER (15:12): I have the question of the member for West Torrens. The question in relation to subject matter was asked yesterday. The question remains outside the purview of standing order 96 subparagraph 2 and is out of order. I will turn now to the government, and the opposition may have another opportunity. I won't say more about it, except to say that the subject matter was essentially repeated following a ruling yesterday. I won't rule in that regard directly, but I note that fact. Is there a question from the government?

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:13): There certainly is. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the government is delivering better services and new technology on our public transport system?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:13): I thank the member for Colton for his very important question. It was just over a week ago that we kicked off our trial of the tap-and-pay initiative to make transport much faster here in South Australia for people catching public transport, in particular our trams.

From late September, commuters using our tram network will be able to tap on with their Visa card or Mastercard or smart devices, and that will deliver better services for tram users here in South Australia. This includes mobile wearable devices that are attached to your Mastercard or Visa card by an app, so you can use Apple Pay on a phone, you can use a Fitbit—if you have one; I need one—or Google Pay or Samsung Pay. They are all able to be used on this new technology. This is exciting and it is putting us in line with other jurisdictions across Australia. In fact, some people have stopped me on the street and said, 'This is tram-endous,' and I agreed with them.

This announcement propels us out of the dark ages that we were left with under the Labor government and into the digital age. It's providing better services and lower costs for South Australians. We know that under those opposite patronage fell across our public transport network—and shame on them. But you know what South Australians want? Better services and lower costs, and that's what we are delivering in our public transport system.

This fact will be validated as we go forward, and more and more people will choose—some say 'choo-choo choose'—public transport as their preferred option to get around. This trial is among a number of initiatives the Marshall government is doing that will help grow patronage. They don't like to hear about growing patronage on public transport because it went down under their government, but we are putting initiatives in place to make it more convenient for the people of South Australia to use public transport.

Having these safer, cleaner, faster and more efficient payment options means that not only will commuters save money—and that of course means lower costs for South Australians, which is what they like—but that in a COVID world we are also making public transport more contactless, which is also good for people in this day and age.

From the trial, I mentioned lower costs. For tram users who would normally buy a regular fare ticket, for an adult that's a cost of around \$5.70. If they were just to buy a ticket for a trip on a tram, that's what it would cost. Now if they use their tap-and-go methodology—if they use their phone or their Fitbit—they will get it at the Metrocard rate, which is about \$3.80 or a little bit over. That is a saving of almost \$2, so again lower costs for South Australians using public transport.

That is what we like. That is good for South Australians and that will benefit intrastate visitors, interstate visitors and visitors from overseas. When they come to South Australia and they want to use our tram, they will be able to do so with ease and be connected straightaway. This is moving South Australia, as I said, into the 21st century.

Over the next few weeks, a validator will appear in every one of our trams—24 of the trams across the network. They will be alongside the Metrocard. Have a look, keep your eye out for them and give it a go. Try this new technology; it is very exciting for everyone. Inspectors will still be able to inspect your phone. They will come along with their little machine and they will zap your phone. They will only get the last four digits and no personal information, but they will be able to tell whether or not you have purchased your ticket on your card—great technology again, going forward, and very, very well protected.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The new tap-and-go method will be great, Mr Speaker. You won't have to have a Metrocard. You will be able to take the tram as often as you like. You will have that cheaper price, of course, which is wonderful. And I'm thinking about people from the regions, too, who come to Adelaide. They don't get a Metrocard, but if they want to jump on the tram and head to the Bay or, if they are at the Bay get to the city, they can use their Visa card or their Mastercard or the associated app. So more jobs, lower costs, and better services for South Australians.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order the member for Reynell. The member for West Torrens.

MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:17): Thank you, sir, my question is to you. When will you release the correspondence to the House of Assembly from the former ICAC commissioner, and will you table it?

The SPEAKER (15:18): I made a statement to the house yesterday morning in relation to correspondence that has been received. When I've got something further to add, I will come back to the house.

MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:18): Sir, my question is to you. Can you assure the house that you and all the staff employed by the House of Assembly will comply with the requests of the ICAC in its corruption investigation of the country members accommodation allowance and that you will not attempt to assert privilege on any document or evidence without a resolution of this house?

The SPEAKER (15:18): I have nothing to add to my statement for the time being, member for West Torrens. I note the question and I note the importance of the subject matter.

MEMBERS, ACCOMMODATION ALLOWANCES

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:18): Sir, my question is to you. Have you received subsequent correspondence from the new ICAC commissioner, Commissioner Vanstone, revoking any request for information outlined in correspondence to the House of Assembly received from the former commissioner, the Hon. Bruce Lander QC?

The SPEAKER (15:19): Again, for the time being I have nothing to add to my statement to the house yesterday morning.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (15:19): My question is directed to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister provide advice to the house about the impact the Marshall Liberal government's investment in emergency services is having on job creation?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:19): I thank the member for Davenport for the question. He is obviously a successful businessman from way back and knows what it is like to create dozens of jobs.

An honourable member: A great Liberal.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Indeed.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I am delighted to have the opportunity to talk about how the Marshall Liberal government's investment in our emergency services is upgrading and modernising facilities for volunteers, and creating jobs at the same time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: As you would know, Mr Speaker, our emergency services do a fantastic job right around South Australia, and we would be nothing without the thousands of volunteers who give up their own precious time to protect the lives and property of South Australians. Time is a most precious commodity, and these selfless South Australians are prepared to spare their time to keep our communities safe.

It is vital that we provide our volunteers with the facilities and tools they need in order to do what they sign up for which, as I said, is to protect lives and property as well. As the member for Davenport, along with other members, realises, ensuring our emergency services sector has the quality facilities it needs to keep us safe is the ultimate priority when we invest in a project.

There is an important economic benefit from projects such as the new emergency services headquarters, as well as our Project Renew programs for the CFS and other emergency services. I had the pleasure of visiting the site of the new \$80 million emergency services headquarters at the World Park precinct in Keswick only a few weeks ago. Work is now underway on the headquarters which, for the first time in the state's history, will see the executive and senior management teams from the CFS, the SES, the MFS and SAFECOM all co-located in a single facility. This coordination, in addition to the facilities the purpose-built headquarters will offer—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —will provide unprecedented command and control capabilities and also strengthen our ability to respond to crisis situations. Importantly, nearly 200 jobs are being created during the construction phase of this project, not to mention the boost to our steel and, importantly, our concrete industries as well.

As many in this house would know, the Marshall Liberal government's Project Renew programs for both the CFS and the SES have been a roaring success—I would say they have been more popular than Tony Modra in his prime—with \$5 million for the CFS over two years and \$1 million for the SES over the forward estimates. Projects include the new shed at the Tea Tree Gully CFS in the member for Newland's electorate and the new group meeting room at the Murray Bridge CFS station in the member for Hammond's electorate. It was great to visit that recently and pay tribute to the good people there at Murray Bridge.

Of course, there is the upgraded plumbing at the One Tree Hill CFS in the member for King's electorate, and the new air conditioning that has been installed at the CFS State Training Centre at Brukunga in the member for Kavel's electorate. Project Renew for SES units began in the 2019-20 financial year and is delivering projects right across the state to improve functionality as well as amenity at SES units. These projects make a huge difference to the capabilities of local CFS stations as well as, of course, to the morale of volunteers, and we should do everything we can to keep up the morale of our volunteers.

The benefits of these projects do not end with just the facilities themselves. Project Renew engages hundreds of suppliers and contractors to deliver the projects, from carpenters, telecommunications specialists, tradies and electricians to steel and structural engineers. Our investment in South Australia's emergency services is not only delivering upgrades and improvements for the sector itself but also creating hundreds of job opportunities for South Australians.

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the government awarded the Adelaide train network contract to Keolis Downer?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:23): No, no decision has been made.

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): My question is again to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister assure the house that Keolis Downer has not had any signing with the government to run the Adelaide train network?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:24): No, again. Those decisions are cabinet-in-confidence. That's it.

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:24): My question is again to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. I acknowledge the minister's comment that a decision has been made by cabinet, but my question is: can the minister assure the house that no signings have been conducted with Keolis Downer regarding the Adelaide train network?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:24): I think I did outline that in both of the last two responses, and I do refer the member to my previous answer.

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has Keolis Downer commenced working with the National

Safety Rail Regulator on its accreditation, and have department staff been present at any meetings between Keolis Downer and the National Safety Rail Regulator?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:25): No, not to my knowledge.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:25): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister please provide an update to the house on the ways the government has been supporting exporters to engage with international markets?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:25): First of all, can I just congratulate you, Mr Speaker. This is the first chance I have had to address you, so congratulations on being the Speaker. Also, I would like to thank the member for MacKillop for his question, coming from a very important—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Look at my mentoring of you. You are like a son to me.

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: Good, thank you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: Specifically, I want to thank the member for MacKillop for his question. His region certainly is a very important one for South Australia. It is a region that has high-quality agriculture—whether that's wheat, barley, dairy, the seafood industry as well. But, really importantly, it is one of the premier wine regions: the Coonawarra with their terra rossa soil—magnificent soil there. As a government, since we have been here we have been focused on growing the economy, not just in the regions but for all South Australians, so it's a pleasure to sit here and stand here as well in the chamber and talk about how we are trying to grow the economy for South Australians, which means jobs for South Australians.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: Hear, hear!

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: One of the ways we are trying to grow that economy is via trade as well—it's a really important segment—and making sure that South Australian businesses, such as those in the member for MacKillop's region, are able to interact with the international markets and export their high quality produce.

Of course, the food and wine sector is really important, but with the times we live in we are really quite challenged regarding the coronavirus. It has really impacted on how businesses can export—whether that's face to face, government to government or business to business. That's quite a challenge for us and, really, we are living in a new normal. Gone are the days when, as I said, you would meet face to face. Now it is much more about that digital engagement. As a government, we have been really cognisant of that and actually ahead of the game.

We have had that in place, even prior to the coronavirus, recognising it's important we engage digitally with our markets via web seminars or even other sorts of events. These events are great because not only do they allow consumers and customers from our export regions to understand what it's like in South Australia but it also helps to provide market information for our South Australian exports about the markets they are going into. As I said, we are able to touch base with all those countries and explain what a fantastic health response we have been able to achieve here in South Australia and show that we are open for business.

The member for MacKillop might like to know that one of the ways we are doing that is via virtual wine-tasting events. It is a way of engaging with some key markets—whether that be China, whether that be Malaysia—some of our key export markets—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON: —and we have set up virtual wine-tasting. I hear the interest from members opposite as well. We have people on the ground in our China trade offices and our Malaysia trade offices who interact with the consumer base over there. They get registration to these events, and then to those who are registered we can send over fantastic South Australian wines. To China we involved 10 wineries and to Malaysia we involved three wineries. We are able to expose to them what it is while they can't be there face to face. The wineries themselves can take them through the different wines and explain the nuances and what fantastic produce we have.

I can update you on that, Mr Speaker. We had over 800 registrations to these events. Importantly, because they are now online they can be recorded. That means that if you can't attend the event in person you can always replay it later. You can buy those bottles of wine, arrange for them to be delivered and then do the wine-tasting session weeks afterwards. That has led to over 19,400 views of these fantastic virtual wine events. From that we also had quite a significant number of inquiries, which South Australian wineries, including from the Coonawarra, are able to follow up. It's a fantastic way that this government is really supporting our businesses here in South Australia to export to the world—and that means jobs.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I call to order the member for West Torrens, the member for Playford, the member for Cheltenham and the member for Light.

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:29): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the Keolis Downer bid to run Adelaide's train network include a significant reduction in the workforce, including fewer train drivers and frontline and operational staff?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:30): Just to refer the member to my previous answer, no contract has been signed and those negotiations are ongoing.

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:30): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does Keolis Downer have any experience running heavy rail passenger services in Australia?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:30): Again, no contract is signed. The member is talking in hypotheticals. To my knowledge, Keolis Downer (to pronounce it correctly) have run a number of rail projects in Labor states like Victoria and Queensland and are quite successful, but there's a number of contractors out there that do an outstanding job. The process of selecting the outsourced provider is continuing.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Premier to order.

KEOLIS DOWNER

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:31): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did the government cancel an announcement last week announcing the awarding of the train contract to run our network to Keolis Downer?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:31): The leader is getting some very bad information again, but I go back to the point and inform him that no contract has been signed.

BUSHFIRE RECOVERY SUPPORT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:31): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house as to recovery assistance being provided by the state to bushfire-affected communities, including my own?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:31): I thank the member for Kavel for this very important question. The member has been a very strong advocate for those who have been devastated by the Adelaide bushfires, and I thank him for showing me around his electorate over the last couple of weeks. It is also important to acknowledge the work of the state MPs whose electorates have been hit by bushfires over the past 12 months: the members for Morialta, Kavel, Heysen, Flinders, Mawson, Narungga and MacKillop. Particularly, I would also like to thank the Premier for his tireless leadership in supporting the bushfire-affected communities.

Following the bushfires across the state last summer, the government has worked closely with primary producers in response and recovery. The government has been delivering \$75,000 bushfire recovery grants to primary producers who have been impacted by fires as part of a joint commonwealth-state partnership. This financial support is helping with the immediate bushfire recovery, such as clean-up, fencing and other vital rebuilding. We have delivered more than \$22 million in recovery grants to over 300 primary producers since the program's inception.

The grants have been distributed to farmers impacted by the fires: Kangaroo Island, \$10 million; Cudlee Creek, \$9 million; Yorke Peninsula, \$1 million; and the South-East, almost \$1 million. Last week, along with the commonwealth government we announced South Australia's bushfire recovery had received a \$4.9 million injection for both Adelaide Hills and Kangaroo Island communities caught up in the fire scar. This funding is to assist the clean-up work, the feral pig eradication program on Kangaroo Island and the local recovery coordinators and their community development officers.

Recently, I toured a bushfire-affected cattle property with the Premier in the Adelaide Hills at Brukunga. The \$75,000 grant helped Brukunga farmer Heidi Sowerby with fencing, water troughs, sheds and other infrastructure so she can rebuild her cattle herd. I also visited Harrogate beef cattle and honey producer Tom Hampton, with the members for Hammond and Kavel, whose property was severely affected by the summer's bushfires. The \$75,000 grant helped Mr Hampton secure new replacement fencing and re-establish his beehives. That's why we made changes to the grants program in July 2020, to expand the eligibility criteria and extend the closing date for applications to 31 December 2020.

It's incredibly pleasing to see the green shoots appear for our farmers impacted by the bushfires. The resilience of those on the land should not be underestimated. As part of bushfire recovery, we also provided funding to support thousands of tonnes of donated fodder to the island and support the Oakbank depot in the Adelaide Hills, as well as fence posts and potato bins to the island. We are also supporting affected wine industries with subsidised smoke taint tests, an early berry smoke taint research project and vineyard surveying.

Last week, I was at Golding Wines at Lobethal, hosted by Darren and Lucy Golding, to hear from the Adelaide wine industry about bushfire recovery. Monday's warm, blustery September conditions were a reminder that bushfire season is not far away and we need to remain vigilant. We will continue to stand side by side with our farmers during this very difficult time.

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:35): My question is for the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. On how many occasions did Keolis Downer attempt to withdraw from the tender process?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: standing order 97. That question contained significant argument.

The SPEAKER: I think it's a question on a subject matter that's been the subject of a number of questions. I will give the minister the opportunity to respond.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:36): I thank the member for his question and note again the point that the contract hasn't been signed; no contract has been signed yet. I am happy to take that element of the question on notice. What I would like to point out to the member, because I know he has an interest in this, is the contracts we will be signing will be very similar to the outsourcing

contracts that they signed, and they have signed a number of them, too: the bus contract, I think, three times, very happy to outsource that. They like that.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: How many?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Three.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: On three occasions they outsourced that. The leader can talk, too, about contracts of outsourcing because he signed the one to outsource Mount Gambier Prison, so he knows all about—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —outsourcing.

Mr PICTON: Point of order.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Actually, no, maybe it was the member for Kaurna—

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna on a point of order.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and that could be why he is stepping up.

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for Kaurna on the point of order.

Mr PICTON: Debate.

The SPEAKER: Standing order 97, debating the—

Mr PICTON: 98: debate. It was a very clear question about how many times Keolis Downer have tried to pull out of the tendering process.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. The minister will return to the subject of the question. He may have finished, but I will give him the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, I have, sir, thank you.

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:37): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Has his department ever encouraged Keolis Downer to remain in the tender process for the training contract?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:38): I don't have that information; I'm happy to take it on notice. But I will turn back again to the point, Mr Speaker, in this conversation around outsourced contracts and draw your attention again, draw the house's attention again, to the two-faced approach from the Labor Party. When they are in government they turn around and they sign outsourced contracts. Now—

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

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Only moments ago, in the previous question, you were in receipt of a point of order for debate under standing order 98, and now we see the minister behaving again contrary to your ruling.

The SPEAKER: I note the point of order. I also note the use of the expression 'two-faced'. No-one has taken exception to that particularly. I would ask the minister to consider his language, but otherwise I note the point of order. I will give the minister an opportunity to conclude his response. I think the minister is finished. The member for West Torrens.

KEOLIS DOWNER

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:39): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did Keolis Downer require a loser fee to be available to unsuccessful bidders in order to keep them in the tender process for Adelaide's train network?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:39): Again, I will take that question on notice. The contracts—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He choo-choo chooses not to answer.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It may have been the practice of the leader when he was outsourcing contracts, like I said, for Mount Gambier Prison to be releasing details of the contracts before they were actually signed, I don't know. That might be how they operate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That's what he is asking me for and it's a disgrace and you know it. Seriously—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. The minister had indicated I think in words 'It's a disgrace and you know it.' I don't know that I know it. The minister will direct his remarks through the Chair. I call on the minister to conclude his answer to the question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I have said, the contract negotiation is ongoing and I will take that on notice.

Mr Malinauskas: You'll take it on notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I turn to the member for West Torrens once again, I call to order the leader, I warn the member for Playford and I call to order the member for Lee. The member for West Torrens.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:41): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. When was a decision taken to offer unsuccessful bidders a loser fee of up to \$1 million to participate in a contract?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy and Mining on a point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 97: it suggests something that may or may not be true and it is hypothetical.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: On the point of order, member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sir, this is a publicly acknowledged fact. It has been the subject of media reporting and confirmation from the government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The point of order is well made. The question was premised on a fact. If the member for West Torrens would like to seek leave to introduce facts, he might go ahead and do so. I will give him an opportunity.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. When the decision was taken to privatise Adelaide's train network, was there a loser fee in the initial tender process?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:42): We are not privatising the train network; we're outsourcing it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

PAYDAY LOAN INDUSTRY

Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:42): My question is for the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General please update the house about her plan to address predatory practices in the payday loan industry?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:42): Members will know that the companies who offer small amount credit contracts, often know as payday lending, have been an issue on the table in Australia for about 10 years. It's been a concern, it's been raised, it's been talked about. The former member for Enfield the Hon. John Rau used to come in here and report to us that it had been raised. Nothing happened.

Since the 2016 federal report on this matter—well, here is the situation. I have indicated to the house before how important it is, especially within the envelope of COVID and people who might be pressed in their financial circumstances to be encouraged to take a payday lending arrangement, to ensure that we maintain some protection of the exploitative practices that can operate in this area.

Consideration was given by the commonwealth, urged by jurisdictions around the country in the New Zealand meeting in the middle of last year. There had been attempts to indicate the urgency about this. Minister Sukkar, the commonwealth Assistant Treasurer, indicated that he hoped to have a draft bill by the end of last year. That hasn't happened. I don't know what is happening in relation to that. But, as I said to the parliament before, if this matter is not progressed in a timely manner, and by 'timely manner' I mean within the year, then we would act.

So just before question time I tabled the government's draft bill to remedy this issue as to the most obvious practices of the industry that need to be curtailed. We can't wait any longer. We are getting on with the job. The key protections in this bill outline some of the matters that I have previously advised them on, but they are as follows:

- amending the protected earnings amount from 20 per cent of gross income to 10 per cent;
- introducing a protected earnings amount for consumer leases;
- prohibiting unsolicited advertising for small amount credit contracts and prohibiting door-to-door selling in relation to consumer leases;
- requiring assessments for small amount credit contracts and consumer leases to be recorded in writing;
- prohibiting early termination fees in relation to small amount credit contracts and requiring repayments across the life of the loan to be equal;
- requiring licensees entering consumer leases to disclose the base price of the good as well as the difference between the base price and total repayments;
- requiring licensees to obtain and consider 90 days of account statements before entering into a lease with the consumer; and

- imposing a cap on lease payments that applies to all consumer leases.

A copy of the bill will be available on the CBS website. In relation to this matter, I want to thank the commissioner, Mr Dini Soulio, who is well known to members, for his and his team's support in developing this reform and the advice that he has given. We must protect vulnerable South Australians. We will get on with the job to protect our own here. I encourage other jurisdictions, of course, and the commonwealth, if they finally decide to do something about this, to protect the rest of Australia.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the Deputy Premier for interjections prior to the question from the member for Elder and just remind all members that, whether before a question is being asked or in the course of the asking of the question in particular, it makes it difficult for me to give the call and then to understand the question if there are interjections across the chamber.

INFRASTRUCTURE AUSTRALIA

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:46): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister provide an update to the house as to how many new projects have been submitted by DPTI to the Infrastructure Australia priority list? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted.

Mr DULUK: Submissions for the February 2021 Infrastructure Australia priority list closed on 31 August this year.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:47): I thank the member very much for his question and I know he is very interested in this. Of course, infrastructure is a very key part of what we are delivering here in South Australia. I did talk yesterday about the \$12.9 billion of infrastructure projects that this government is very proudly delivering. We have a number of projects on the Infrastructure Australia list, and the department is also working with Infrastructure SA to put more onto that list. That list will be released in February.

We have put a number on that list, and we have a number that are being considered as well. We have actually received an opportunity to continue to put projects on that list. I don't have the exact number in front of me, but I am happy to go away and have a look at that for the local member, but I can assure him that this is a key focus.

Of course, we have also been working very closely with the federal government on stimulus as we go through this COVID-19 pandemic the world is experiencing. We know it's a health crisis on one hand and it's an economic health crisis on the other hand. That's why again we have fast-tracked that \$144½ million worth of road projects, a lot of them in the regions focused on road safety.

We know, again, the history of the lack of road maintenance over 16 years of the Labor government. We are getting in there and fixing a lot of that, adding road shoulders and audio tactile line marking to a number of our regional roads as well as the north-south freight route, of course—some \$12 million going into upgrading the roads there as well. The South Eastern Freeway is another aspect that we are looking at and getting on with fixing.

This is stimulus money. This is improving our road safety network and making sure that we are generating jobs for South Australians. That is the key here. At this time, we want to be generating jobs as well as introducing and improving our infrastructure, particularly around our road network. As for the finer detail of the member's question, I am happy to take that on notice and come back to him.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:49): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Have there been any loser fees or incentive payments introduced into the process of outsourcing South Australia's train network tender process after it began?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:49): Again, I think I have outlined this very clearly to the member. That contract process is continuing. No contract has been signed, so that is continuing and

that is evolving as we speak. I am happy to take that on notice, but I just think it's a little bit rich in this place when those on the other side want to talk to us—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —about outsourcing, in particular the member for West Torrens who outsourced \$5 billion worth of South Australian assets: the lands titles office, the Motor Accident Commission—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And I know you don't like to hear it on that side.

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Standing order 98, again, sir.

The SPEAKER: The question follows a number of questions on this topic. It was quite specific.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question was quite specific. It went to whether any loser fee or incentive payment had been made. In the circumstances it called for a specific answer. I will give the minister an opportunity to direct himself to the question. The minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The point I was making with the \$5 billion of assets the member for West Torrens sold off under the nose of South Australians—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —the lands titles office, the Motor Accident Commission—

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —the forests, lotteries—the list goes on, sir.

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Not within the first five words did he not come to the substance of the question. When you—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard: I've got four minutes.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —asked him to stop so that you could hear the point of order, he defied your ruling, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! What's the point of order, member for Lee?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: First of all, standing order 98, and also not obeying a ruling of the Speaker, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I am prepared to hear the minister for more than just a few seconds, member for Lee. I have directed the minister specifically to the question. I call the minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, sir. Again, I return to the lands titles office, the Motor Accident Commission, the forests and the lotteries—\$5 billion worth of state assets that the member for West Torrens sold and privatised on South Australians. He may want to ask himself the question whether any of those contracts were written into the deals that he did. But I stress the point again—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Were any of those contracts written into the deal?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —that the negotiations for the outsourcing of the trains, that contract is not signed and the negotiations are continuing.

NO JAB NO PLAY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:52): My question is to the Minister for Education. In his own role and also in the role of representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, when will the Department for Health respond to representations made by me on behalf of my constituents, and in the meantime while we wait for the outcome of the registration and appeal process, what can be done to allow their child to return to the early learning centre where she was enrolled prior to the implementation of the no jab no play legislation? With your leave, sir, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: Despite the efforts of her parents who are acting on medical advice and persistent and constant representations, slow-moving bureaucracy has denied their child the right on medical grounds to be able to attend early learning, and she now needs your help to get things moving and allow her dad the ability to return to the workforce and keep earning a wage to support his family. I am happy to provide you with extra information should you need it.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:53): I thank the member for Florey for the question, and I trust that the names provided in the question will provide sufficient information for the Minister for Health, to whom I will go to ask the question that the member for Florey has raised so that a response from the Minister for Health in relation to the matters that pertain to his portfolio can be brought back to the member for Florey.

However, I will provide an aspect of the answer now rather than take it formally on notice because I suspect that the Minister for Health's aspect of the response may contain personal information which might be appropriately directly provided to the member for Florey.

For the further information of the house I can advise that in early August, when the no jab no play legislation came into effect, I suspect that the family which the member for Florey is referring to is one of a number of South Australian families who have had the impact of a child currently enrolled in a preschool service unable to continue that enrolment by virtue of not having the information related to up-to-date immunisation processes being available to the preschool service.

For the overwhelming majority of South Australian preschool enrolees, that information has been with the preschool effectively since the beginning of this year, when it was required in relation to the earlier version of the legislation passed by this parliament, I think, over a year ago. That was in relation to immunisation records being required in the event that they would need to be brought upon if there was some sort of event, that that would be of interest to keeping children safe.

The second round of legislation, which was introduced into the parliament in the first half of this year and passed in the parliament in May, I think, put on that further obligation that the continued attendance of a child could only occur if they were vaccinated, had their immunisations up to date and had the paperwork with the preschool, unless of course there was a medical exemption. I believe there is a process that has been fairly clearly articulated to all families in South Australia—at great pains by preschool directors and their staff across our 380 government sites and many other sites throughout South Australia in the non-government system, but the overwhelming majority of our students are in our government preschools.

I have spoken to many preschool directors around South Australia about how this process has gone. The member for Finnis and I were in Victor Harbor, at the Victor Harbor kindergarten only last week, I think it was, where examples were raised. I have been to a range of other preschools throughout metropolitan and regional South Australia in the last month, and it has been a topic of conversation. A number of those preschools have reported that every single child is immunised, every single child's family has provided the papers. There are some sites, a small number of sites, where there are a number of children whose parents for whatever reason do not wish them to be

vaccinated. They have been informed, prior to the process, that this service would not be available unless they got their children vaccinated.

There is an opportunity for a temporary exemption process to take place for those children for whom there is a vulnerability in their situation and an inadequacy of the paperwork in their family. There is a particular cohort with whom we are working with SA Health very closely to help get their situation up to date. There are also a number of families that are still seeking medical exemptions. That may be the circumstance here, and we will provide further details directly to the member for Florey as possible.

NO JAB NO PLAY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:57): Supplementary following on from your remarks, minister: their child has a diagnosed medical contraindication. The problem is the paperwork is being bogged down. The family has been onto the department and onto your office as well. The real issue is that, unless we honour the system, which is—

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey!

Ms BEDFORD: —these children are allowed to have an exemption and the paperwork moves fast enough for them, she can be stuck at home for weeks.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey, pursuant to the leave that was granted earlier, I note a further introduction of facts. I call the Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:58): I am not intimately familiar with the individual case. There are a number of cases that have been brought to the attention of the education department and of the health department. This is actually a very difficult job for many preschool directors across South Australia, where there are children who don't necessarily have the paperwork.

The department has provided in excess of \$1 million worth of extra administration support directly to preschool directors to give them enough release time to support those families that needed assistance with either paperwork for existing immunisations for which potentially the paperwork was not there, or for families that were endeavouring to seek medical exemptions, or for families that had been persuaded, as was the intent of the legislation, to vaccinate their children, potentially for the first time, and to go on a course of catch-ups, if you will, in relation to their vaccinations.

It's a very complex area, particularly for a number of those where there is no paperwork. That is what SA Health and the education department and the preschools, where there is a child in that circumstance, are working closely on. It is a complex situation where there is a family that has had a child enrolled in a preschool but there is no intent on the family's part to have the vaccinations done for non-medical reasons. That has been a challenging situation for some preschool directors.

The chief executive of the education department at my request wrote to all families in preschool services to make sure that they were reminded—and this is something that I know the Australian Education Union was also grateful for—that this was the law, that it was not the decision of the preschool director to stop their child from being able to receive a preschool program which they were already enrolled in, and to encourage those families, some of whom had identified that they would be bringing their child to preschool irrespective of the new law—that was going to put a strain on the preschool directors in that circumstance that they did not deserve.

I was very pleased that we did not have any terribly problematic incidents through that week. There is this cohort of families who are still seeking medical exemptions, effectively from the Chief Public Health Officer. The Chief Public Health Officer and her team, as I think every single member of this house is fully aware, are doing an extraordinary job for the people of South Australia—an unmatched job in the nation or indeed in the world—in a range of other challenges that they are dealing with at the moment. That is not to say that this question is not important, too, but I am going to defend a question where there may be several weeks or days—I am not sure of the circumstance—

Ms Bedford: Months.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Maybe even months if that is the circumstance, as the member for Florey describes. If there is some wait in relation to that, it is certainly something that—I know a number of families have been applying for those medical exemptions. There has been, I think, the discretion of the Chief Public Health Officer to give several weeks' extension to a number of those families where there has been an identified best effort made by that family, or a realistic intent, to deliver the outcome the member for Florey describes.

The fact is that we are in a global pandemic, however, so I will give the Chief Public Health Officer a pass if it is a matter of correspondence being delayed. We will, as I said to the member for Florey, seek details about the case in question. If there is a medical reason that is of the nature that is seen as appropriate by the Chief Public Health Officer, then an exemption may be provided. Not every doctor's opinion that there is a person who is inappropriate for a vaccination is necessarily considered by the Chief Public Health Officer to be at the level that would meet the exemption. That may or may not be the circumstance here.

GLENTHORNE NATIONAL PARK

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (16:02): My question is directed to the Minister for Environment and Water. I ask the minister could he please update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's commitments to establish Glenthorne National Park in our southern suburbs?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (16:02): I thank the member for Davenport for a great question. It is always good to be able to update this house on the progress of one of the Marshall Liberal government's flagship environmental initiatives—that is, the creation of Glenthorne National Park in Adelaide's southern suburbs.

It is an area of land stretching from around Happy Valley Reservoir through the former Glenthorne Farm property and through to the sea around Marino Conservation Park and Hallett Cove Conservation Park, saving a body of land that was long-slated for development, that being Glenthorne Farm. That 200 hectares of open space is such an important piece of open space for the southern suburbs community. I think it was once described by Mike Rann as 'the lungs of the south'. He liked the quotes and the slogans but didn't actually do anything to save the lungs of the south.

That took the Marshall Liberal government, and that's exactly what we did. We said that if we got elected in March 2018, we would save that land from almost inevitable development and save it from 16 years of inaction—likely to be 22 years of inaction or 20-plus years of inaction under Labor should they have been re-elected. We know what their Glenthorne Lite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member: They hate national parks.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: They do. They hate national parks, rangers, reservoirs, the River Murray, the Coorong—they hate lots of things. Anyway, we know with Glenthorne Lite that was pitched by Ian Hunter in the lead-up to the last election, the likelihood would be that the southern portion of that land would have been sold off for Tuscan villas and the like, and the northern part might have ended up as some sort of park.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: But rest assured the Marshall Liberal government has saved this land. On 28 May 2020 that land was protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act and also rolled into the O'Halloran Hill Recreation Park in the north to create a body of land about 550 hectares or so of connected open space on both sides of Majors Road.

Since the house last sat, the loop trail, which gives the community access to that site for the first time in many, many decades, has opened, and the community can get into Glenthorne and explore what that site currently has to offer but also, perhaps more importantly, the environmental and recreational potential the site has in the medium to longer term. Glenthorne will take decades to unfold in its full environmental form, but we are getting there very quickly.

That loop trail, that 4½ or five kilometres or so, is enabling people to get in and explore the heavily vegetated creek line that runs through the property, where there are plenty of mature trees and shade. There is a lot of birdlife in there, a real corridor running through the property. They can then see the plans for the revegetation, the walking trails, the cycling, the picnic sites and, potentially, camping further down the track as that site is brought to life.

On 2 August, National Tree Day, it was great to have the Premier and many members of the community come along to Glenthorne to take part in the inaugural community tree planting on that site. Over the coming years we will plant in excess of 100,000 trees in Glenthorne National Park, and this planting season—which is coming to an end in a few weeks' time as the weather warms up—we will get around 35,000 new trees and shrubs into the site. It is all part of greening Glenthorne and creating a great place that people can enjoy. It is great for the wellbeing of the southern suburbs and, of course, securing that legacy—the lungs of the south.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is warned, the member for Playford is warned for the second time, the member for Kaurana is called to order, the member for Newland is called to order, the member for Lee is warned, the member for Cheltenham is warned. Notwithstanding the present difficulties, given the COVID restrictions, it is important that order is maintained throughout the chamber. The member for Elizabeth.

HINDLEY STREET POLICE STATION

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (16:06): My question is to the Minister for Police. Is the government closing Hindley Street Police Station?

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:07): I thank the member for Elizabeth for the question, and I thank him for his interest in South Australia Police. It is amazing how many complaints I have had about the member for Elizabeth when he was in the police—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I think there are two points of order. The member for Elizabeth on a point of order.

Mr ODENWALDER: He is making personal reflections on me and I take offence to that statement. Further to that, I would like the minister to clarify it.

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth, if you have taken offence it would be practice to call on the minister to apologise and withdraw. I don't know that he can do both at the same time.

Mr ODENWALDER: I call on the minister to withdraw and apologise.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: I withdraw and apologise. The member for Elizabeth asked about the Hindley Street Police Station.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The bottom line is that obviously we will certainly have a Hindley Street police station. Whether the current Hindley Street Police Station—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —will be in the same location in the long-term distant future is obviously an operational matter and a matter for the police commissioner.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: There will be a Hindley Street—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: —police station.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Reynell! The member for West Torrens.

TRAMCO

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:09): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Did Tramco withdraw from the tender process citing a lack of information and a rushed bid process by the state government?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:09): Not to my knowledge, but I need to stress to the member for West Torrens again—and I am happy to take that on notice—that the contract isn't signed. The negotiations are continuing. We have spent almost all of question time discussing the matter, and I can't be any clearer. He is asking about a contract that hasn't been signed.

The contract has not been signed. You may have rushed out with details about contracts and whatever else when you were in government when you were outsourcing all those things I listed before: the Motor Accident Commission, the lotteries, the forests and the like—the lands titles office. You may have rushed to give all the details when you signed the bus contracts and outsourced prisons. That may have been your modus operandi, but again I stress the point that no contract has been signed and the negotiations are continuing on.

EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:10): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting South Australians into employment?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (16:10): I thank the member for Flinders. I know he is very, very focused on jobs for regional South Australia, particularly in his electorate of Flinders.

The Marshall government has a top priority and that top priority is delivering rewarding employment for South Australians. We are delivering on key election commitments to build a strong economy, increase training participation, create new jobs, lower costs and provide better services for all South Australians. As we face the impacts of COVID-19, the government's work to strengthen the South Australian economy over the last 2½ years put South Australia in a better position to recover post COVID.

The latest ABS job figures confirm that South Australia has been quicker to rebound than other states. In June and July, 20,000 South Australians returned back to work. An extra three million hours were worked in July compared with June, and that's the highest percentage increase in Australia. Interestingly, in those July figures 9½ thousand full-time jobs returned to the marketplace.

The Marshall Liberal government has signed a national partnership agreement with the Morrison government to deliver the JobTrainer program here in South Australia. Of course, just like the Skilling South Australia program, we were the first state to sign. We are eager to get out there and spend the federal government's money supporting South Australians in jobs. This resulted in an additional \$88 million into the state's training system: \$34.5 million from the Marshall government, \$34.5 million from the Morrison government and an extra \$19 million from the Marshall government so we can focus those training skills into new jobs—\$88 million in total, a tremendous outcome.

South Australian school leavers and jobseekers will benefit from low-cost training under JobTrainer delivering targeted training and skills in demand. Skills for employment are critical for our economic recovery from the COVID pandemic. There is no doubt we have learnt from previous downturns in the economy that skills will be the fastest way out. If we've got a skilled workforce, it will be the fastest way out.

Unfortunately, when we came to office we inherited the lowest skill base in the country. Forty per cent of the adult population haven't had tertiary education—not a cert III. They went straight from school into the workforce—the lowest in mainland Australia. That's the legacy of those opposite, so we have a lot of work to do, but we have started that work.

Mr Speaker, I know that you were certainly very excited when I told you about the latest national data from the NCVET showing that South Australia in 2019 achieved a 14.7 per cent increase in apprentice and traineeships commencements compared with just a 2.5 per cent increase nationally. And I can feel it in my bones, I think it's the vibe, I think it's Mabo—but on Monday, when the new figures come out, I think we will see some even better figures in the NCVET.

I will be very interested to see where we are in particular categories. Some of those categories have been very difficult and very challenging for previous governments. I am very, very excited about that. We know that a rising tide lifts all boats, so let's get ready for a bit of boating on Monday.

Grievance Debate

STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (16:14): I welcome the opportunity to be able to address the house in this format for the first time since the midwinter break because, of course, it has been an incredibly eventful few weeks during the course of the parliament's winter recess. Most MPs in the parliament, I am sure on all sides, took the opportunity to get out and engage with their communities and spend some time talking to people about their circumstances and how they have been impacted during the course of the COVID-19 led recession.

It is hard not to get overwhelmed, when you get out and talk to people about it, by the level of human tragedy within our community, not in regard to the health response, because that has been largely very good in South Australia, but in regard to the economic response. There is a lot of human tragedy in our community at the moment. In my own electorate, I spoke to people who own cafes and restaurants who are grappling with their decisions to have to lay people off, notwithstanding the support of JobKeeper.

I heard of one gentleman who took out a very substantial loan to keep his hotel laundry business going not knowing what the future of that debt is and his capacity to be able to service it because he does not know how long the pandemic will last. That was having implications for his family and children. These are human stories, real people who are currently looking to government for leadership in their time of need, and that includes leadership from the state government. That includes having a government that is exercising the function of delivering policy in a way that will make a material difference to their lives.

They are looking to those opposite for policy, reason, consideration and leadership. They want to see people caring about their jobs rather than their own, and it is incredibly unfortunate that throughout the course of the winter break we saw anything but that occurring. What we saw was a government mired in a scandal of its own making as a result of a suite of Liberal country MPs doing everything they possibly could to maximise the benefit to them as a result of living beyond the 75-kilometre radius.

It is a crisis that has engulfed the government. It has already been well litigated in the media and in the public sphere, and it will continue to be litigated in this house. But the problem is that that crisis has resulted in a substantial change in the ranks within the government. What we have seen is a comprehensive reshuffle, a bunch of leadership roles changing as a result of that country members' allowance scandal. Now, this week, in this place, upon return back to parliament what we are starting to see unfold is the consequence that is happening on the functioning of the government and, indeed, the impact that will have on real people's lives.

Let's start by looking at some of the new faces we have, none less than the Speaker himself, who took the opportunity of his elevation to immediately embark on a partisan attack rather than try to allow for the ordinary, practical and appropriate functioning of the house itself—hardly bodes well for good government. Then, of course, let's take the new Minister for Police. What did he do on the

first opportunity he rose to his feet? He decided to make a scandalous attack on the shadow minister for police, a good man who has been a serving police officer himself.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will resume his seat.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: This is a personal reflection. I withdrew the comment and I apologised. This is a personal reflection on me, and it was not my first contribution.

The SPEAKER: The minister has withdrawn and apologised. The matter, I understood, was resolved to the satisfaction of the member for Elizabeth. He has raised a point of order. He has indicated that he has been aggrieved. The minister withdrew and apologised, so I ask that the leader not relitigate that matter in the circumstances.

Mr PICTON: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: On the point of order.

Mr PICTON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: this is the grievance debate of our parliament. The comment was said. It was not being raised as a point of order in the speech: it was being raised as part of a grievance speech. If your ruling goes through, you are effectively saying that we are not allowed to make comment on things that were said that were later withdrawn in parliament, which I think is not a particularly good precedent for our parliament to set.

The SPEAKER: It is not a ruling, member for Kaurana. The point of order has been raised. I am simply noting that the minister has already withdrawn and apologised.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: After the scandalous attack on the shadow police minister, the minister had to withdraw and apologise for it, and then he could not even let us know about what is happening at the Hindley Street Police Station, notwithstanding the fact that there is a For Lease sign out the front. Then, of course, we got the new Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Goodness gracious!

This minister is now responsible for one of the most important portfolios within the government. He is in charge of the infrastructure program that is supposed to be delivering real jobs to South Australia, and it turns out that it largely only exists on paper. Furthermore, on one of the central platforms of this government's policy agenda with regard to public transport, the privatisation of the train and tram network, apparently the minister has not even had the time to be briefed about such an important policy of the government. It is truly extraordinary.

My point is this: at a time when we have 170,000 South Australians currently either out of work or looking for more work, at a time when building approvals in the state are down 32 per cent, exports are down to 2.9 per cent of the national share when at the time of the election they were 4.1 per cent, at a time when we are in the midst of an economic crisis, this government has had to completely reshape its front bench, including a central economic portfolio, and this has all descended because of a crisis of the government's own making—and it is the people of South Australia who are set to suffer.

This cannot occur in a continued way for the life of this government. What we need is fresh leadership in this state, a serious policy agenda to address the economic crisis and a stable and united government that is concerned about South Australians more than themselves.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader's time has expired.

CHAFFEY ELECTORATE

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:21): I would like to rise to talk about some of the important issues in the great electorate of Chaffey. I would like to take this opportunity to make mention that today is R U OK? Day. It is also World Suicide Prevention Day. They are two initiatives that in today's climate have become more important than ever before. Here in South Australia, nationally and globally, we are dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic. However, here in South Australia we have

dealt with a number of disasters, not only the bushfires that have burnt far and wide around the state but also the drought and the hardship of the potential trade barriers that we are dealing with at the moment, particularly with COVID-19.

The opposition leader talks about blaming the government for the drop in trade and economic activity. South Australia's records are second to none. Our trade numbers are bucking the national trend and our economic credentials are well outpacing any of the other mainland states. I would say that this government is leading the nation. South Australia is the envy, going through the uncertain times with the pandemic, the fires, the flood and all of the uncertainties that we currently face.

As I said, it is important to raise awareness around suicide and to encourage communities to look out for one another and ask the question: are you okay? Each year, these events are raising more and more awareness. They are promoting mental health, wellbeing and suicide prevention, all issues close to my community's heart, and this year, they are more important than ever.

We know that regional communities face issues around isolation, particularly our elderly and those more vulnerable. They are too scared to leave their homes. They are too scared to attend their doctor's appointments because they are the most vulnerable to contract COVID-19. They are the most vulnerable through these uncertain times. Some, who do not have families, who do not have a close connection of friends, are locked away inside and have a level of uncertainty. So we urge family, friends, neighbours, community people to just knock on the door and ask: are you okay?

I would also like to mention two great organisations in the Riverland: Life Without Barriers and Headspace in Berri, which have been championing these messages in the Riverland and hosting events today as part of the awareness campaign.

As I have said, people in rural populations are two times more likely to die by suicide. Drought, low commodity prices, high input prices, financial stress, isolation and, of course, as I have already mentioned, COVID-19 continue to intimidate and threaten every community here in South Australia. These important organisations are doing vital work throughout the year. They are supporting people who are vulnerable and people who are struggling. They are also supporting people who have added significant pressures placed upon them.

I would like to talk about some of the great opportunities. We know the importance of social interaction and physical exercise in managing mental health. The Marshall Liberal government is supporting community sporting clubs to recover from the impacts of COVID-19. We know that sport is a vital part of the Riverland community. It is the fabric and the backbone of social interaction, health and wellbeing. Health is vitally important in these current times.

Hardworking mums, dads and volunteers are the fabric of our sporting clubs. The Office of Recreation and Sport has been supporting many of the local sporting clubs, particularly with the Active Club grants. It was great to see that the District Council of Loxton Waikerie is expanding their sporting precinct with the help of a \$380,000 grant.

I was also out at the Renmark Olympic soccer event of recent weeks to see the new lights out there. It has given a new perspective to that club and to the sport. They can get out of the heat, they can continue their work during the day and they now have opportunities to undertake competitive sport under lights, and that is now bringing out a new audience—spectators who otherwise would not have gone out and had a look.

The Riverland is a great place to visit and a great place to be. I congratulate the under 18s, under 15s and under 13s on their best and fairest players in their respective age groups: Adam Westley, Jordan Gadaleta, Reuben Lehmann and Malachi Lloyd.

Time expired.

DOYLE, MR J.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:27): Among all staff at the Florey EO, few people have held the affection and esteem of our mentor, comrade, true friend and supporter, Mr James (Jim) Doyle, who passed away on 15 August 2020 at the age of 102, having received in his remarkable lifetime his quota of celebratory telegrams and messages from the dignitaries who recognise achieving great age. These acknowledgments were at the end of a long and distinguished life with many inspirational

achievements, paying testimony to his dedication and commitment to all working people, so much so that in 2011, a new union office complex in Port Pirie was named Jim Doyle House.

Jim was born in Rockhampton and grew up in Longreach, the eldest of seven children. His father was a teamster who drove a wagon of 12 to 16 horses and carted wool from Longreach pastoral stations. Jim left school in 1932 at the age of 14 and got work pulling thistle weeds along the course of a river. He started shearing in 1939 and worked in shearing sheds all over Queensland and later in New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania and South Australia.

He tried to join the Army at the beginning of the war but shearing was a reserved occupation. Jim was a shearer at the time when Australia's fortunes rode on the sheep's back. After Pearl Harbour, he was allowed to join the Army. Jim volunteered to drive trucks and was accepted, even though he did not hold a driver's licence.

Even so, he was eventually posted to Geraldton where soldiers were spread along the WA coast as they were expecting a Japanese attack. As there was a shortage of shearers, reminiscent of things today when their importance and skill as a trade is really noted, he was pulled out of New Guinea by the Army to return to shearing, as they needed the wool from the sheep for the war effort. He was eventually discharged in 1944.

Jim always believed the best place to educate workers was amongst them. In 1946, he was shearing at Carandotta Station near Mount Isa and was heavily involved in the industrial action to win the 40-hour week in the industry in Queensland so that shearers would no longer have to work on Saturday mornings. He was also instrumental in getting the 40-hour week in the pastoral industry for New South Wales.

By the time I met Jim in the late 1980s, he was living a much quieter life than in his younger days, chiefly supported by his close friend and driver, Don Jarret, who is here today, and friends Les and Chris Birch. Among other dear friends also here today are Claire and Jim Hughes, Bob and Kath Mack and David Wilson. Other friends Ron Garvey and Ron Buckingham were shearers with Jim, and they have unfortunately passed away recently.

Jim's close friend Don Jarret spent a lot of time with Jim over the past 23 years and we have shared many happy Florey events with these two great men. Don remembers Jim as a private man and as someone who knew exactly what he wanted. Jim never wavered—he was straight down the line and what he said, he meant—his astute summations always ending up to be an accurate assessment of the true position of things.

Jim was a genuine friend to Don and had a lot of respect for Don's sister Audrey over a period of around 20 years until her death in 1998. Jim was very impressed with Audrey's attitude, which obviously was closely aligned to his. Don confirmed with me Jim was a great supporter of both Steph Key and, luckily, me as well, because he considered us to be important activists. I know we were both very proud to know him and to be his friend. Les Birch described him as:

...a man dedicated to the pride of the Trade Union movement who fought all his life for fairness, equality and the rights of working people. Jim was the longest continuous member of a trade union in Australia—serving 87 years as a member—then Life Member—of the AWU. His passing is a loss to the trade union movement, but his legacy and influence will live on through those he encouraged and mentored over his lifetime.

Peter Duncan, a former member of this place and of the House of Representatives, posted a message on 20 August:

Jim Doyle died a few days ago in his 103rd year. I last saw Jim in January 2019. It is hard to over-estimate Jim's contribution to the Union movement, the broader labour movement and the working class.

A shearer by trade and lifelong member of the AWU, Jim devoted his life to assisting others and fighting the battles of the working class. He was an official for decades and in retirement published a newsletter called The Plod, which more often than not criticised the cant and hypocrisy so often found in society and the mainstream labour movement.

He was never much interested in accumulating worldly goods or property and, sadly, spent much of his later years in less than material comfort following a defamation action, which unfortunately he lost. I know Peter would not mind me adding here that Jim would often say after the

deaths of those who cost him so much, 'At least I outlived the bastards.' Peter concluded, 'The real battlers of this world have lost a genuine champion. Vale Jim Doyle.'

The SA branch of the Labour History Society, where he also held life membership, remember Jim as a man who:

...dedicated his life to the Trade Union movement and the betterment of the working class. A mentor to many, a tough and strategic trade unionist and a dear friend. His counsel will be greatly missed.

I am indebted to Allison Murchie's contribution to the much longer version of Jim's biographical notes made available from the Labour History Society for some of my remarks here today.

For myself, I would like to add how good it always was to discuss policy and history with Jim. He had a wide understanding of issues and, more importantly, their history, and demonstrated the patience of a saint whenever I decried the glacial pace of reform. Jim is survived by his son, Young Jim, to whom we all extend our heartfelt condolences. Jim Doyle was a legend and will be greatly missed and always remembered.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Waite, I just note that in the course of the member for Florey's grievance, which I was particularly loath to interrupt in the context of the subject matter, there was apparent to me very audible conversation going on between members in the chamber. I just note that if members are to engage in conversation, then they do so quietly and conscious of the right of the member on their feet to be heard in silence. Member for Waite.

WAITE ELECTORATE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:33): Thank you, sir, and thank you for your deliberations there. I rise today to recognise the outstanding members of my community who continue to demonstrate their wonderful respect and values for our community, care for the environment and conscientious efforts to improving the electorate that we all live in.

Recently, I joined with the local Blackwood Reconciliation Group members and over 100 volunteers to plant some 600 native trees at the Colebrook Reconciliation Park. Kurna food, medicine plants and other native plants from the Plains and Adelaide Hills were selected in consultation with local Kurna educator Tamaru Kartinyeri. A majority of the plants were propagated, donated or locally sourced from the Coromandel Native Nursery, so thank you to them.

I would like to thank the collaborative efforts Peter Stokes from the Department for Environment and Water, John Sandham of the Botanical Gardens of South Australia and the Australian Plant Society—and, of course, a very active member in Rotary—Trees for Life and Blackwood Uniting Church, especially Allen Edwards, who is chair of the Blackwood Reconciliation Group, Helen Sage, Di Griggs, and once again Tamaru for his fantastic Welcome to Country. The Blackwood Reconciliation Group works actively towards reconciliation in our community in conjunction with the former Colebrook Home in Eden Hills and really aims to create a place of peace and reflection and of healing in our community.

This month, I also met with the Friends of Waite Conservation Group to discuss the importance of volunteering and their volunteers in combating feral pests, such as olive trees, in our national parks and reserves. As part of celebrating National Landcare Week last month, I urge people to get out and join their local landcare group. If you live in a community that does not have a landcare group, come join the ones up in Waite. Actively partaking of these activities and connecting with nature is so important for one's mental health and physical health, as well as an array of social benefits. As many members have also indicated, today is R U OK? Day and World Suicide Prevention Day.

In my electorate, there are a number of groups dedicated to positive environmental outcomes, such as the Blackwood Action Group, Upper Sturt Reaches Landcare Group, Friends of Sturt Gorge Recreation Park, Friends of Shepherds Hill Recreation Park and Friends of Belair National Park. I would like to thank all those who take time out of their lives to green our suburbs and to improve our environment.

On this note, the Belair National Park has been receiving some much warranted attention since we last sat here before the winter break. The new community reference group has been

meeting regularly to discuss the master plan for the recreation space at the former country club and golf course site. I have been meeting with the local groups associated with the developments, and it was great to see some announcements today around additional mountain bike trails in the park.

I was also pleased recently to join the Minister for Environment and Water and the federal member for Boothby to celebrate the opening of the new Long Gully Volunteer Centre kitchen and those renovations, and that, of course, was part of both state and federal election commitments and money from the Adelaide City Deal with the federal Morrison government. As part of that money from the City Deal, there are works that are going to Old Government House for garden landscaping works and the redevelopment of the coach house.

In terms of sport in my community, I am happy to see once again both state and federal funds flowing into Waite. The community is very excited for the Sturt Lions Football Club, which has received some funds recently for the development of Karinya Reserve. After 17 years, the Lions and its president, John Vander Veeken, will finally have a home ground which will include a new two-storey clubroom building, a grandstand and a Football Federation Australia compliant artificial turf pitch. The good thing about the completion of this project is that John can finally retire as president.

Recently, I had the great honour of meeting two centurions from my community. Lois Liebing from Kalyra Communities turned 100 last week, and she told me that the secret to her long life has been working hard. And I met with Viv Samuel, aged 101, last Friday and presented him with a certificate marking VP Day. Viv was awarded the Military Medal in the Africa campaign in World War II, and served in the British 7th Armoured Division, which was known as the Desert Rats, at Tobruk—an absolute true living legend. When we were meeting and talking on Friday he said, 'Sam, we've got to wrap things up because I'm off to Rostrum this afternoon,' at 101 years old not out.

HAMPSTEAD PRIMARY SCHOOL

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (16:38): In December last year, Hampstead Primary School in my electorate of Torrens was the victim of a suspected arson attack. The fire caused severe damage to the hub of the school, leaving burnt-out shells among the remaining buildings. I witnessed the devastation on some of the faces of some of the families who visited the site on the days following the fire. I spoke to the school principal to offer my support to the community and to hear plans on how the school would resume at the beginning of the 2020 school year.

On day one of the school year the Minister for Education visited Hampstead Primary School, taken by the school community as an indication that they would be supported by him on the road to a quick recovery. In fact, he did a video at the front of the school. He even posted the visit on his Facebook page, saying that this year the students were going to have 'a fantastic experience with the learning experience unimpeded'. Well, unfortunately that has not been the case.

The school community has been very patient for eight months, putting up with the untouched burnt shell in the middle of the school, a situation that has seen the year 5 to 7s isolated from the rest of the school, as there is no access through the charred building. In addition, without a general-purpose room for incursions, indoor physical education and coordination programs, students are missing out.

Also, as a result of the fire there is only one suitable space for a meeting room, which is having to be shared by occupational therapists, psychologists and other support services. The valued and much-loved Stephanie Alexander kitchen garden program has been abandoned because the kitchen has had to be the staffroom. This means that the students miss out on the associated learning of the garden, the cooking of healthy foods and related lessons.

Without an art room space, lessons this year have to take place in the performing arts room, impacting on other lessons and subsequently resulting in a loss of other school programs. This was not what was envisaged at the beginning of the 2020 school year. Students have described the burnt-out shell as being 'a bit scary' and, for potential students and their families, a school tour is not what it should be.

The leadership team, teachers and support staff have been amazing in their resilience and dedication to providing quality learning experiences for these young students, students who every day are confronted with the consequences of this appalling act of arson on their school, a place in which they should always feel safe. Some are refugees, and they have already experienced situations that cause severe anxiety.

These young children should not have to be greeted each day by metal fencing across a burnt-out shell and lessons in makeshift rooms. Together, they have waited far too long without a clear plan for their school. They deserve better than this. Our educators have been put under immense pressure this year due to COVID-19, and to have eight months without suitable infrastructure is simply not acceptable.

I am waiting to hear back from the minister regarding my letter outlining concerns about the situation and my request for an urgent meeting. I understand the need to safely remove the charred building, but it appears there have been numerous opportunities during the school holidays that have been missed, and the temporary modular classroom should have been installed months ago.

The school needs to be informed about the immediate plans being put in place for Hampstead Primary School. They need to be assured they will receive the necessary infrastructure without delay, providing the educational learning and teaching environment we expect in 2020. This needs to be a priority for the department, and the minister should ensure that the required resources are immediately made available for this to happen. It would seem sensible that the opportunity is also provided to the school to include some changes to the infrastructure as part of the build that would meet the school's need now and into the future. It should not be a missed opportunity.

Hampstead Primary School offers an excellent array of educational programs and support to its students—language learning classes, celebrations of the many cultures that make up the school community, specialist STEM centre, Aboriginal language learning and 1:1 mobile devices. Today, I call on the Minister for Education to intervene and to get moving the infrastructure build for Hampstead Primary School so the school community can put the ashes and the burnt remnants behind them. The students, teaching staff and the school community of Hampstead Primary School deserve nothing less. Eight months is a long time. The time to have it fixed is now.

MENTAL HEALTH

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (16:43): Today, I would like to talk about the stigma of mental health. As people would be aware, I am very passionate about issues of mental health, especially with regard to people not seeking or acknowledging that they may have an issue with regard to their health and wellbeing. I have spoken previously in this house and also worked with relevant government and non-government agencies, holding forums to promote this issue.

It is in this regard that I recently took up a challenge to get rid of the stigma of people suffering mental health concerns. There has been for many years an issue of people who may be impacted by outside issues that may impact their health and wellbeing. However, as males, we still appear to have this attitude that we should not openly talk about this for fear of being seen as weak and/or not macho.

This feeling, and fear of the stigma being placed upon us, has to be addressed and brought into the open and addressed openly. This issue is not only confined to older males but also to many young people across both genders who are impacted with pressures resulting from not only the COVID-19 impacts but also schooling pressure, social media bullying, intimidation or financial issues.

It is with this in mind that I took up the challenge recently to raise funds for Lifeline to establish a Connect centre in Port Pirie to provide a facility for a location for these people to actually talk to a trained counsellor or other people who do not necessarily need to be qualified but who may have experienced this issue and have come out the other end. This is sometimes the best opportunity because these people can talk from experience and they can personally relate to people who may have this issue. I might add that, to my information, people attending this facility would also not require a referral from their medical practitioner.

By accepting this challenge, I pledged to endeavour to raise \$10,000, and if that could be achieved I would contribute \$5,000 from my personal funds to go towards this project. This campaign

has achieved a total of just in excess of \$20,000, which is greatly appreciated. The challenges given were to either colour my moustache or shave it off. As I have not shaved off my moustache for the past 52 years, it was a very daunting experience—firstly, with colouring it, and then we had to find a suitable colour and somebody to colour it, and then shaving it off. As you can see, in some people's view it makes me look a bit younger, but that may be questionable.

My grandchildren asked their mothers what I looked like without my moustache. Even both my girls had never seen me without it, so it was a complete shock to all my children, including my grandchildren, that I would do this. This decision was met with a gasp from my youngest grandchild, Jax, who was fearful of the idea of grandpa not being the same. However, my daughter was able to convince him that I would be the same and to come with other members of my family to witness this process at 4.30pm last Friday.

I was invited to go to my daughter's home for Father's Day. Again, this was met with the same response: me not being allowed to attend my daughter's place on Sunday because of the same concerns. My grandson Jax thought that his grandpa would be different and he did not want to know anything about it. However, at 4.30 last Friday, my partner, Lyn, and I, and my family and other supports, did the deed. Firstly, we coloured the moustache purple and then we shaved it off in a public location. I must admit that I ensured that there was a defibrillator present, just in case, and also a first-aid attendant.

I sincerely thank everyone who donated, especially in these very trying and uncertain times, and I would also like to thank many of my colleagues in parliament who donated to this great cause. These donations were received from members of both houses of parliament. Even though the time for the challenge has expired, I am still encouraging people to donate further to this project. This can be through Lifeline at Westpac: BSB 032816, account 223182.

We must remember the people who may be experiencing these issues. We must reassure them that they are not alone, that we are walking this course and this journey with them and that we are here to support them.

Matter of Privilege

MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER (16:47): Before I call the minister, I make the following statement regarding the matter of privilege raised yesterday in the house by the member for Florey. Before addressing the matter, I wish to outline the significance of privilege.

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

During the recent ballot to elect the Speaker, the member for Florey advised the house that members were showing their ballot paper to other members. As the Speaker had not yet been elected, the Clerk appropriately acknowledged the comment of the member for Florey. In raising the matter of privilege yesterday, the member for Florey has intimated that the actions of members in showing their ballots to one another is 'a flagrant disregard of the spirit of the secret ballot', and, further, any attempt to improperly coerce a parliamentarian to show their vote to another member may constitute a contempt of parliament.

In response to my invitation to the member for Florey to provide me with further materials, the member for Florey has very generously provided to me further information to assist me with my deliberations under cover of a considered letter dated today, which was handed to me this morning. In relation to the potential contempt, I note that standing order 8 provides:

Each member of the house then present delivers to the Clerk the name of the candidate he/she chooses to be Speaker of the House.

The standing order is silent on what members should or should not do with their ballot papers prior to delivering them to the Clerk at the table.

In the absence of a specific provision in the standing orders, the practice of this house has been one whereby staff collect the ballot papers and deliver them to the Clerk at the table. Confirmation of this practice can be found in *Hansard* of 8 December 1982 at page 13, and I quote the Speaker:

I will take the honourable member's point of order after the ballot papers have been collected.

This ballot related to the election of a chairman of committees, regarding which standing order 14 states:

If more than one member is proposed and seconded as Chairman of Committees, the election is as provided for the election of Speaker.

Further, on 14 September 2004, on a ballot being conducted for the appointment of a member to the Natural Resources Committee, I quote the Chair at the time from *Hansard* at page 18:

I direct the staff to collect the ballot papers and the scrutineers to come to the table.

I agree with the member for Florey's assertion that any suggestion that a member has been coerced by other members to show their ballot paper or impeded in the casting of their vote would likely constitute a contempt of this house. However, I have not been provided with any information or evidence of members being coerced during the ballot requiring them to show their ballot paper to another member or being impeded in casting their vote.

I thank the member for Florey for raising this matter and providing me with additional materials. However, I am satisfied there is no evidence to suggest that members were obstructed or impeded in the discharge of their duty to cast their vote to name their chosen candidate to be Speaker of the house. Accordingly, I do not propose to give the precedence that would enable any member to pursue this matter immediately as a matter of privilege.

However, my opinion does not prevent any member from pursuing the matter by way of substantive motion. If the member for Florey does have concerns about the operation of the standing orders in providing the necessary protection and safeguards to enable members to cast their ballot in private, I invite her to consider writing to the Standing Orders Committee so that the committee may consider the matter.

Further, and in relation to the process of election that occurred this week, it has been brought to my attention the publication of certain photographs from the floor of the chamber in published electronic media and social media. For the purposes of my noting that has come to my attention, it does not matter who the member or members involved were. However, I do take the opportunity to remind members that the ruling of Speaker Atkinson in 2013, as reiterated by Speaker Tarzia as recently as 3 June this year, is that there is to be no taking of photographs in the chamber.

That is especially with regard to members taking photos of other members in the chamber. That is now contrary to rulings of numerous Speakers. So I put members on notice, as Speaker for the first time myself, that if this happens again it will be a naming offence.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(16:54): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 22 September 2020 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:55): I will resume where I left off when time ran out before the lunch break. At that point in time, I was taking the opportunity to close the debate by addressing comments made during the debate. Specifically, I was dealing with comments made by the member for Kaurna. He made an incorrect assertion that the government is privatising the former government's generators.

The reality is that the former government committed over \$600 million of taxpayers' money to purchase diesel generators, to set them up in two locations—at Elizabeth and Lonsdale—to run them on diesel at the same time that the former government was trying to have people believe that it was moving away from fossil fuels. They were set up so that they could only be operated at times of energy emergency and at no other time. They were not used by the previous government. They were purchased, there was a maintenance and operating contract put in place, they were installed, they were commissioned, but they were not used.

I do not say for a second that it would not be handy to have generators available for use at times of energy emergency—yes, of course it would be. However, it is completely inaccurate for the member for Kaurna to have suggested that what our government has done with them is inappropriate in any way whatsoever.

Our government has not privatised them. We have leased them to two separate companies. Part of that lease agreement is that they will be relocated and run on gas rather than on diesel—so much cleaner and a much better operation in many ways. We have entered into agreements with companies that already have renewable and grid-scale storage assets, so to complement it with new, modern fast-start gas generation is exactly the type of generation portfolio that our government believes is ideal for the South Australian market.

One company that sells on the wholesale market and sometimes perhaps to itself, if it chooses to, so that it can then on-retail, but sells essentially as a generator and has the opportunity to maximise the output from renewable energies in storage and back it up from gas-generated, fast-start quickly in two or three minutes in and out of the market using less gas when operating, is ideal. That combination allows a company like that then to go and acquire contracts to sell to customers because they are then reliant on not only the sun and/or the wind and the storage. They can then commit to deliver electricity under all circumstances. So that is absolutely a very positive development. We also managed to get back for the taxpayer a huge amount of the money that the previous government committed for generators that it was not going to use.

In addition, and very importantly—because as I have said before, I do accept that it is beneficial to have generation available at times of energy emergency—these generators, which are being leased to be used throughout the year whenever appropriate, will also still be available at times of energy emergency.

The same generators that would have been there ready to run for the previous government on diesel will now be there ready to run for South Australians, under the current government, on gas if needed under an energy emergency. So I completely refute the words of the member for Kaurna in that respect, as do all serious energy industry commentators.

The interconnector was another topic the member for Kaurna raised, a very important topic. I do not think he is right across the way in which an interconnector can be brought into the market, but that is not a criticism because it is actually pretty complicated. There is probably nobody who knows every single part of that process. ElectraNet, on behalf of ElectraNet and TransGrid, is putting forward a proposal to the Australian Energy Regulator—the federal independent body that regulates the energy industry—to have an interconnector built between South Australia and New South Wales. That would be incredibly beneficial in many ways.

The opposition has regularly and falsely characterised this as just an extension cord. There no doubt will be times when we will be very pleased to bring some electricity into South Australia through this interconnector to supplement the one that is already in place with Victoria but, far more than that, this interconnector will allow additional generation to be built in South Australia. Much of it will be exported into New South Wales. We will export far, far more renewable energy from South Australia through this interconnector into New South Wales than we will ever bring into South Australia from New South Wales.

All members here will know from comments made in question time yesterday that there are investors signed up, ready to go, just waiting for the interconnector to be committed. This will be very positive for South Australia in many ways. It will attract new investment into new generation in South Australia. It will allow us to have a greater volume and penetration of renewable energy. It will allow New South Wales to receive more renewable energy from South Australia. It will support New South Wales as it works through its retirement of fossil fuel generation, which is coming. It will help them from a security perspective, and it will help them from an emissions perspective.

This is very important for essentially the NEM. The member for Kurna said that the interconnector would end up preventing generation in South Australia, meaning that we have less generation in South Australia. The reality is that it is actually the exact opposite, and all sensible energy industry commentators say exactly the same thing: the interconnector will attract more generation into South Australia.

The last thing that the member for Kurna inaccurately commented on was with regard to household solar curtailment. I have not gone back over the *Hansard*, so I am not going to quote this, but essentially he said that the South Australian government is just going to turn off everybody's solar and make sure that everybody who has solar will be curtailed, etc. It is just base scaremongering.

The reality is that AEMO has recommended to the South Australian government that there are times when it will be necessary for some of the rooftop solar generation in South Australia to be curtailed from feeding electricity back into the grid because we are at a risk of having, in the not too distant future, more electricity going into the grid from solar energy than we actually need to take out of the grid for all consumers' needs aggregated. If that is allowed to happen, the system would black out.

We are talking about a few hours at a time a few times a year for some of the rooftop solar generators in South Australia, and in fact it will affect mostly those who acquire solar rooftop generation from now on. It will affect others as they do retrofits and things like that. It is important that I put that on the record, Deputy Speaker, so thank you for the opportunity.

Coming back to a few last comments before we go into the committee stage, as the shadow minister has indicated he would like to do, this is a pretty straightforward bill in principle. This is about saying that the penalties to the industry—electricity and gas, in fact—have really not changed much, if at all, since 1996, so 25 years ago roughly, and it is about time that we updated those penalties. That is essentially what is going on.

There are some updates with regard to a system of tiering. There are some updates with regard to identifying what the penalty bans will be and, more specifically, the maximum penalties in those bans. There is some updating with regard to what types of offences of existing rules and regulations would be dealt with by different tiers. There is also the opportunity for civil penalties and other court-ordered directions to come into force if seen appropriate by the Australian Energy Regulator when identifying breaches and handing out penalties.

Finally, I would like to say that I think the Minister for Trade and Investment gave an outstanding outline of exactly what is going on. He took his full 20 minutes. He stepped through very well the research that he did very thoroughly. If the shadow minister had the opportunity to hear everything that the Minister for Trade and Investment contributed, then he would be certainly very well informed. I will certainly do everything I can to inform him, to the best of my ability and that of my adviser, when he asks questions in the committee stage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have just a general question to the minister. I note that Treasurer Frydenberg (former energy minister Frydenberg) took to the election a policy of a big stick approach to energy retailers, the wholesale market and the gas market. This has been written about on numerous occasions. I ask the minister: are any of the changes we are considering today as a

consequence of that policy change and process that the commonwealth Treasurer and commonwealth energy minister and the COAG Energy Council went through, and are these not subordinate but supportive of measures made in the federal parliament?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The short answer is no. The medium-length answer is that this is something that has been coming for 10 or so years, well before the set of rules, colloquially described as the 'big stick' legislation, were dreamt of, to the best of my knowledge. I believe it was energy minister Taylor who took it to the election, rather than the former minister, because I think former minister Frydenberg was the Treasurer going to the last election, but I may have that wrong.

This is work that has been undertaken at COAG's request under Liberal and Labor, state and federal. It really has absolutely nothing to do with that whatsoever; it is a bringing up to current day value of penalties and also an improvement and adjustment in the types of penalties that are available.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much for that answer. I am just quoting a press release from minister Frydenberg, where he said that they had been reduced and returned to parliament as Treasurer. That is the only reason I mention that. Just broadly, if I can, under the title what is the ongoing future for the COAG Energy Council, given the new national cabinet role? Can the minister give the committee an overview of how it will work going forward? Will we still maintain the COAG Energy Council, or will it be a national cabinet process going forward?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will help. It is not really germane to the bill, but it might help you with regard to questions that you want to ask that are germane to the bill. First of all, I share my thoughts. I do not speak on behalf of the South Australian government or the COAG Energy Council or the federal government or any other state, but what is widely known is that when the premiers and the Prime Minister started meeting, initially in response to the COVID emergency, they, we understand, believed that this was working well and it might be something that then they would want to do more broadly to deal with other issues.

Then other portfolio areas started to come together in the same format, largely again under the broad umbrella of the COVID urgency that was needed at the time. Ministers, federal and state, started meeting in their portfolios through audiovisual means rather than face to face to say, 'For resources, what does COVID mean to us? For energy, what does COVID mean to us?' That was the start of it, and I believe that at what would broadly be called the COAG level, or the council level if you like, it is still being worked out whether that is the right way to continue for each portfolio.

I think there is a strong desire from federal government and states, Liberal and Labor, to see whether or not this is a better way of working than the more traditional COAG style, but I do not believe that any final decisions have been made about that. Certainly from an energy perspective, I can share that ministers have all been keen to make sure that we have face-to-face meetings in person as well as face to face through digital means that we have been having at the moment.

They are working very well, and they are able to come together with far less fuss and fewer resources and more speed. But ministers have certainly said, 'We think it's important we do get together face to face in person as well,' and how that transforms from here is yet to be seen.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Does the COAG Energy Council still exist, or has it been terminated?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: To the best of my knowledge, it still exists, and the way that we have been meeting more recently is in addition to that.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Regarding commencement, when does the minister anticipate this act coming into effect?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Member for West Torrens, I have been advised that it will go through the normal process of proclamation and assent. Some of the regulations have

been finalised, so some of them could be brought into effect quite quickly. Some of them are still being consulted on and still being developed. I apologise that I do not have a date or a firm answer for you, but I guess the short version is: the normal way. It is not urgently pressing that it happens at a particular point in time, but we do not want to drag our feet either, so the sooner the better.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think that is a perfectly reasonable response to the question that I asked. The reason I ask about timing is about consultation. I do not want to jump around and do the committee a disservice, but it seems to me that, given that consultation is still underway, the legislation passing and having a date set forward for assent assists people in preparing for the introduction of change.

As you said in your remarks, it has been quite a while since there has been a refreshment of this act in terms of penalties. There are large definitional changes for who it applies to, so I would imagine you could give the industry some certainty to know whether we are talking about the next six months, the next 12 months or the next 24 months. I am not trying to be difficult; I am just trying to ask for a range, if you could give it to me.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, I certainly understand it would be nice to know if it was six months, 12 months or 24 months. The AER is understandably keen to get it started as quickly as possible. Certainly, from a South Australian government perspective and also with responsibilities as lead legislator, we are keen to get it happening as soon as possible.

Parts of it could come into effect at different times from others and connect what I have just said to—part of the statement in your question, member for West Torrens, was it would help people to prepare, to get ready and to know when it was happening with regard to their behaviour. The reality is that none of the things that could be considered breaches are changing through this act, so what is right to do and what is wrong to do under all the rules is not changing. The penalties are changing.

If, hypothetically, a company is doing everything to the best of its ability, regardless of the penalties, the time that it comes in should not change much in terms of their actions and the way it goes about things. If, hypothetically, a company is perhaps not doing everything it could possibly do to make sure that it makes no breaches and it is waiting to see, 'Well, maybe we'll tighten up our operation a bit when the penalties get stiffer,' that would be a shame if, hypothetically, there were companies operating in that way but, nonetheless, they should not be breaching, regardless of the penalties.

We will bring the changes in as quickly as possible. I am not avoiding your question; there is no answer. Some of it could come in very quickly, so the act can come into effect, the regulations can follow, all the penalties that currently exist will still exist and they could methodically be changed as the bits of consultation are completed and the regulations are completed across the whole batch.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, that is a perfectly reasonable answer. I am a little bit confused, though, about your answer. My understanding is that you cannot enact parts of the act. I completely accept that you will do the regulations as you go along, and that is a perfectly reasonable and sensible thing to do, but the question I have asked is not when the regulations will come into effect but when will the act be enacted. Without again pre-empting any debate on any clauses, there are clauses here that define annual turnover, that define what a listed corporation is and that change those definitions.

While I accept what the minister is saying is perfectly sensible, if you are in the system now you should be behaving and be captured by these penalties, but there are definitional changes in here, including turnover, which changes the penalty threshold, I imagine, which is what the act is attempting to do.

The reason I ask this is not so much about the regulations that are out to consultation. I imagine the regulations would be about the way in which the penalties are implemented and the thresholds to meet them, but the core body of the act would be: when is it in place? My final question here is: do you expect the act to be assented and the regulations decided later, or will you finish consulting on the regulations before you assent to the act, because I think that is a fundamental difference?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: My apologies if I was not clear. The act will be proclaimed as quickly as possible, and then the regulations that follow it and the act will be all at once. The effect of the on-the-ground, if you like, changes will be rolled out as quickly as possible, but they will quite likely come in parts. However, the act itself will all come into effect at one point in time.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am a bit confused with paragraph (c), which provides:

- (c) a provision in Part 4 amends the National Gas Law set out in the Schedule to the National Gas (South Australia) Act...

Could you please explain to the committee what that change does? Is it just a definitional change?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Clause 3(c), I am advised, says that everything in part 4 of the bill we are discussing at the moment is what amends the National Gas Law, keeping in mind this bill amends three sets.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is the part that I am concerned about. Is there any change within the body of this amendment bill that changes any of the vesting powers or the conferral of the function of powers on a state minister?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that there is no relinquishment or gain of powers for the state minister. This is essentially powers for the Australian Energy Regulator.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I will take it on notice between the houses. If you find something, I assume you will tell me.

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This clause changes some definitions. It provides:

annual turnover has the same meaning as in section 2(1) of Schedule 2 to the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 of the Commonwealth;

If your opening statement to me was that these changes have no impact on the 'big stick' commonwealth changes that amended the Competition and Consumer Act to give the ACCC power to intervene and fine within the electricity market, why are we adopting their definitions for annual turnover? Is it just a harmonisation measure, or does this confer any powers on the ACCC to act using this act?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, shadow minister, I do not think you have anything to fear in this regard. There is no connection. It is just like some things refer to the ABS figures. This is just identifying a measure of turnover because, as you would have seen, tier 1 penalties at a maximum could be \$10 million or 10 per cent of turnover or three times the financial gain that an organisation might have received by the breach. So it is just a definition of 'turnover'. It has no other connection to any other use of national consumer law that I am aware of.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Clause 4(3), amending section 2(1), inserts the meaning of 'listed corporation'. It provides:

listed corporation has the meaning given by section 9 of the Corporations Act 2001 of the Commonwealth;

I assume there is already a provision within the act, which I tried to find earlier, talking about listed corporations being liable to penalties. Is there now a difference that you are trying to fix? Could you explain the reasoning why you want to insert this definition rather than leave the definition as it was?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: To the best of my knowledge, it is really just another way of having a definition and perhaps broadening out the definition of what types of organisations might be liable to these penalties if they do a breach. My adviser has said that there is some research to do to give you a very specific answer to your question, and I will get that for you between the houses.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is not a conspiracy theory. I just assumed listed corporations were already subject to the National Electricity Law, so I am surprised that we have to change a definition of 'listed corporation'. I am sure there is a perfectly good reason for it. I could have the answer between the houses. I do want to pose a question to you in this section. There are a number of players in the market, I imagine, especially the wholesale market and the retail market, that are not listed. Do penalties still apply for them if they are licensed, in another provision? Or is this simply for only listed corporations?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will give you the same style answer as I did before. No, it is not so much a list of individual organisations. It applies to body corporates, it applies to individuals, it applies to listed corporations, liable entities. Again, just like the last time, I am advised that some detailed research will be done so that I can get a more specific answer to you between the houses.

Let me finish by saying that the intent is to capture any type of organisation or person who might need to be captured in this. It is actually about trying to make sure that the range of definitions captures everybody so that we do not accidentally exclude anybody, which was the risk you raised in your question.

Clause passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note that in this section, all the penalties are prescribed including dollar amounts. I was just wondering why they are not subject to regulatory change to be increased, rather than to come back to the parliament every time we want to increase these fines of penalties.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Member for West Torrens, if you think about where we were in 1996—flat fees left. We are trying to bring them up to a current-day standard for a range of reasons, contemplating inflation, but also a more modern understanding of the energy system. Another one of the things we are doing is the specific dollar amounts are indexed through this amendment bill. The new act will have indexes.

If my memory serves me correctly, the next time they are indexed will be 1 July 2023, and then every three years after that. Those fixed dollar amounts, which are not automatic penalties in their own right—some of them might be maximum, some of them might be ranges, etc.—will be indexed with inflation from these new base rates every three years.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, without wanting to disrupt the committee or enter into a debate with the minister on this, obviously when penalties are introduced into a bill they are indexed; there is a definition for indexing. I thought the purpose of the COAG change was to allow a freshening up and to allow, by regulation, fees and penalties to be increased annually. If there is an indexing process, that is fine; that is the decision of the COAG and the opposition supports it.

The part that I am interested in is the breach by a natural person. There are different civil penalties for the breach by a natural person depending on the circumstances of the corporation or entity that they are in. Could the minister explain why, under new section 2AB(1)(a) the fine for a natural person is \$33,900 but in the cause of new section 2AB(1)(b) it says:

- (b) in the case of a breach of a civil penalty provision prescribed by the Regulations for the purposes of this paragraph—
 - (i) if the breach is by a natural person—
 - (A) an amount not exceeding \$287 000...

I am assuming the regulations will specify a different type of entity that person is employed with, or there is a turnover difference. Could you explain that to the committee?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I have not mentioned it, but one of the key foundations of the set of changes we are trying to make is that not only are we updating the penalties

to a current-day value but there is also a range of penalties, and I did mention that before. We are getting tier 1, tier 2 and tier 3 penalties.

For example, for the highest tier breach, the maximum penalty is whichever is the greater: \$10 million, 10 per cent of the organisation's turnover or three times the gain the company made via the breach. For tier 2 the maximum penalty is \$1.435 million and for tier 3 the maximum penalty is \$170,000. Having said that, there is also a tier structure for natural persons. That is why those rates are different. It is not that the natural person is necessarily different, but because that person would be getting fined for a tier 1 or a tier 2 or a tier 3 offence.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Clause 9 amends 'Obstruction of person authorised to enter'. The act provides:

A person must not, without reasonable excuse, obstruct or hinder an authorised person in the exercise of power under a search warrant under this division.

It just deletes the penalty and provisions and substitutes it with the penalties.

Was consideration given to giving greater powers to officers to enter remote sites? There was a case that came to my attention where people needed to enter a site to execute a search. It was unstaffed and they could not enter. The act was silent on it. I am just wondering if it is a problem or whether the department and council see no issue with that. If they see no issue with that, I will happily support it and move on.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: For clarification, a remote or unmanned site?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Unstaffed.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that is not something that came up in the consultation at any stage. If anything emerges that I am not aware of or that my adviser is not aware of right now, we will let you know between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have always had a problem with this power that the AER has. The AER is not an independent statutory office. The AER commission are public servants employed by the commonwealth Treasury. They are not necessarily like ESCOSA or any other body that are independent and self-regulate. They charge a fee and are regulated by the government but, by and large, they are independent and can act on instruction.

We are giving public servants extraordinary powers of compulsion, maintaining serious powers of compulsion, under this clause. I have always been a believer that the AER should be separated from the Department of Treasury and Finance and should be a standalone body, much like ESCOSA. It is not.

Does the minister have any concerns about the increasing powers given to this body—which go through nearly four pages of amendments—a body that is basically appointed by the Treasurer? Would you like to add anything on that?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Just give me a moment, please. Apparently some messages have to be dealt with as soon as possible. My apologies, the answer was going to take a little while.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Parliamentary Committees***ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. T.J. Stephens to the committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned).

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. D.W. Ridgway to the committee in place of the Hon. D.G.E. Hood (resigned).

ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. T.J. Stephens to the committee in place of the Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins (resigned).

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. N.J. Centofanti as the alternate member to the Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE STATUTES AMENDMENT (ANIMAL WELFARE REFORMS) BILL

The Legislative Council passed the following resolution to which it desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

1. That the number of members who shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the Joint Committee on the Statutes Amendment (Animal Welfare Reforms) Bill be one member.
2. It be an instruction to the Joint Committee on the Statutes Amendment (Animal Welfare Reforms) Bill that during the period of any declaration of a major emergency made under section 23 of the Emergency Services Act 2004 or any declaration of a public health emergency made under section 87 of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011, members of the committee may participate in the proceedings by way of telephone or videoconference or other electronic means and shall be deemed to be present and counted for purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(17:43): I move:

That this house concurs with the resolution of the Legislative Council contained in message No. 54 that it be an instruction to the Joint Committee on the Statutes Amendment (Animal Welfare Reforms) Bill that during the period of any declaration of the major emergency made under section 23 of the Emergency Services Act 2004 or any declaration of a public health emergency made under section 87 of the South Australian Public Health Act 2011, members of the committee may participate in the proceedings by way of telephone or videoconference, or other electronic means, and shall be deemed to be present and counted for purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member.

Motion carried.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (PENALTIES AND ENFORCEMENT) BILL***Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 10.

The CHAIR: We are on clause 10. Member for West Torrens, you have asked one question on clause 10.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The minister has not answered it.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I have not answered, and that was why I was particularly keen to make sure we did come back into committee. The answer to the question essentially is that the powers that are vested in the officers, as you described previously, are

enforceable by courts. It is not a power to enter. It is not a power to force anybody physically in any way. It is an authority, hypothetically, a right to information: 'Company A, you must provide this information.' Company A refuses to do it. It is then enforceable by court to require company A to provide that information.

It is not the type of thing where I would have great sympathy with the member for West Torrens, if it were a right to come onto somebody's farm or that sort of thing. I am advised it is purely streamlining, essentially, so that the AER can get the information it needs to do a thorough investigation when it believes that is warranted. If company A refuses to provide the information, then it is a legal proceeding, essentially, by the AER to try to force the company to provide the information.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the minister and I here are probably both pushing on the same open door that maybe the bureaucracy in the AER might not like. The powers he is talking about now are the same powers that the ICAC have. We are giving greater coercive powers to a body that is not judicial, that is, the AER. We are putting amendments in the bill that I am going to vote for, that the minister is proposing that come from the COAG council, that compel people to answer questions even if it incriminates them.

We are removing silence as a defence: 'I refuse to answer that question.' If you do so, there is a penalty in place, then the court can order you to answer the question or decide not to, like an integrity inquiry. The point I make is that might well all be good and proper and appropriate, but I do not believe it is appropriate for a bureaucracy like the AER to have those powers. That is the point I am making.

I know they have the powers, and I know what they are doing them for, but they are beefing them up dramatically and they are adding in extra clauses here that are making this a lot like the crime commission the commonwealth runs. I would bet London to a brick that, if I went and checked the crime commission act with some of the clauses in here, they would be very similar. Subclause (6) provides:

(6) Section 28—after subsection (3) insert:

(3a) A person must not, when appearing under subsection (2)(c), refuse or fail to answer a question that the person is required to answer for the purpose of providing information...

I agree: they should provide the information. But if that information incriminates you, the penalty that would be in place in a criminal proceeding would not be liable because they have compelled the answer. We are beefing up powers the AER already have.

I am not going to die in a ditch over this. I understand it has been agreed nationally, and I have already given the minister my word we will support this, but I do point out the powers we are giving a department of Treasury and Finance are greater than the tax commissioner has. I have been at these meetings, too, when we all agree that the AER should have the power to call for information, but we are talking about people being compelled to give evidence that could incriminate them. There are exclusions for reasonable excuses, but I doubt they grant the protection that we hope they would.

I am not so much seeking an answer from the minister as I am making a statement to the committee that I have grave reservations every time we do this. I have been guilty of it as well. Subsequent parliaments keep on doing this to stamp out poor practice. Rather than going to the core of the problem, we are simply making it easier for investigative bodies to get to the bottom of what it is by removing rights. That is not how we should be legislating.

Again, I understand that this is not something the opposition will stop; I just point out that the AER is not an independent statutory office. The AER, CEO or the board, as talented and as qualified as they are, are not judicial officers. If you read the act, division 3, 'Power to obtain information', the AER have a whole series of powers to get information. Subsection (8) of the body of the act provides:

This section does not require a person to—

(a) provide information that is the subject of legal professional privilege...

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Sorry, whereabouts is that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is in the actual act, not in the amendments. That is already here. These are the protections:

- (a) provide information that would disclose the contents of a document prepared for the purposes of a meeting of the Cabinet...

So we are protecting ourselves from the act, making sure we are okay. No cabinet documents can be given over, legal professional privilege cannot be waived or deliberations for the commonwealth or state or territory. Then it provides:

- (10) A person incurs, by complying with a relevant notice, no liability for breach of contract, breach of confidence or any other civil wrong.

So we are saying, 'You can't be fired for this, if you speak to us. There's no penalty for you for breaching your employment contract.' Does it mean you cannot be held criminally responsible once you admit what you have done to avoid the sanction that we are putting into the body? I caution the committee if we keep on doing this, whether it is the AER, whether it is ESCOSA, whether it is ICAC, whether it is any other investigative body, if we keep on digging away at the rights of people to remain silent when being asked questions. I will just leave that as a statement to the committee. I do not expect the minister to answer. He can if he would like to; it is up to him. I will not be voting for this but I am not voting against it.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I have a short response. I certainly understand where the member for West Torrens is coming from. I point out, as he did, that that particular section 28(3)(a) finishes by saying—and I will paraphrase this—a person must answer, a person must comply 'unless the person has a reasonable excuse'. I am advised that the assessment of the reasonable excuse is not just up to the AER or up to the person. The assessment of the reasonable excuse can be determined by a court. So there is some meaning there, but I take on board the comments that the member for West Torrens has made.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is an expense to go to court to seek that protection. Telling a public servant 'I refuse to answer that question' could impose great costs for an individual who refuses to answer, but I accept what you are saying.

Clause passed.

Clause 11.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Clause 11 amends section 28R, a pretty robust clause that is already in the act, which provides:

28R—Providing to AER false and misleading information

A person must not, in purported compliance with a regulatory information...

All we are doing is changing the penalties, moving it from \$2,000 to \$6,300 and \$10,000 to \$31,000. The question I ask of the minister is—and I could never really get the right answer to this from other debates we have had on different matters—what is the definition of 'false and misleading'? Is it about intent and being deliberate about it? What happens if an employee hands over information that they have been given by their superiors and it turns out to be false and misleading? Who is held to account for that? Is it the individual or the body corporate?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I will get a full answer to that question for the member for West Torrens between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clause 12 passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 17:57 the house adjourned until Tuesday 22 September 2020 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***EX GRATIA PAYMENTS**

62 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (13 May 2020). Has the Treasurer approved or made any ex gratia payments since 2 May 2019? If so:

- (a) To whom were the payments made?
- (b) For what purpose were the payments made?
- (c) What is the amount of each payment?

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

The government has provided response in Question on Notice 88.

PREMIER AND CABINET DEPARTMENT

68 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (13 May 2020). Which consultants and contractors have been engaged to by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet since 1 July 2019?

- (a) What is the cost of each of these engagements?
- (b) What services have these consultants and contractors been engaged to provide?

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

The consultants which have been engaged by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet since 1 July 2019 are provided in the following table.

Consultant	Purpose of consultancy	Total Contract Value \$
Action Market Research Pty Ltd	Aboriginal Entrepreneur Hub Research to inform the content of the Aboriginal Entrepreneur Hub Consultation and Workshop	51,766
Authentic Workplace Relations	Expert advice on an employee relations and industrial matters	6,003
CQR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd	Incident Response Gap Analysis for Cyber Security	10,740
CQR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd	SA Government Cyber Resilience Review	33,525
CQR Consulting Australia Pty Ltd	Risk assessment and review of the ISMS cyber security operational services trans to DPC ICT Services	24,435
Creativation Pty Ltd	Prepare a business case for SAGOV Services Portal	59,091
Creativation Pty Ltd	Modelling of Low Digital Skills Risks in the SA Government sector	20,000
Escient Pty Ltd	Develop a high-level operating model and propose a future engagement approach for the Digital Strategy for South Australian Government	19,251
Euan Ferguson Pty Ltd	To assist South Australia to determine a Consequence Management approach	16,400
Experience Matters	Commercial in confidence	—
Gherashe Consultants Pty Ltd	Develop the South Australian Government's Arts Plan for the 2019-2024 period	372,500
KPMG	Deliver a prioritisation engagement plan from the findings and recommendations from NEC Performance review and run workshops for stakeholders	27,465
KPMG	Cultural institutions storage project options analysis	183,278
KPMG	Advisory services to support the development of a strategic business case for an Innovation Hub at Lot Fourteen	30,000
KPMG	Support in the development of Resilience and Recovery: An Investment Prioritisation Framework for South Australia	37,195
Positive Solutions Pty Ltd	Provision of development and strategic planning for the Carrick Hill Board	13,380
Powell & Co Pty Ltd	Probity advice for Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery	235

Consultant	Purpose of consultancy	Total Contract Value \$
PriceWaterhouseCoopers	Define the vision and scope of the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery	147,529
PriceWaterhouseCoopers Indigenous Consulting Pty Ltd	Design for the Aboriginal Entrepreneurs Hub	185,200
Saab Australia Pty Ltd	Information Security Registered Assessors Program (IRAP) assessment for Child Protection Datalink	18,000
SGS Economics & Planning Pty Ltd	Prepare of a full business case for the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery on Lot Fourteen, including analysis and recommendations on governance and funding arrangements for this Institution	77,025
Thompson Lewis Ltd	Provision of a consultancy program on a range of issues including the implementation of a performance management framework for the SA public service and work with senior executives to facilitate adoption; strategic advice surrounding the implementation of election commitments; and other strategic advice on transitioning to an altered operating environment under the new government	\$100,000 NZD
Tony Rosella Design	Consultation on Kaurna sculpture reinstallation for Adelaide Festival Centre redevelopment	1,040
TSS Cyber Pty Ltd	Risk appetite and tier selection advice for Office for Data Analytics	6,600

The contractors which have been engaged by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet since 1 July 2019. Details on contractors are provided in the following table.

Contractor	Purpose	Total Contract Value \$
Altus Traffic Pty Ltd	Traffic management services for the Multicultural Festival	6,253
ASG Group Ltd	Business analyst for Vulnerable Childrens Project	11,550
BDO Advisory	Regional Industry Structure and Employment (RISE) Model Update	36,800
BDO Advisory	Independent probity review of the Public Library Content (Digital) Evaluation Process—50% of costs recovered from the Libraries Board of South Australia	38,438
Bespoke Hospitality	Front of House staff for Tarnanthi Launch and Art Fair and Tarnanthi Sunday Sessions	5,621
Bonita Kennedy	Preparing DPC Records Disposal Schedule	1,500
Bound Consulting Group	Team development services for the International & Diplomatic Relations Business Unit	2,765
Bound Consulting Group	Organisational Development for the South Australian Museum	4,350
Chamonix IT Management	Communications Approval Portal enhancements	34,050
Chamonix IT Management	Architectural advisory services for the SA GOV Services Portal	9,600
Chamonix IT Management	Design thinking services to improve the digital experience of the citizen	6,000
Chamonix IT Management	Budget Template Go Live	3,450
Chamonix IT Management	Develop an Application Services Plan, and support the implementation of the plan	26,182
Data 3 Ltd	Azure foundations assessment for our DPC Azure enrolment	18,000
Data 3 Ltd	Arts SA Grants Management System (GMS) system enhancements	13,850
Data 3 Ltd	Payroll Overpayments (POP) system enhancements	9,350
Donovan & Associates	Historian's review of operational records disposal schedule	110
Dr Gemma Munro	Co-design and facilitation of forum for Magnetise SA project	40,750

Contractor	Purpose	Total Contract Value \$
EDU Net Solutions	Provide services for delivery of Website Service System Design manual	25,455
Empired Ltd	Premier's Office CRM	3,625
Empired Ltd	Arts SA Grants Management System (GMS) enhancements	11,250
Empired Ltd	Payroll Overpayments (POP) system enhancements	11,043
Empired Ltd	Frontier data import changes for Payroll Services in Shared Services SA	5,744
Empired Ltd	Chris21 import work package for Payroll Services in Shared Services SA	4,795
Eric Dayton	Data Analytics architecture review	16,800
Expose Data Pty Ltd	Data architect services	7,800
Expose Data Pty Ltd	Model development and deployment for Vulnerable Childrens Project	6,000
Flinders University	Tarnanthi data collection and research project	45,175
Flinders University	South Australian Government internship program placement	2,000
Haymakr	Budget post-campaign evaluation	12,500
Hays Specialist Recruitment	Temporary Staff	Government contract
Hudson Global Resources (Aust)	Temporary Staff	Government contract
Innodev Pty Ltd	Deliver Project Management Services to the Office for Technology	500,000
locane Pty Ltd	Managed technology services of an infrastructure platform for client agencies relating to engineering support and maintenance activities for the Office of Data Analytics	128,586
locane Pty Ltd	Support the protected environment including moves, adds, changes, deletions upon request	30,000
locane Pty Ltd	Provide Security Architect / Advisor services to the Office for Technology	318,182
Life Registered	Data extraction, data cleansing and automation for the Attorney-General's Department to support the Vulnerable Children Project	19,961
Locatable Solutions Pty Ltd	Geospatial services for the Early Intervention Taskforce	14,625
Locatable Solutions Pty Ltd	Geospatial services for the Emergency Management Project	16,313
Modis Staffing Pty Ltd	Temporary Staff	Government contract
NEC IT Services Australia Pty Ltd	Senior technical support for operational and project work on ICT infrastructure and services for the provision of across government ICT services	755,190
Objective Corporation Ltd	Upgrade records management system to Objective 10.5	62,250
Objective Corporation Ltd	Data migration for business units transferred from Department for Innovation and Skills to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet	87,104
Objective Corporation Ltd	KNET data migration	46,313
Objective Corporation Ltd	Objective Application server support	73,414
Objective Corporation Ltd	Data management services	16,021
Ochre Dawn Creative Industries	Event Management Services—coordinate logistics of the Aboriginal Entrepreneurs Hub consultation forum	8,938
Optus Communications	Senior technical support for operational and project work on ICT infrastructure and services for the provision of across government ICT services—1st Contract	45,750
Optus Communications	Senior technical support for operational and project work on ICT infrastructure and services for the	163,798

Contractor	Purpose	Total Contract Value \$
	provision of across government ICT services—2nd Contract	
Paxus Australia Ltd	Temporary Staff	Government contract
Peoplebank Australia Ltd	Temporary Staff	Government contract
Randstad Pty Ltd	Temporary Staff	Government contract
Rider Levett Bucknall Sa P/Ltd	Provision of cost management services in preparing updated cost models for the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery	4,715
See Marketing & Communications	Creating YourSAy engagement reports and Better Together email copywriting to distribute to other agencies	22,951
Shearn & Co Pty Ltd	Project Lead for Lot Fourteen	390,000
Simply Speaking	Facilitate consultation for the Multicultural Legislative Review 2019	1,700
Solstice Media Ltd	Creation and distribution of communications, highlighting South Australian economic and cultural activity	312,500
System Solutions Engineering	Technical Support for the Media Monitoring Unit	11,800
Talent International (SA) Pty Ltd	Temporary Staff	Government contract
Talent Options	Temporary Staff	Government contract
Taylor Accountants	To assist with acquittals process for Fund My Neighbourhood grant program	10,027
TSS Cyber Pty Ltd	Review and management of the Security as a Service function	153,960
Wavemaker	Commercial in confidence	-

EX GRATIA PAYMENTS

88 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (4 June 2020). Has the Treasurer approved or made any ex gratia payments since 28 February 2019?

- (a) To whom were the payments made?
- (b) For what purpose were the payments made?
- (c) What is the amount of each payment?

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

1. The secrecy provisions of the Taxation Administration Act 1996 prevent me from releasing the names of the recipients of state tax related ex gratia payments, including those in receipt of payments approved or made since 28 February 2019. This is consistent with a ruling made under the former government when I sought similar information under the Freedom of Information Act 1991.

2. In the period since 28 February 2019 to 4 June 2020, I have approved ex-gratia payments for the following purposes:

- Land tax ex gratia payments (e.g. for deceased estates);
- Job accelerator grants;
- Payroll tax small business rebates;
- Payroll tax 2017-18 in lieu of proposed legislative changes to the statutory rate;
- Payroll tax general ex-gratia payments;
- Stamp duty ex gratia payments (e.g. including pre-construction grant, foreign ownership surcharge, off-plan concession, bushfire relief and LTO fees relating to conveyance);
- Bushfire relief ex gratia payments; and
- Support for organisations to help them continue to operate throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

I have also approved ex gratia payments to be made by other ministers to businesses impacted by COVID-19.

3. Since 28 February 2019 (up to and including 4 June 2020) the Department of Treasury and Finance has paid the following ex gratia payments that I have approved for the purpose listed as follows:

- Land tax general ex-gratia payments, \$730,094;
- Job accelerator grants made by way of ex gratia payments, \$35,092,600;
- Payroll tax small business rebates, \$476,319;
- Payroll tax 2017-18 rate reduction administered by way of ex gratia payments, \$8,787,810;
- Payroll tax general ex gratia payments, \$1,215,463;
- Stamp duty ex gratia payments, \$9,974,573;
- Bushfire relief ex gratia payments, \$56,710; and
- Support for organisations to help them continue to operate through the COVID-19 pandemic, \$6,501,100.

I note this list does not include ex gratia payments made by agencies other than the Department of Treasury and Finance. A range of COVID-19 support has also been provided through other means, for example grants such as the \$10,000 emergency cash grants for small businesses. Full Information on COVID-19 support for businesses has been addressed in other Questions on Notice.

CAPITAL AND INVESTING BUDGETS

91 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (4 June 2020). Have any departments or agencies estimated to have underspent their approved 2018-19 capital/investing budgets?

- (a) Which agencies are estimated to have underspent?
- (b) By how much has each agency estimated to have underspent?
- (c) What are the reasons for each agency's underspending?

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

The final outcome for the 2018-19 investing expenditure for the general government sector was \$1,794 million, which was \$49 million (2.7 per cent) lower than the revised budget for 2018-19 included in the 2019-20 Budget. Investing budgets published in the 2018-19 State Budget were revised to reflect subsequent decisions made by the government during 2018-19. Revised budgets were presented in the 2019-20 Budget papers. The following agencies reported underspending, and the reasons for that underspend, against their approved revised 2018-19 investing budget:

- Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (\$63.8 million) associated with major projects including the Gawler Line Electrification and Northern Connector
- Health and Wellbeing (\$46.7 million) associated with major projects, including the new Royal Adelaide Hospital site works, Country Health SA Sustainment and Compliance and Electronic Medical Records System
- Education (\$30.3 million) associated with various school capital programs
- Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing (\$15.2 million) mainly associated with the Home of Football at State Sports Park, Adelaide Super-Dome upgrades and Women's Memorial Playing Fields
- Premier and Cabinet (\$10.1 million) mainly associated with the Adelaide Festival Centre upgrade
- Emergency Services (\$9.3 million) mainly associated with the structural firefighting training prop (MFS) and heavy urban appliances (MFS) projects
- Treasury and Finance (\$8.4 million) mainly associated with Super SA ICT and the office fit-out for State Administration Centre and Wakefield House projects
- Environment and Water (\$5.2 million) mainly associated with the Riverine Recovery and Flows for the Future projects
- Innovation and Skills (\$3.3 million) mainly associated with system projects to support organisational transformation
- Courts Administration Authority (\$3.2 million) mainly associated with the Electronic Court Management System and Higher Courts Redevelopment projects
- Child Protection (\$2.6 million) mainly related to office accommodation fit-outs
- Attorney-General's Department (\$1.8 million) mainly associated with the liquor licensing full fee structure and Ombudsman SA Office Accommodation projects

- SA Police (\$1.2 million) mainly associated with the Police Records Management System (stages 2 to 4) and the Umuwa Police Station project
- TAFE SA (\$1.2 million) mainly associated with capital works at the Mount Barker and Murray Bridge campuses
- Energy and Mining (\$1.0 million) mainly associated with the State Drill Core Reference Library project
- Tourism (\$0.07 million) associated with annual works programs
- Primary Industries and Regions SA (\$0.04 million) mainly as a result of livestock sales exceeding livestock purchases
- Environment Protection Authority (\$0.04 million) associated with minor capital works
- Defence SA (\$0.04 million) due to the treatment of a land purchase as an expense
- Trade, Tourism and Investment (\$0.03 million) associated with the ICT capital program.

A significant element of the investing underspend reflects changes to the timing of projects that were subsequently carried over into 2019-20 and future years across the forward estimates. The budget included a slippage provision to reflect the tendency, on a whole of government basis, for underspending due to some projects slipping from their budgeted expenditure profile. This provision largely offset the identified agency underspending.

CAPITAL WORKS PROJECTS

118 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (4 June 2020). For all agencies reporting to the Premier:

1. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2018-19 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.
2. Please list all capital works projects budgeted to incur expenditure in 2019-20 including a breakdown of budgeted expenditure by financial year, for all financials years that the project is anticipated to incur expenditure.

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

The government has provided response in Question on Notice 116.

HOUSING SA

181 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (1 July 2020). As at 30 June 2020 what are the total number of Housing SA properties with outstanding maintenance?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Marshall Liberal government recognises the significant public housing maintenance liability left by years of mismanagement by the previous Labor Government.

Maintenance work is performed under a number of programs such as responsive maintenance (day to day); capital works, external painting and programmed maintenance that improve the standard of public housing; and important upgrades to increase tenant safety in their homes such as modifications for people with disability and security upgrades for people who have experienced domestic or family violence.

14,959 SA Housing Authority properties had an outstanding order for maintenance or capital upgrade as at 30 June 2020.

This government has delivered on its election commitment to undertake a full asset condition inspection program of authority-managed properties and is currently assessing the physical and structural condition of all properties. The program has already assessed over 26,000 properties, leading to an increase in maintenance and capital upgrade orders being lodged.

The Marshall Liberal government has provided significant additional funding to fast-track maintenance and capital works on authority-managed properties, including

- \$21.1 million through to the 2018-19 state budget for a preventative maintenance and upgrade program; and
- \$75 million through Our Housing Future 2020-2030 to start addressing the capital maintenance backlog, including \$10 million immediately brought forward through the COVID-19 maintenance stimulus package.

Maintenance works may have been completed by a multi trade contractor, but their invoice has not been returned to the authority for payment or the authority has not finalised payment.

CORONAVIRUS

190 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (2 July 2020). For each of the following weeks, how many essential travellers and how many non-essential travellers entered South Australia from the state of Victoria?

- (a) 1-7 June 2020?
- (b) 8-14 June 2020?
- (c) 15-21 June 2020?
- (d) 22-28 June 2020?
- (e) 29 June-5 July 2020?

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

- (a) 951 essential travellers and 822 non-essential travellers
- (b) 1,333 essential travellers and 1,358 non-essential travellers
- (c) 1,532 essential travellers and 1,691 non-essential travellers
- (d) 1,509 essential travellers and 1,883 non-essential travellers
- (e) 2,406 essential travellers and 1,463 non-essential travellers

ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE

In reply to **the Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (28 April 2020).

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

The government has provided a response in Questions on Notice 78 and 79.