

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Thursday, 12 November 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.

#### *Motions*

#### **CORONAVIRUS, MENTAL HEALTH**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (11:01):** I move:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report upon the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health of South Australians, with particular regard to—

- (a) the impacts of social isolation on mental health and wellbeing;
- (b) the stress and anxiety caused by the sense of uncertainty and disruption to daily life;
- (c) particular impacts on vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians, including implications for models of care and social support;
- (d) particular impacts of job losses, business closures and economic recession on mental health and wellbeing;
- (e) mental health presentations in the context of the pandemic and implications for policy, programs and service delivery;
- (f) rates of suicide, self-harm and substance abuse in the context of the pandemic, and implications for policy, programs and service delivery;
- (g) measures taken, or that ought to be taken, to help South Australians to proactively manage mental wellbeing in the context of the pandemic;
- (h) policy and program responses taken, or that ought to be taken, to address mental health and wellbeing challenges in the context of the pandemic;
- (i) the efficacy of the government and community responses to date; and
- (j) any other relevant manner.

Mr Speaker, 2020 has been a year like few others. The sudden onset of a global pandemic and the impact of the lockdowns, travel bans and other measures to tackle it have had impacts on daily life that few of us will forget in the years to come. We do not yet know what the endgame will be. This virus, which the Chief Public Health Officer has repeatedly described as 'highly transmittable', seems set to be with us for some time to come.

We are earnestly hoping for a vaccine and we all know that, even with the best efforts, there is always going to be an element of luck in every medical breakthrough. We cannot be certain when or if a vaccine will become available. I am informed, for example, that following the 1919-20 flu pandemic—the deadliest pandemic in recorded human history in terms of absolute numbers—it took another quarter of a century for the first seasonal flu vaccine to become available.

After millions of deaths over 1919 and 1920, later waves were less virulent and subsided into the regular seasonal flu because of acquired immunity long before a vaccine came to the market. Indeed, it is perhaps easy to forget that the world has lived with pandemic-scale diseases such as cholera, influenza and the plague for centuries without the benefit of vaccine. Even today, HIV remains a pandemic-scale disease across the globe.

Humanity has lived through pandemics before and will find a way to live through this one. As with previous pandemics, or indeed others that remain current, the key to our response will be adaption. Already, we have seen dramatic changes to public administration and the delivery of programs to the community. Barriers that once seemed insurmountable have fallen and ideological objections have been set aside.

The federal budget and state budget both exemplify this trend, but it is clear that on 1,001 fronts there will be more changes to come. It is incumbent upon us all as public policymakers, legislators and elected representatives to embrace these opportunities as they emerge, to seek to chart a new course for the delivery of public policy and services for our community in the face of this extraordinary crisis.

I turn to the substance of the motion that I bring to the house today. Australia has responded far better than many nations to the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. Although it was touch and go at some stages, by and large governments have acted in a timely fashion to arrest the spread of the disease and to mitigate the immediate impacts of public health measures, such as social distancing, travel restrictions and business controls, on the economic life of the community. This is not to deny that there are things that we could have done better, of course, nor that there are legitimate differences in opinion as to how things should be done in future.

We all have done well and that should be well recognised; however, one of the areas that has perhaps received less attention has been the impact on mental health. Fear, worry and stress are normal responses to perceived or real threats and at times when we are faced with uncertainty or the unknown, so it is normal and understandable that people are experiencing fear in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Added to the fear of contracting the virus in a pandemic such as COVID-19 are the significant changes to our daily lives as our movements are restricted in support of efforts to contain and slow down the spread of this virus. Faced with the new realities of working from home, unemployment and underemployment, business shutdowns, homeschooling of children and lack of physical contact with other family members, friends and colleagues, it is important that we look after our mental health as well as our physical health. As we adapt to this crisis, we must also adapt to this impact.

It is important to acknowledge that the way we have conversations about mental health and the services for mental health are continuing to evolve. We have come a long way since I was a youngster, but there remains an active public policy debate about how mental health should be addressed as part of our healthcare system. It is good that we continue to have these discussions, and they are even more important now. I do not profess to be an expert, although I have had my own experiences with mental health that have shaped my values and interest in this important area of public policy; however, even a cursory review reveals there is much more to unpack.

Some have described the mental health impacts of the pandemic as a hidden epidemic or even a third wave, and the underlying data paints a picture that should be a concern for all of us. According to *The Lancet*, one of the world's premier medical journals, in its November editorial there is now mounting evidence that the COVID-19 pandemic is having a monumental impact with 'effects on the mental health and wellbeing of populations worldwide'.

From studies into more recent pandemics, such as Ebola and SARS, we know mental health impacts can include widespread panic and anxiety, depression resulting from the deaths of friends, family or colleagues, and stigmatisation and social exclusion of survivors. One meta-analysis has found depressed mood, anxiety, impaired memory and insomnia were present in up to 42 per cent of cases of precursor coronavirus pandemics, SARS and Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS), and that these symptoms continue beyond recovery.

We should also recognise the mental health impacts of the pandemic on our frontline workers who, with increased workload and trauma, are more susceptible to stress, burnout, depression and post-traumatic stress disorder. In the longer term, we can only speculate what the impacts could be. We know, for example, that non-pharmaceutical interventions, although essential, have led to physical isolation particularly of at-risk groups, disruptions to services and widespread job losses. Disruptions to services disproportionately impact at-risk groups, such as people with pre-existing mental health conditions or on lower incomes.

Recently, to mark World Mental Health Day on 10 October, the World Health Organization released the results of a survey of the impact of COVID-19 on mental health, neurological and substance use services in 130 countries around the world. Conducted from June to August 2020, the survey finds the pandemic has disrupted or halted critical mental health services in 93 per cent of countries worldwide. Reasons for disruption were various and included redeployment of health

workers to COVID-19 responses, use of mental health or treatment facilities for COVID-19 quarantine or simply not enough funding to start with.

When we look beyond our borders, it is perhaps tempting to discount the impacts of the pandemic on the mental health of South Australians. We have, after all, experienced nothing like what Victorians have just emerged from: a lockdown that must have seemed endless. The stresses and anxieties COVID-19 has created here in South Australia can seem to pale by comparison, but it is clear, even without direct lockdowns, that the mental health impacts of this pandemic are significant and beyond the prior experience of almost all of us. We may not have been exposed to the same levels of disruption as many in other places around the world, but that does not mean there are none. An article on 10 October in the *Sunday Mail* reported:

- psychiatric consultations have increased by 5,000 in March to June and wait times for services have ballooned;
- there was a 20 per cent increase in mental health presentations to the RAH over the last four months;
- antidepressant prescriptions have already increased since March compared to 2019;
- ambulance call-outs for mental health in September increased by 23 per cent compared to last year;
- weekly calls from country South Australians to mental health emergency triage services have increased by 20 per cent compared to last year;
- calls to drug and alcohol information services peaked in July, 26 per cent higher than last year;
- average mental health visit times at metropolitan emergency departments rose to 12 hours in July—90 minutes longer than the same time last year; and
- Lifeline call rates were up 12.5 per cent in September—one of the highest in the world.

These are just some of the indicators and should be enough to give pause to all of us here. It is important to acknowledge that governments have been responding with extra resources being made available, but, of course, this is for a system which is chronically underfunded, and, in any event, this is not just about funding. Like so many other matters this pandemic has touched, it is clear that we need to be open-minded enough to find new and better approaches to deliver outcomes.

What can we do to ensure that all our citizens can continue to enjoy the pleasures of social interaction at a time of social distancing? What can we do to keep people connected to each other and the community in which they live? What can we do to ensure that vulnerable individuals are really heard and seen before a tragic event unfolds? How can we help build good mental health habits that improve resilience for all at-risk groups? What do we need to do differently in delivering acute services? How can we intervene earlier to prevent escalation of mental health problems?

This inquiry, if the house is open-minded to support it, is an opportunity to explore and, I hope, find answers to these and other questions. I commend this motion to the house and I would hope that we can get the support to have this select committee established to understand how we can move forward. Again, I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:12):** I commend the member for Frome for bringing this motion to the house to set up this very important select committee. We know that there are many impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic, and one of the particular areas of impact that will be a very long lasting impact is going to be on people's mental health and wellbeing, not just from the issues around the pandemic itself but also from the economic shocks from the pandemic.

Already we are seeing in our state a significant increase in demand on mental health services. We are seeing that at our hospitals where there has been at least a 10 per cent jump in terms of mental health admissions on last year. We are seeing that in our mental health services, like Headspace, which I visited recently, and I was informed that there was a 15 to 20 per cent jump in demand on their services. We are seeing that from our GPs and primary healthcare practitioners who are seeing significant demands additionally in terms of mental health services.

We have also seen it from researchers, such as those at the SAHMRI Wellbeing and Resilience Centre, who have been monitoring and tracking people's wellbeing, and who have seen that there are increased issues and increased anxiety, and we need to make sure that we address this. This is an appropriate thing that this parliament should be doing.

This is our job. It is our job as a house to look into these key issues and to come up with recommendations and proposals so that we can work on a bipartisan basis to address these very confounding issues and to take action to help the people of South Australia.

We currently do not have any house select committees in operation at the moment. There are no other select committees on the books, so we have the capacity in this parliament to work together on this matter. We have had very successful select committees in the past, over previous decades, where members of this house have worked together on a bipartisan basis to interrogate the evidence, find out what is going on in the community and bring back here solutions that the government can then implement.

That has delivered many good results for our state. One example I was a member of was the e-cigarettes select committee with the member for Hurtle Vale and the members for Black and Hartley as well. We came up with bipartisan recommendations, and they are now the law of the land in this state. I hope that we can do the same thing through the committee that has been proposed by the member for Frome.

This should be a time when we all work together to achieve a good outcome for the people of South Australia. There is no excuse for the government to refuse this. I think if the government were to refuse this, if they were to get up and move an adjournment of this, they would effectively kill it because it would move way to the back of the list and we would never see it again.

As the Hon. David Ridgway talked about in the other place yesterday, it would be moved to the Bermuda Triangle of the list of the parliamentary business of private members in this house. That is what a member of the Liberal Party said yesterday in the other place about the operations of this house. Let's not have this deferred and sent to David Ridgway's Bermuda Triangle. Let's make sure we get this committee started straightaway because there is not a moment to lose.

We know right now that there are very significant issues in the community. We know that if we delay this a week, two weeks, a month or six months, then we will not have time to address these issues before they become real problems for people in our community, real problems for the family members of people who are suffering, real problems for our doctors, nurses, psychologists and other mental health practitioners in our community and real problems in terms of the economic output of our state and the total wellbeing of our state.

I hate to think it, but there are potential real problems in terms of future deaths by suicide that could happen in this state. Already, we know that in 2009 the number went up in South Australia, and we do not want to see that exacerbated by the pandemic. We want to make sure that there are as many measures as possible to address that. There has been an announcement made in recent days in the budget for some mental health packages; however, this is per capita the smallest of any mainland state.

All other mainland states on a per capita basis are going ahead of us in terms of what they are delivering. They all had their packages in place well before this government announced something this week. We have the slowest and smallest mental health response thus far, and we should not be satisfied with that. I think we should work together on a bipartisan basis to address this, working across the aisle, as the people of South Australia would expect us to do.

When it comes to these big challenges, we should work together as a parliament to investigate them. We have the staff, we have the members of parliament and we have no other select committees on the books. There is no excuse whatsoever for not passing this motion today and getting cracking on the important work of investigating this issue and coming up with solutions to help the people of South Australia, who desperately want action on this issue.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:18):** I rise briefly, too, to commend this motion. I support the member for Frome's motion that the house establish a select committee to inquire into and report upon the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on the mental health of South Australians. I

agree with the member for Kurna that select committees are a really good vehicle and a good use of the resources and time of the parliament and the members of parliament as well.

I will go back to 2010, I think it was, when there was a push from the then opposition, the Liberal Party, to have a select committee on the grain handling situation after a fairly disastrous harvest. Interestingly, within the Labor caucus, the former member for Napier was the agriculture minister and he railed against it, saying, 'No, we don't want to have a select committee.' I took a different point of view, and so did the member for Light, who obviously represents grain handling interests as well. The member for Chaffey was also on that.

I have to say that was a really good experience, where we went to all parts of South Australia. A few of us even got a trip to Western Australia and a few of us went to Canada. We had the member for Hammond, the member for Chaffey, the member for Light and myself, and it was very capably chaired by the member for Frome.

So to anyone on the government benches, we should not fear what these select committees can do. They are really important in the way they can get in and find some solutions and some evidence about how we can deal with these sorts of issues as a state and as a parliament. I congratulate and thank the member for Frome for bringing this motion to the house, and genuinely hope it gets bipartisan support.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:20):** I will add just a few comments to support the motion and support the member for Frome in his bid to establish a select committee. I agree that this issue is one that is worthy of investigation; it has certainly been raised in my current electorate of Light and by people I have had discussions with in the Barossa Valley. In particular, the issue of mental health has been raised by young people in my community.

For my youth advisory panel, which I established some 12 months ago, the number one issue for young people in my community was mental health—and this was before the COVID pandemic actually hit us. Subsequent discussions with the youth advisory panel in my community revealed there was a whole range of new issues that the pandemic caused. For example, young people were uncertain about their future, about their university studies, etc., due to the fact that their year 12 schooling was interrupted by COVID-19. They were uncertain about what impact that would have on their year 12 results and their potential to go to university or on to other further education. That weighed heavily on those students.

There were also a lot of students doing vocational education and training programs who were, unfortunately, not able to do their placements during the COVID-19 period. They were not able to go to onsite work, etc., and, again, those students were stressed out because their education and training were being interrupted by COVID-19 in the sense that they were not getting their practical experience.

A third group we talked about was those students who were forced to go online and do their studies online. If I were a student I would say, 'Online study is not for me. I really do benefit from face-to-face and classroom contact.' Some students are really great at online study, but a lot of students struggle when they have to do all their study online, both in a school environment and in TAFE and other institutions.

In fact, one of the students in my electorate, a university student, asked if we could establish a local education hub in Gawler where students could go to study locally. It was about achieving peer support, because they were struggling studying by themselves in their own home. These are some of the mental health issues that have been raised by young people in my electorate.

Another issue they raised was where a family member had lost their income, and the impact that was having on the family itself as well as the person who had lost their income. The family obviously had diminished income but a range of financial commitments to meet, and that was causing a lot of stress and pressure on them. Young people often carry that burden, and it also impacts on them in terms of their education and study.

There are people in my electorate, as well as in the Barossa area, whose businesses have declined dramatically. Some of these people have invested their whole life savings in their businesses, and to see that go really badly is not only a short-term issue but also a long-term one. It puts them under financial pressure. They have often given up a job, perhaps a full-time job, to go

into business for themselves, and that was having an impact on them as well as their family. So there is a whole range of issues that needs to be addressed.

I agree with the member for Frome, certainly from discussions I have had with people in my own electorate and also in terms of the Barossa, that these mental health services are not being adequately resourced. When you hear people say, for example, that they are struggling and cannot see a medical professional for three, four, five or six months, that is just too late. They need care now.

There is a GP in my town who now specialises in mental health. I heard her on the radio the other day saying that she can take no new patients until 2022. So if you are in need of GP care in the mental health area you have to wait until 2022, which is not good. People from Headspace came to see me and spoke of the gaps and lack of resourcing for them, and the impact that is having on young people, and the need to be able to provide a new service in Gawler.

There is a whole range of gaps. When you talk to organisations such as Mates in Construction you find that, for whatever reason, the construction industry has one of the highest suicide rates for occupations in this country. I do not fully understand that, but it is a fact, and men predominantly work in those industries.

There is a whole range of issues we need to address and fully understand. Importantly, the evidence we take will hopefully develop into appropriate strategies, policy responses and appropriate funding. With those few comments, I fully support this motion because it is incumbent upon us to make sure that we understand this issue as members of parliament and that we influence government policy, irrespective of what flavour we are. It does not matter which level they are at—

**The Hon. G.G. Brock:** It shouldn't make a difference.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** —that's correct—it shouldn't make a difference and it won't make a difference. We need to make sure that through this committee we bring this issue to the fore and get it investigated.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **JOINT COMMITTEE ON END OF LIFE CHOICES**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:27):** I move:

That the report of the committee be noted.

I would like to speak briefly on this report, which was tabled recently in this chamber. This is the report of the Joint Committee on End of Life Choices of which I was a member. It was a joint select committee of both chambers, which we have just been talking about.

This committee was given the task to explore current medical practices in relation to people who are terminally ill and in terms of helping people who have a terminal illness. A key term of reference was to look at the Victorian model of voluntary euthanasia in that state and whether that model would be an appropriate model for South Australia to adopt if it wanted to adopt some form of voluntary euthanasia. The committee was also asked to inquire into any other matter.

If my recollection is correct, when this matter last came before this parliament in this chamber the house divided, in the sense that we were evenly divided. The matter to commence some sort of scheme for voluntary euthanasia was defeated with a casting vote of the then Speaker of the chamber. It will not surprise you, Mr Speaker, when I advise the house that the committee could not come to a conclusion on whether or not the Victorian model is an appropriate model.

That said, some really good work was undertaken by the committee, and this report actually reflects further investigations and evidence taken by the committee, which adds to the body of knowledge and advances it a bit further. Hopefully, it will be a useful resource for any future debate on this matter.

The committee did identify a number of themes and issues relating to the matter of voluntary euthanasia. Some key themes emerged through the committee. For example, palliative care is a

critical part of our health and wellbeing system, and the committee believes it requires additional funding to make sure that the availability of palliative care is both consistent and equally accessible to people right across the state.

There was evidence given to the committee to support the view that palliative care in itself is not available to all our citizens equally right across the state, and that is of concern given that it limits people's choices when they may have a terminal illness. Also, any palliative care system should be designed to make sure that it is accessible, particularly to people in regional areas, Aboriginal people and to those for whom English is not a first language, given a whole range of cultural issues associated with voluntary euthanasia.

The committee also found that a key focus of palliative care should be on providing dignity for those people approaching their end of life. There were also some findings regarding advance care directives and whether the community fully understood their existence. There was some evidence provided to suggest that some people in the community still do not understand the availability of advance care directives. For those who do, sometimes they do not fully understand what they mean.

Also, an advance care directive in one state does not apply to another state. One of the findings of the committee was that we should look at the advance care directive legislation to make sure it is uniform across the country. Also, it should pick up, for example, if somebody were to make an advance care directive in Victoria that it should be recognised in this state and vice-versa, rather than when people move around and do not then get a new care directive that that one is not valid and they are unaware of that. So there are some practical things we could do to improve our current system of palliative care and also our current system of advance care directives.

Some of the things we also need to look at are in terms of things associated with the use of voluntary euthanasia. We had, as you can imagine, a divergence of opinions and views and evidence given to the committee on this issue. There is always a difficulty in assessing what weight you put on a particular piece of evidence and opinion against others. I think this is also a very important position. People of different positions on voluntary euthanasia can be quite sincere and genuine in holding these positions and, in any future debate we have on euthanasia, we should remember that.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Yes. Thank you, minister. This is also true on a whole range of social issues as well. I think on all issues we should always try to be civil in the way we debate them. Particularly around issues of life and death, and issues which are quite strongly held by people, we need to be respectful in those debates and have debates which shine a light on issues rather than just turn up the heat.

The committee found that there are a number of different schemes already in place. One is in Victoria and there has been one more recently in Western Australia. The committee did not recommend one scheme above the other but said it would have to use our report and also the evidence we collected for any future debate in this place.

I am aware that a bill has already been moved or is about to be moved in the other place to give effect to introducing a model similar to the Victorian model for voluntary euthanasia in this state, so I will not labour the point because I am sure this matter will be debated and what is in this report will be debated at length during that bill.

I would also like to thank the members of the committee, who, even though we had differences of opinion on a range of issues, worked very well in a bipartisan way to make sure that the evidence before us was properly considered.

I acknowledge the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC, the Chairperson of the committee. I think the Hon. Mr Maher did a very good job in being very fair and respectful in chairing the committee. The member for Waite was a member of the committee until 4 February, the member for Finniss was a member of the committee and is now a minister, the Hon. Dennis Hood MLC was a member, Mr Murray was a member from 6 February, I was a member and the Hon. Mr Parnell MLC was a member.

I do have to say, though, that it was a bit disconcerting that it was an all-male committee. I must confess that was disconcerting for me. I did raise it, but, for whatever reason, the two places

could not find room for a woman on the committee. That was a bit of an issue but, irrespective, I think that we worked well together. I also would like to thank the committee secretary and Clerk Assistant, Ms Leslie Guy; Mr Anthony Beasley, parliamentary officer, who supported the committee extremely well; and the research officer, Dr Robinson, who, as best she could, put together a report on the evidence that we collected.

With those comments, I would like to ask that the chamber note the report. As I said earlier, given that it is a bill before parliament, I am sure that we will have some more extensive discussions about voluntary euthanasia in this state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MOUNT COMPASS AREA SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:37):** I move:

That the 74<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Mount Compass Area School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

The R-12 Mount Compass Area School requires additional capacity to support the transition of year 7 students to high school in 2022. The school was allocated total project funding of \$9.75 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program.

Broadly, the scope of the redevelopment at Mount Compass includes construction of new buildings and refurbishment to existing facilities. The scope of work in more detail contemplates the construction of a new administration building with foyer and reception areas, offices, storage and staff amenities; the construction of a new art and technical studies building with teacher preparation, storage and student amenities; and a new student services building with book and uniform storage and student facilities or amenities within that portion of the construction as well.

The scope of work also incorporates a new home economics building with learning areas, a new school canteen, the construction of a new dual classroom building that would also be used as a performance space, refurbishment of change rooms and the gym, and a new school entry. When complete, the redevelopment project will provide Mount Compass Area School with the required capacity to accommodate 600 students and, in doing so, will cater for the future transition of year 7 students to high school, as earlier mentioned.

The committee has examined written evidence in relation to the Mount Compass Area School redevelopment project, which advised that the appropriate consultation in relation to this project had been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects as set out in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

Having regard to the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the proposed public works.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:39):** It is an absolute delight for me to be able to reflect on this extremely positive project at Mount Compass Area School. It is a project, indeed, which was born with a \$5 million proposal offered in 2017 by the former government but which this government expanded, firstly, to be some \$9 million and changed, as the member for Kavel just identified, and then, to ensure that we could gain the full scope of the project, I have given authority for that to be expanded to an \$11.1 million investment.

It is an investment by the people of South Australia that will ensure that Mount Compass Area School can have the redevelopment that it needs not only to enable the year 7 transition to go forward with appropriate capacity, and indeed the quality of the infrastructure for those year 7s to access the junior secondary curriculum in the way that it is designed to be taught, but also to deal with some of the extremely ageing infrastructure that was unfortunately left for many, many years by the former government. A number of those issues have been on the cards for a long time in need of address. I am really pleased that we are able to now do so.

I remember visiting this school a couple of years ago with the member for Finnis—in fact, I think it was October 2018. He obviously has very close connections with this school community and

has had a long period of time. We were impressed by the way that the school is integrating their STEM facility into the way the school is working, but there was so much left to do. We are really pleased that this project will now do that with the new administration building, the improved home economics and the new tech studies facility.

I remember going into that existing tech studies facility with Mr Basham, the local MP. I tell you what, the tech studies facilities I remember from the 1990s were a bit dated then, but I think that unfortunately Mount Compass Area School in 2018 was in a very similar situation to mine in the early 1990s. It is going to be a dramatically welcomed step forward I think by the school and the school community. Improving disability access on a site that is quite undulating I think will also be very welcome.

I am very confident that Dash Architects and Cook Building and Development, the builders, will support the school very well, and I cannot wait to see what is achieved, hopefully without any foreseeable troubles, in October next year.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:42):** I acknowledge the minister's commitment to this project over a number of years, his familiarity with the needs of the school and the work he has undertaken very closely, I might add, with the member for Finniss to ensure that additional funding can be brought forward to see this project to completion.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** And the member for Mayo as well.

**Mr CREGAN:** It is also right for me to acknowledge the member for Mayo's contribution to ensuring the completion of the project. The member Finniss, as you know, Mr Speaker, sharing a boundary as you do, is a passionate advocate for improvements to education within his electoral district and further afield and is very familiar with the needs of the school.

The additional funding is certainly needed and much appreciated by the school community, and it will see and ensure the development of new facilities that will stand the school in good stead for the growth that is anticipated as a result of the transition of year 7s into high school and additional future needs at the school site.

We are also very appreciative of Dash Architects and Cook, the builders, and acknowledge those very hardworking education department staff who have ensured, too, that this project can be realised in the appropriate form that it has been.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GLOSSOP HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:44):** I move:

That the 75<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Glossop High School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Mr Speaker, as you well know, Glossop High School currently has two locations: the middle school campus, which supports years 8 to 10, is situated in Glossop and the senior campus for years 11 and 12 is located in the township of Berri. The proposed redevelopment will consolidate these disparate campuses onto one site through the relocation of the middle school campus to the senior school campus at Berri.

The total project funding for the Glossop High School redevelopment project is \$17.202 million, and when complete, the redevelopment will deliver refurbished existing facilities and new construction works. The accommodation is directed at ensuring that there are appropriate facilities for up to 800 students on the Glossop High School Berri campus.

Features of the Glossop High School redevelopment project include the construction of two new hub buildings which will provide flexible and open learning environments with a range of open and closed spaces, as well as general and technical learning areas. One hub building will be for the year 7 and year 8 cohort and the other hub will be for the year 9 and year 10 cohort. There will also be an extension of the school's existing performing arts building, and the administration building will have improvements and extensions as well. There will also be a minor refurbishment to classrooms as part of several projects.

When completed, the Glossop High School redevelopment project will support the expected future enrolment growth at the school, which includes the transition of year 7 students into high school in 2022. It is anticipated that the proposed works, including the new building works and refurbishments, will be completed in a single stage. Construction is expected to be completed by October 2021.

The committee has examined written evidence in relation to the Glossop High School redevelopment project, which advised that the required consultation in relation to this project had been undertaken. It follows that the committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991.

Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends this scope of public works I have outlined to the house.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:47):** I rise to welcome this report. It is a great initiative for the middle campus and the senior campus to amalgamate. It has been done with a lot of consultation and the current Minister for Education has listened and acted. It has taken over \$17 million of a mixture of funding—previous funding plus some new, additional funding—to make this project a reality.

This is something that has been in the making for an extended period of time. It is great to see that the Marshall Liberal government has seen fit to find some common sense in bringing those two campuses together. We know that the Glossop middle campus is situated in the township of Glossop and the senior campus is in the township of Berri. This brings efficiencies into the school, with teachers not having to travel between campuses, and it brings some continuity and certainty that Glossop High School will be a much better positioned teaching institution with that single campus.

I must say that I have dealt with a number of the school's principals over time—I think there have been three—and the governing council. My last visit to the senior campus at Berri was with the Minister for Education, the Hon. John Gardner (member for Morialta). It was such a pleasure to go there and see the works that had started on this project. These works will bring the facility up to a class education precinct.

Glossop High School principal, Emily Griggs, is doing an outstanding job. She is making sure that all the i's are dotted and that the t's are crossed in bringing the 700 or so students from that middle campus into the senior campus, which currently houses some 250 students. It is a great project and I am absolutely delighted that we are seeing this upgrade. It is bringing opportunities for those students at Glossop to come together and have a class education facility, so I welcome the report and I thank the Minister for Education.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:49):** There is an absolutely world-class facility that is being constructed at Berri: the new, united Glossop High School campus. As the member for Chaffey outlined, we were able to visit it a few months ago and it was a real pleasure to engage with Emily Griggs, the principal, who is an outstanding school leader.

Representatives joined us from the teachers and the governing council to look at the great work that is already underway at that campus. It is a school that is very much in touch and engaged with its local community and is delivering great work but it is also a school that has had the complexity of dealing with two campuses for a very long period of time.

Just as at the Norwood Morialta High School, with campuses split between Magill and Rostrevor, and the three schools at Whyalla, where the years 8, 9 and 10 were on a different campus from that of years 11 and 12, those points of transition—going from one campus to another, especially when it is in a different town—are a point of risk and a point of complexity for the student, their teaching and their welfare. Enabling a smooth transition from year 7 through to year 12 on the one campus and one site with world-class facilities will be a game changer for so many people in the Riverland, particularly those children who attend Glossop High School.

One complexity, of course, is that Glossop High School, which is now going to be entirely located in Berri, has required us to consider a new name. The government's approach has been very much to bring the community into that discussion. There was obviously a committee involved, with principals, lead educators and members of the community. They brought forward a short list and the community response to that short list of four names actually provoked a really interesting discussion with lots and lots of suggestions of other names as well.

Rather than just taking the bureaucratically easy option, I really commend the Department for Education and the school for the recommendation they gave me, which I probably would have gone with anyway. They looked at it in a different way. They said, 'Let's go out to community consultation again. Let's bring in some of these fantastic ideas that the community put forward.' We have had such a strong level of community engagement with not just the short-listed names but ranges of other suggestions. I think the committee that is looking at that is giving me advice and I am looking forward to being in a position to announce that in the not too distant future.

That will be the new name for the school, but it will still have at its bones the great school community Glossop High School has had for many years, but in an enhanced physical environment. There was a \$6 million grant given, I think, under Building Better Schools in 2017. That was not going to get it done, so, like so many of these other projects, we have enhanced that project. Indeed, it is now a \$17.2 million project so we can get this done right and do the job that the students at Glossop High School and in that broader Berri and Riverland region deserve.

Greenway Architects have done a tremendous job. When the member for Chaffey and I were visiting in July, we saw the workers on site from Sitzler with shovels in the ground. It is a project that is creating a number of new facilities and refurbishing others throughout the site, so across the site of the school there is a range of those different, discrete projects that are well underway: refurbishments, expansions, construction of new buildings and, indeed, as in a number of projects, the removal of some of the old infrastructure.

I cannot wait to see what is going to be the final product at Berri. It is going to look terrific and it is going to be a terrific experience for those students. December next year will be a very exciting time as that reaches its conclusion. On day one of 2022, the year 7s in the area will be coming into the new building for the year 7s in Berri and it will be a terrific day. I commend the member for Chaffey particularly for his advocacy on this project.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:55):** I acknowledge the minister's contribution and the member for Chaffey's contribution but more importantly their commitment, passion and dedication to seeing this project to completion. It is no small thing that the school community will have a consolidated site for delivery of future classes. I think it is right to say that in bringing the school together we bring the community together as well, and I appreciate very much the minister reflecting on the process for choosing a new name for a school; that, too, is no small thing.

It is right to acknowledge Emily Griggs whose passion for this project has been immense and whose commitment to seeing it through is also important, ably assisted by the governing council. There have, as the member for Chaffey remarked, been three principals who have been closely engaged in this project but many governing council members as well over many years.

It must also be said, and it should be recorded, that the member for Chaffey has been a constant advocate in close consultation and contact with the Minister for Education. Together most recently they visited the site, but what, of course, has not yet been recorded but must be is that the member for Chaffey has been a constant and abiding advocate to see these works to completion. They now will be completed, and we are looking forward to seeing the outcome of those works.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: CRAIGMORE HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:56):** I move:

That the 76<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Craigmore High School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

The high school is located in Blakeview in the City of Playford. The high school requires additional accommodation to support the expected future growth in student enrolment numbers, which includes additional accommodation to support the future transition of year 7 students to high school. The

redevelopment will include demolition, new works and the refurbishment to existing facilities at the school site. Aspects of the proposed redevelopment include, if I can detain the house on these matters in view of the time:

- the construction of a new two-storey learning centre incorporating a dance studio, general learning areas, music rooms, breakout spaces and staff preparation areas. That is important work;
- the redevelopment of existing spaces to provide additional student and staff amenities. That is important work;
- an upgrade and extension of the school gymnasium to provide general learning areas and store rooms. That, too, is important work;
- an upgrade of the existing toilets and change rooms;
- demolition of an aged building; and
- landscaping and paving works.

The total project budget for the Craigmore High School redevelopment project is \$12.06 million, and when complete the project is expected to deliver a total school enrolment capacity of 1,400 places by 2022. This will in turn support the transition of year 7 students to high school that same year. The proposed works at Craigmore will be staged with construction expected to be completed by November 2021.

The committee has examined written evidence in relation to the Craigmore High School redevelopment project, which advised that the appropriate consultation in relation to the project, including with agencies, has been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal meets the criteria for the examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, and based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works that I have outlined to the house.

I have reflected on a number of school projects today and made an effort to detail the scope of those works to the house, but in the time left to me may I also thank and acknowledge the work of our committee staff. There is a substantial head of work to be done before each committee meeting. We are very grateful to our staff for that work, and we are particularly thankful to the education department for providing such excellent reports to us to enable us to fulfil our obligations as earlier described in the act.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:59):** Very quickly in light of the time, I just want to commend principal Rosie Heinicke for her leadership in this project, as well as Tridente Architects and Hutchinson Builders. who are doing great work. It was a great pleasure to talk about what this project was going to be when I was at the school in March last year. Indeed, we expanded the funds available to this project from \$10 million to \$12 million so that it can be done right. The member for Kavel outlined the scope of the works. It is going to be a wonderful facility. It is due to be completed in August next year—I cannot wait.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **TRAINING AND SKILLS DEVELOPMENT (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 11, page 12, after line 17 [clause 11, inserted section 9(4)]—Insert:

- (ab) the Minister must, within 3 sitting days after giving a direction, cause a copy of the direction to be laid before both Houses of Parliament; and

No. 2. Clause 11, page 14, after line 13 [clause 11, inserted section 15(3)]—Insert:

- (ab) the Minister must, within 3 sitting days after giving a direction, cause a copy of the direction to be laid before both Houses of Parliament; and

No. 3. Clause 17, page 24, line 42

After 'for a specified period' insert:

(however the probationary period, as extended, must not exceed 6 months in total or 25% of the term of the contract, whichever is the lesser).

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

The government accepts the bill with the amendments.

Motion carried.

## APPROPRIATION BILL 2020

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 November 2020.)

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (12:02):** I would like to indicate that I will be the lead speaker in regard to the bill. I would like to start my budget reply by acknowledging the often stated but nonetheless important fact that we do indeed live in the best state in the country in the best country anywhere in the world. We say that confidently today, particularly in the context of South Australia's truly extraordinary health response to COVID-19.

On behalf of the state parliamentary Labor Party and the broader Labor movement, I again would like to put on the record our gratitude for the amazing leadership shown by the State Coordinator, Mr Grant Stevens, and Professor Nicola Spurrier and, indeed, the contribution of cabinet ministers and the Premier for their continued hard work and exquisite decision-making to protect us from COVID-19.

We also know that behind every great leadership team there are also those who execute, so most importantly we continue to pay a huge amount of kudos to those on the frontline keeping us safe: our hospital staff; those in the health bureaucracy, often unrecognised; our police; our emergency service workers; and those from the ADF who provided assistance—we thank you too.

Recently, I had the opportunity at an event to chat to a member of SAPOL, who explained to me the recent work she had been undertaking in the cross-border region in the South-East of our state. That particular task meant that this police officer had to spend an extended period of time away from her home, away from her husband and her young children. I asked the officer what that meant for her, and she said it was tough. However, as quickly as she recognised the difficulty associated with that she was also quick to point out to me that she saw herself as one of the lucky ones because she still had a job—and indeed she was right.

All of us in South Australia who are still in work are the lucky ones. No greater sacrifice has been made to keep South Australia safe than by those who have lost their businesses, lost their jobs lost their livelihoods. Those of us who give thanks for retaining our health and our jobs should remember that many of our brothers and sisters have willingly paid a terrible toll for that privilege.

Our focus must be on those people, the good men and women who have willingly complied with all the requests and restrictions placed upon them in the full knowledge that this would compromise their standard of living for the benefit of others. They are the true heroes of this unprecedented health and economic crisis. Our task is to repay this altruism not just with a promise for today but with a bold policy for tomorrow.

On this score, this latest state budget has succeeded in some areas but completely missed the mark in others, and this represents a massive missed opportunity for the people of our state. The elephant in the room with this state budget, of course, is the debt, the biggest debt our state has ever

seen, an astonishing \$33 billion that the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, has aptly described as 'eyewatering'.

The easy thing to do, the politically expedient thing for an opposition to do when faced with such a daunting set of numbers, is to scream, wail and cry foul about how such a decision is totally reckless. Indeed, we know this is precisely how the member for Dunstan would act because that is how he did act when he was opposition leader. However, we on this side of the house have been consistent when it comes to debt: we believe you pay it down when times are good, as Labor did for an extended period under the leadership of Mike Rann and Kevin Foley—but, when times are bad, we believe you use debt productively to drive jobs.

The problem is that those opposite have been consistently inconsistent on the question of debt and, worse, on how and when debt has been deployed. Almost immediately upon being elected this Premier was telling us that life in South Australia was now good, despite his government presiding over a total collapse in jobs growth. During the first two years of this government only 1.3 per cent—1.3 per cent—of all jobs created in Australia were in South Australia, well down on the 6.2 per cent achieved in the last two years of the Labor government.

These truly horrific numbers, often reflected by having the highest unemployment rate in the nation, were particularly shocking considering that this Premier was already increasing the state's debt in the order of \$10 billion—long before COVID even existed. And here we are, most three years into the life of this government, and what infrastructure projects are there to show for it? Virtually nothing, only a massive ribbon-cutting exercise on Labor-designed and funded projects.

There remains no sign of The QEH redevelopment, no sign of the Main South Road duplication, no sign of the park-and-rides at TTP or Klemzig, no sign of the mooted O-Bahn to Golden Grove. The level crossings at Hove and Ovingham continue to be delayed, and who can forget this Premier's last central infrastructure vision, replete with a glossy, a fly-through, and a cheesy video? Yes, Mr Speaker, GlobeLink—'globlink'—was quickly consigned to the dustbin of history by the Premier himself, along with the right-hand turn of the tram. So, while the Labor Party and I do not begrudge the use of debt in these truly extraordinary times, we desperately hope this next debt hike actually delivers the jobs and the infrastructure that have been promised.

There is no bigger promise than the completion of the north-south corridor. This is the project that Labor started and actually delivered on. The Northern Connector, the Superway, Torrens to Torrens, Darlington, Regency to Pym—all these projects have the stamp of Labor getting things done written all over them, and thus far this government has not actually delivered anything on South Road, only a promise. We welcome this promise, we back this promise and we say to the government, 'Don't take our bipartisan support for granted. Our expectation, the South Australian community's expectation, is that you finally get on with the job.'

The fact that this project remains not fully funded, there is no design and major construction is not scheduled to start until 2023—five years after this government took office—does not bode well for the job creation our state so desperately needs now, and it is jobs that our state so desperately needs. Never before has this state had such a daunting task to provide so many South Australians the dignity of work they are now being denied.

There are currently 165,000 people, 165,000 souls, actively looking for work. One can only imagine how they must feel that, according to this state budget, there is zero jobs growth for the financial year despite the record debt and despite a \$2.6 billion deficit. Couple this with other challenges on the horizon and we know that things are going to get tough. We know that thousands upon thousands of South Australians are currently enjoying the relative security of JobSeeker and JobKeeper. Combined, these two expenditure measures represent an unprecedented injection of cash into our economy.

When we reflect upon the stimulus delivered by the Rudd government during the course of the GFC, it is often the so-called 'Rudd cheque' that comes to mind. The one-off \$900 cheque pales into complete insignificance in comparison with the \$1,500 every fortnight that thousands upon thousands of workers get on JobKeeper. We should not underestimate the positive yet distortionary impact this is having on parts of our economy.

Inevitably, the JobKeeper program must come to an end and, as it currently stands, that is scheduled to occur in March next year—a mere four months away. When that bell rings, those thousands of workers who have relied on these payments, and the businesses who have benefited from the stimulus of these payments, will not be in a position to wait for years for distant stimulus to arrive. They cannot afford a repeat of the insipid rollout of the stimulus we have seen thus far from this state government, as demonstrated in the recent figures from the Auditor-General.

Furthermore, if we are going to borrow against the wealth of future generations, we have a profound obligation to ensure that every dollar spent is spent where it is either needed most now or where we are setting up jobs for the future, and herein lies the missed opportunity. It is alarming what a budget with a \$33 billion debt and a \$2.6 billion deficit does not deliver.

This opposition does not want to see opportunities slip by us, which is why today, as promised, I offer a constructive response to this year's state budget. I offer proposals to ensure that no stone is left unturned in the pursuit of a better South Australia. Frequently, since the commencement of this pandemic and the obvious success of South Australia's health response, many have cited the opportunity this success brings to our future economy.

Many have hoped that COVID-19 would reframe the perception of South Australia to those ignorant of our exceptional way of life, ignorant of our competitiveness, ignorant of the opportunity of doing business here. This, combined with business increasingly looking for ways to reduce their cost base and COVID-19 resetting the way we view work, must represent our best opportunity yet to actively pursue and attract new businesses and new jobs to South Australia.

Our federation is competitive in its design. It is not enough to expect businesses to just come here. We must go out and find them. Now is the time to seize on our success and establish an active policy of investment attraction. Labor believes a well resourced but highly accountable investment attraction agency should be established, with a \$50 billion bid fund aimed at attracting new businesses to our state.

This policy is a No Regrets proposition. Bid funds by their nature are only expended if they are successful. We know through the likes of Boeing and VeroGuard, this policy can deliver well-paid jobs of the future to our state. On top of bringing new businesses to our state, we have to support existing businesses to assist their growth which is why we want to bring back Brand SA.

Since the pandemic began, there is anecdotal evidence that consumers are asking where products are made as the public recognises the essential value of a local supply chain. The successful I Choose SA campaign was downgraded last year when this government axed Brand SA in a \$1.6 million funding cut. Labor believes the government should bring back Brand SA and fund an \$8 million new 'Buy South Australian' campaign to urge South Australians to buy South Australian made products in their local supermarkets.

This investment, spread over two years, would fund a broad intensive advertising and promotion campaign across media and in our supermarkets to encourage South Australian shoppers to buy local and shift a proportion of their regular supermarket spend away from imported products to SA made products and produce.

According to the ABS, each month South Australians spend just over \$700 million in supermarkets and grocery stores. Over the 12 months to February 2020, just prior to the COVID-19 hoarding, \$9.047 billion was spent in supermarkets and grocery stores. A mere 5 per cent shift in spending from imported products to SA made products would mean an extra \$450 million spent directly into South Australian made products.

Deloitte Access Economics forecasts that South Australia's gross state product will contract by 6.9 per cent to \$100 billion in the 2020-21 financial year. The \$450 million increase in purchasing would represent 0.45 per cent of the state's economy for a minimal outlay from the state government. Establishing the investment attraction agency and Brand SA come at a cost that could easily be accommodated within the existing unallocated funds of this budget's Economic and Business Growth Fund. This investment has the power to deliver a real return at a very modest cost.

The COVID-19 crisis has highlighted the importance of local manufacturing and has given rise to questions about Australia's sovereign manufacturing capability. Shopping aisles empty of basic essentials from toilet paper to pasta and hospital storerooms bare of medicines, hand sanitiser and face masks have brought home the importance of a capable domestic manufacturing sector. A

strong manufacturing capability is critical to Australia's self-reliance. If there is anything COVID-19 has taught us, it is that we need a self-sufficient country, particularly in a time of crisis.

Manufacturing still employs 64,000 South Australians according to the ABS which is why I find it truly astounding that this government's budget delivers nothing for our manufacturing base in this state. Manufacturing in South Australia has transitioned and evolved to be competitive in a global marketplace. Whether it is forestry, food, defence or steel, we still make things and we make them well. Labor wants our manufacturing base to expand once again and create more jobs which is why we propose the introduction of a \$20 million 'Made in South Australia' grant program to support small and medium manufacturers to innovate and grow.

There are other sectors of our economy that deserve specific attention, particularly those that have been hardest hit by the pandemic, which, unfortunately, has had a disproportionate impact on female workers. We know that in the early months of the pandemic the number of women employed fell by 5.3 per cent; this is in comparison to 3.9 per cent for men. One such critical industry is tourism.

Last week, I had cause to go to Sydney. It was nice to catch a plane again, sort of, but I did get the opportunity to talk to workers at the airport. It was good chatting to people who were clearly enjoying starting to see people floating around the airport a little bit more. In one conversation I had with an air hostess on the way back, we were just chatting about her routine and how much she had been at work, and she was lamenting the amount of time that she was not at work, notwithstanding the fact that she acknowledged she was on the JobKeeper program and that was allowing her to pay the bills and make ends meet.

But it was the work that she missed—the dignity of that work, the human interaction associated with that work. Her current status in regard to work is that it is highly infrequent and she does not know what is happening from one day to the next, let alone one week to the next. She said that she just wants to be at work properly. Well, we want her back at work, too, which is why in July Labor proposed a \$200 SA tourism voucher program to encourage South Australians to holiday here and help kickstart the local tourism industry. The dollar-for-dollar scheme would have provided a voucher of up to \$200 if South Australians spent at least the same amount of their own money purchasing a bookable tourism product.

The Marshall Liberal government did belatedly respond to Labor's initiative—and that is a pattern we have become used to over here—with a short-lived program that provided \$100 against a hotel room booking in the city or \$50 in the regions, with restrictions on when it could be used. The flaws in the Premier's scheme were exposed when it was revealed that, although 50,000 vouchers were snapped up quickly when they became available, fewer than half were actually redeemed, meaning that the millions of dollars promised by the government for the industry never actually arrived at the time they needed it the most.

Labor's plan is not only more generous but also provides redemption against a range of tourism products and services, not just accommodation in the CBD. We do not just want money circulating in our economy; we need new tourist dollars coming in, driving private sector activity and private sector jobs, which is why the state government should introduce an SA great holiday voucher scheme to attract interstate visitors, similar to the scheme introduced by the Northern Territory government.

A \$5 million campaign could partner with travel retailers and provide interstate residents the opportunity to save up to a thousand bucks on a South Australian holiday. Interstate visitors who book flights, accommodation, tours and attractions or hire a vehicle would be entitled to a \$200 discount for every \$1,000 spent, up to a maximum of \$1,000. This would make South Australia an attractive destination for interstate visitors, as competition for interstate travellers really starts to heat up. We want those planes full again, which goes to why I caught a plane in the first place last week.

I caught a plane to Sydney to sign a deal committing Labor to bring back our car race, not just because this race is an icon on the national sporting calendar, not just because people love it and not just because we believe Mad March belongs to the many rather than the few, but because this race creates jobs—over 400 full-time jobs last year, according to the government. Well, I hope

the Premier knows that 400 jobs created from the Clipsal last year—in excess of 400—equates to 20 times as many people who work at the Space Agency.

What makes me angry is the way the Premier seems to dismiss these jobs—the idea that somehow these jobs are less important than others. Well, tell that to the worker building the grandstands, or the worker cooking the food, or the worker cleaning the hotels. If you are going to take their jobs away, you had better have a plan to replace them. So far, you have not announced one single new event since your decree to ditch the V8s. I say to those workers in the tourism and hospitality sectors, from airlines to travel agents to the hospitality staff: Labor wants you back at work as much as you want to be at work and we will always fight for your jobs.

In Labor, we believe health and education are central to any budget, and ordinarily one might expect that a budget with a debt and deficit as large as this budget has would deliver for these critical areas of service delivery. But, unfortunately, again there appears to be only wasted opportunity. Never has the health system been more important, or our hardworking doctors, nurses and health staff been more valuable, yet the response of the Liberal government has been to cut health services and penalise our health workers.

There is a stark difference between the COVID public health response run by Professor Spurrier and the public hospital services run by the Premier and the Hon. Stephen Wade. Ramping at our hospitals has almost doubled under the Liberals. Last week, 93 calls to 000 went unanswered, yet the Liberals have sided with their interstate corporate liquidators, KordaMentha, to cut nurses. Now we have 112 fewer in our public hospitals than we did a year ago.

Over 200 doctors at the Women's and Children's have written publicly about their serious concerns about the state of services and have been flatly ignored. ICAC raised serious questions and concerns about maladministration and corruption in the administration, yet the resources for investigation were refused. Experts have described the increasing number of mental health patients in emergency departments, stuck waiting for days on end, as a human rights abuse, yet the government's mental health COVID package is the smallest per capita of any mainland state.

Upgrades to our hospitals have been put in the slow lane. There are continued delays to projects like at The QEH and the Lyell McEwin, and over the past two years we have had the lowest spending on upgrading hospitals for a decade. And, as a slap in the face to our hardworking nurses, allied health workers and hospital orderlies and cleaners, the Liberals have hiked the cost of their car parking by 129 per cent—\$725 a year. These are fees they must pay to get to work and these hikes are set to restart in a few months' time.

There is no question that the situation in our hospitals is getting worse, not better, and patients, doctors, nurses and paramedics are losing confidence. It is time to listen to our clinicians, to stop the cuts to frontline public hospital services, to invest in overstretched mental health care services and put health prevention at the forefront rather than an afterthought. Our clinicians have shown how they can deliver during COVID; we need to give them the tools to do their job and get the corporate liquidators off their back.

Insofar as education is concerned, this is a budget still very much running on the fumes of the previous Labor government's record investment in school infrastructure.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** That's right. When the government says it is 'building, building, building', what it really means is that it has simply decided not to cut a swathe of projects that have already been announced before it came to government. But it makes for an impressive headline figure and takes attention away from the deep cuts this government is making to the education department.

In theory, it makes sense to ring-fence efficiency measures to the department itself as a way of protecting individual schools from the brunt of those cuts, but this can only be done to a point, and after \$11 million of savings announced in the government's first budget, \$48 million of savings last year and \$30 million announced in this budget, that point appears to have passed.

Make no mistake: these cuts will hurt schools, they will hurt staff, they will hurt students. Do not be fooled by the government's rhetoric that somehow, magically, an additional \$30 million of

savings can be wrung from the department without it having a material impact on learning and classroom support.

There is essentially nothing new in this budget for public schools, and that is a truly remarkable thing to say of such a significant area of government spending. Overwhelmingly, the infrastructure projects accounted for in this budget were committed to by the previous Labor government. In fact, almost \$1 billion of the \$1.3 billion regularly touted by the Premier were Labor projects.

Any increase in education spending is largely due to increased enrolments. It is breathtaking that this government would pat themselves on the back for carrying out the most basic and fundamental task in the education portfolio: funding new enrolments. In the absence of any genuine new spending in public education, that is what they are doing. We should not forget the dirty deal this government made with their federal mates on school funding, which guarantees public schools will never reach 100 per cent of the Schooling Resource Standard, and allowed them to count transport and infrastructure spending in the calculations. This is something that had been never been done before.

Furthermore, this government's assault on TAFE—our public training provider—is now in top gear. In this government's first budget, we saw the closure of three metropolitan TAFE campuses, and last year we saw TAFE facilities provided to private RTOs to conduct their own training. This year, we have seen important high-demand courses in areas such as ageing, disability and early childhood education cancelled in metropolitan Adelaide. This budget lays bare for the first time the magnitude of those cuts. There have been \$33 million in cuts to TAFE alone in the past financial year, and this comes at a time when 165,000 South Australians are either out of work or underemployed.

These cuts come at a time when this government should be investing in public training, not writing it off and selling it off for parts. I am pleased to report to the house that education is a policy priority for Labor under my leadership, starting with not squibbing the tough decisions and tough discussions to be had around the structure of our higher education sector in South Australia. This Premier has squibbed it but I will not because South Australia needs and deserves a top 100 university and I will explore every opportunity to give our kids the best chance to fulfil their potential.

If it was not enough for the Premier to get rid of the V8s, he has now decreed that a brand-spanking new tax on electric cars is a good idea. The more we learn about this policy, the crazier it gets. While other countries around the world are now taxing polluting the earth, this Premier is taxing not polluting the earth. While other countries around the world are investing in electric vehicles, this Premier is actively disincentivising the purchase of electric vehicles.

Imagine how the 3,000-odd owners of electric vehicles in South Australia feel today. Only last week, they saw the news that the Premier was committed to electric vehicles. He said that they were good for the environment, good for the state and good for jobs. Those owners, as did we, thought, 'Absolutely. This is a worthwhile investment and something that speaks to the future. We want to incentivise this transition.' This is because we and all South Australians know that progress in the area of climate and climate change is inevitable and must be embraced in order to capitalise on the extraordinary opportunity we have.

We supported that decision. Those 3,000 owners of electric vehicles supported that decision. Fast-forward a few days and guess what? They turn on their television sets and see that the Premier has now gone from supporting the electric car industry to taxing it in a way that no-one else around the country has. It truly beggars belief that this Premier has decided to embark on a policy of actively disincentivising the take-up of electric cars just as that transition was about to begin.

Why on earth would we be disincentivising good behaviour? The equivalent would be to tax smokers for giving up smokes. It is an absurd proposition, which is why I can report to this house and to the people of South Australia that we will block this tax measure. We will not allow this Premier to sabotage South Australia's good standing in the world or our world-recognised position as being a leader on tackling climate change. That is a brand and that is a position worthy of preservation and enhancement, not destroying it, which this government seems intent on doing.

Yesterday was Remembrance Day, an occasion when we reflect on those who paid the ultimate sacrifice for our country. When we reflect on that sacrifice, we normally think of it as being for our freedom, for our sovereignty and for our democratic way of life, but we also know those soldiers made that sacrifice in the hope that future generations would one day enjoy the opportunity of a better life with a brighter future.

Post World War I, the Roaring Twenties, with mass production and new technologies such as electricity and automobiles, saw unprecedented economic growth which delivered new jobs and real wage growth to an expanding middle class. Similarly, post World War II, the forties and fifties delivered yet more economic growth on the back of a golden age of capitalism, which was combined with mass postwar migration and Keynesian economic policies. This postwar economic boom delivered yet an even bigger middle class with even higher wages and, indeed, full employment.

Obviously, the debt owed to those men and women who did pay the ultimate sacrifice in World War I and II can never truly be repaid, but hopefully their souls can rest easier in the knowledge that they did leave behind a more prosperous future and a fairer country. Although it is hard to draw any equivalence between world wars and this pandemic, particular in the Australian context, the post-crisis ambition should be the same: an ambition to not just return to the life we had before COVID-19 but have a better and fairer future for future generations.

In South Australia, unlike any place in the world, we have the opportunity to seize that moment, to capitalise on our strengths like never before. On this side of the chamber, we have that ambition. We owe it to those who have given up so much this year to not just build back but build back better.

We need to provide jobs for the future, where secure work is not just provided to one gender at the expense of another. We need to deliver education that brings South Australia's relative performance back on par with leading nations around the world. We need to ensure that when a loved one gets into the back of a hospital, they are going to have access to the treatment they need when they need it. We need to honour our commitment as custodians of this planet to leave a better environment than the one we inherited.

One budget alone cannot address all these problems, but at this moment in our history there has never been a better time to start. As we approach an election year, on this side of the house we cannot be more excited about the opportunity to present to the people of this state a policy for a bigger, bolder and fairer future for the place that we call home. South Australians deserve absolutely nothing less.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:38):** I rise to make my contribution on this year's state budget. I want to echo the comments that just about every other contributor in this place has made on this budget, and that has been to reflect on what an absolutely shocking year this has been, particularly here in South Australia—of course, not just here in South Australia but around the rest of the country and, indeed, around the rest of the world.

But we started the year with the continuation of what were horrific bushfires which gripped parts of our state. It was extraordinary to watch—literally firsthand as the power of social media now allows us to—the efforts of our emergency services workers as they were battling these bushfires. I will never forget that vision of those firefighters in that emergency truck trying to break their way through the fire front on Kangaroo Island to try to escape with their lives.

Then, of course, after the horror of the bushfires we were confronted with a pandemic, with the coronavirus. It quickly became clear, as we grappled with what this meant for our daily lives, that it was not just the emergency workers keeping us safe from those bushfires. We were now seeing our healthcare workers keeping us safe from the pandemic and we were also seeing public transport workers keeping us moving around our communities.

We were seeing retail workers put up with what were at times some of the worst behaviour we would expect to see in our community with people unfortunately being abusive, hoarding goods, and so on, but they showed up for work and they battled through. The same has to be said for our schoolteachers and our childcare workers turning up each day to educate our children, not knowing whether or not they were going to be safe doing so.

As the leader has said, many lost their jobs and many have also not regained work since losing their jobs. Yes, all of us have been inconvenienced, but that pales in comparison with the

impacts on those people who have lost their jobs, and, of course, that in turn pales in comparison with the impacts on those families and loved ones who lost their lives from the virus itself.

I am also pleased to add my contribution to the statewide recognition about how good the health response has been in this state to the coronavirus. It has been absolutely exceptional. The leadership of the State Coordinator, the Commissioner of Police, Grant Stevens, and, of course, the Chief Public Health Officer, Nicola Spurrier, through this period has been exemplary. You do not need me to say that. Indeed, you do not need any of us to say that in this place. You need only to look at the reaction of the community to their leadership.

We had a complete acceptance of the directives and the leadership they were providing. There was none of this rubbish that we saw interstate or overseas where people were reacting angrily to the restrictions that were being imposed on the community, and I think that speaks volumes not only about our community but also about those two individuals and the leadership that they demonstrated.

While the health response has been good, we also need to acknowledge that the Premier made the decision that that health response and the restrictions that would have been put in place and the management of those restrictions was to be left up to the those leaders in the Public Service—again, the Commissioner of Police and the Chief Public Health Officer. I think that we should also be proud of the quality not just of their leadership but of the remainder of the Public Service in carrying out those directives and ushering us and guiding us through these difficult times. It is great to be able to say that we have a Public Service here in South Australia that is capable of delivering such extraordinary results.

In separating himself from being responsible for the health response for the pandemic, the Premier, and by extension the Treasurer, became front and centre of the state's economic response to the coronavirus pandemic. Just as soon as those restrictions were imposed, businesses were necessarily shut down and restrictions were put on their operations and their capacities to trade and to employ people to generate a livelihood. Questions emerged about how the state government was going to support them.

I take my hat off, I have to say, to the decisions that the federal government took very, very swiftly; in fact, I think it was only about 36 or 48 hours after the national media started asking questions about whether our country needed to follow the lead of other western democracies around the world and institute some sort of wage subsidy scheme. If we cast our minds back 10 years, we never could have expected a conservative government at the national level to have gone down that path, and I think it speaks volumes of Josh Frydenberg and his decisions that he has taken to implement not only the JobKeeper scheme but also the JobSeeker scheme, as well as some of the other schemes that have been put in place to support Australians, small businesses and their workers.

Here in South Australia, though, the calls were not so readily heeded. While the Premier was quick to announce a stimulus package and then two weeks later a further stimulus package, it was disappointing to learn that less than a quarter of that had been spent, according to the Auditor-General, more than three months later. We were promised by the Premier it would be spent very quickly, that it would be spent over the next six months in the period between March and September, but here we are in November and still less than half of that money has been spent. That is a massive disappointment, and that is to say the least. To say the most, what it has cost is people their jobs and many people their livelihoods.

I want to make it clear that Labor supports and has always supported aggressive economic stimulus to combat an economic crisis. You only need to cast your mind back a period of 10 years or so to think about the response we had from the federal Labor government and the state Labor government at the time to respond to the economic crisis confronting us with the global financial crisis. Debt and deficits were recorded as the state budget in 2009 contained \$4 billion of combined new operating and investing spending measures, but we entered that period from a position of strength.

In the years leading up to the GFC, the state Labor government had paid down all the general government sector's debt. We were accruing financial assets, such was the strength of the budget

position. There was plenty of capacity to combat the global financial crisis and its economic impacts. What was the response from the opposition at the time, the Liberal politicians, led by Rob Lucas? They consistently criticised the debt. They consistently criticised the deficits. Of course, the Liberal lines around debt and deficits were 'debt crisis', 'debt emergency' and 'bankrupting the state'.

Fast-forward to now as we enter this current economic crisis, and we do so on the back of two years of a Liberal state government, again led in the Treasury capacity by Rob Lucas. They have spent those two years desperately trying to mirror Labor's strong record of infrastructure delivery, as the leader said, running around cutting ribbons on Labor-delivered projects. In those two years, they radically increased state government debt by \$10 billion, and that is before the pandemic hit our shores. They have made all sorts of promises about infrastructure projects in the future, announcing infrastructure spending and then largely not spending it.

We get to this budget, this week's announcement, and make no bones about it: this is a desperate, last-gasp attempt of the government to rebrand itself. The Premier and the Treasurer are doing all they can to look like a competent government despite the scandals that have also accompanied this past year. The Premier has lost a backbencher, three cabinet ministers, a Government Whip and a President of the Legislative Council to scandal. To this day, we still have a criminal case on foot before the courts and ICAC investigations. This budget desperately needs to distract from the shambles of a government led by the Premier.

The Premier and the Treasurer are asking South Australians in this budget to forget the last 2½ years. They are asking us also to forget their rhetoric in the past on debt and deficit. They are asking us to forget the chaos, the dysfunction and the disunity of the past 2½ years, and they are asking us to forget they have spent 2½ years delivering nothing in terms of infrastructure. They are asking us to forget they have already added \$10 billion of debt to the books and delivered nothing to show for it.

As I said, Labor supports using debt and deficits to combat an economic crisis. We did it, and we support this government doing it again now that they are in power. But if we look at what they are promising to use this economic stimulus on, they are asking us to trust that they will not behave like they have in the last 2½ years and that, for the first time, they will actually start making good on the promises to South Australians.

After the budget came out this week, I took the most recent budget papers and I compared them with the first set of budget papers released under this government, six months after the state election in March 2018. I looked at the major projects the government has continued to talk about over the last 2½ years as being those that would deliver economic activity and jobs across South Australia. I looked at how they were going with those jobs as they are described in this budget compared with how they were described in the first budget.

The Joy Baluch Bridge duplication at Port Augusta was placed into the budget and money set aside by the former Labor government. In the first budget it was due for completion in June 2021. In this year's budget it is now due for completion in June 2024, three years late.

Regarding the Festival Plaza project, once again funded by the former Labor government, the car park was due to be completed five months ago in June 2020 according to the Liberal's first budget. That has blown out by two years. The plaza upgrade itself was due to be completed, according to their first budget, in June 2021; it is now due two years later.

The Tonsley rail junction—again, funded by the former Labor government—is due two years late. The Springbank Road intersection upgrade is now due two years late. The Golden Grove Road upgrade is now due a year late, in June 2021. The Gawler East Link Road, which was meant to open in June 2019, is now finally due for completion, despite a partial opening, in June 2023—four years late. The Port Road/West Lakes Boulevard/Cheltenham Parade intersection—which the member for Cheltenham and I know the importance of, as it services our two electorates—is two years late.

The Main South Road Seaford to Aldinga upgrade is a year late. The Dublin saleyard access project for the heavy vehicle industry is three years late. The Darlington upgrade project will not be finally completed for another two years. The train operation centre blew out by \$3 million. The North Terrace right-hand turn, of course, was axed. The Port rail spur, of course, was axed. GlobeLink, of course, was axed, as the leader said.

The city tram extension was described in their first budget, six months after the last state election after they complained about how the project was carried out, as being a \$80 million project. It is now described, in the latest budget, as being a \$121 million project—a more than 50 per cent blowout. The Port Wakefield overpass project—your will remember this, Mr Speaker; this was one the Premier and Rod Hook told us would cost \$24 million, seemingly forgetting that trucks also like to use regional roads—is not \$24 million anymore but \$90 million. Not a bad effort, a 250 per cent blowout in budget.

Aside from all the delays in those projects, the real impact on the South Australian economy is thousands and thousands of construction workers missing the opportunity of working on those jobs, thousands and thousands of wages being paid, thousands and thousands of opportunities for small businesses to be supported so that they can, in turn, employ people.

I wish it were just the delay that was the worst of these projects, but the fact is that nearly all those examples have blown out in cost. The Festival Plaza project has blown out by more than \$30 million, the Tonsley rail project has blown out by nearly \$60 million, the Springbank Road project has blown out by \$35 million, and the Gawler East Link Road has blown out by \$13 million. Main South Road is perhaps one bright spot—unless it actually means what it alludes to, and that is a budget cut—and is now \$283 million rather than \$305 million.

The Darlington project is the most fascinating to me. When the government first released a budget six months after the state election, six months of all the briefings that the transport department was able to provide the new minister and the Treasurer, they said it would cost \$620 million. In their second budget they said it would be \$667 million, and now it is \$754 million. Not bad, taking a fully-funded, on-track Labor infrastructure project and blowing it out twice. It is absolutely extraordinary.

So, when we are asked to believe that they can deliver a \$33 billion debt-funded economic stimulus package you would be forgiven, would you not, for expecting that South Australians might be at least raising an eyebrow about this government's capacity to deliver. We are being asked to forget the delays and the blowouts in the infrastructure program that they have so badly managed, and we are now being asked to trust them that finally, in the last 18 months, they are going to get their act together and start delivering jobs for South Australians. Of course, unfortunately, the \$33 billion is not the last of it.

I asked the Premier repeated questions yesterday in question time why the north-south corridor project did not find all of its project funding in that \$33 billion, and how much more debt beyond the \$33 billion would be needed to fund it. He could not answer that question. We know it is at least another \$4.5 billion. Or why only \$685 million of the Women's and Children's Hospital had been funded.

There is more debt beyond \$33 billion that needs to be accrued. It is the same with the Hahndorf traffic improvements project, the Main South Road duplication project and the Victor Harbor Road duplication project. It does not stop at \$33 billion; it is just where it starts, and it will be long in the rear view—the idiom that the government likes to use at the moment—of the Treasurer who, of course, will be long gone. It will be for the rest of the state to have to work out how we are going to manage this.

As I said, Labor supports deficits and Labor supports going into further debt if it means that we can support our economy to get out of a crisis. What we cannot support is a government that has removed a debt ceiling or a fiscal target relating to debt from the budget papers. According to the Premier and the Treasurer, it is a blank cheque to continue spending and bugger the impacts. Well, I am sorry but that is not good enough.

Interest rates are low and, yes, this debt might be cheap, and even cheaper today than it was last year, but are we not hoping for an economic recovery? Are we not hoping for strong economic growth? Are we not hoping that conditions will improve, that demand will increase and that, at some point perhaps, interest rates will increase to reflect that we have strong economic activity in our national and state economy? Do we not think that those interest rates might bring with them a higher interest cost burden to the state budget? What does that mean?

It means that there is less money to spend on our hospitals, which are already under pressure; it means that there is less money to spend on our schools, which still are not getting their

full entitlement under the original Gonski reforms; and it means there is less money to spend on all those other important areas of government that the public expects. We are willing to give the government some slack with this budget, to give them the authority that they need in this parliament to get on with delivering some economic stimulus but we say to the government that they have to break the last 2½ years of failure to deliver, failure to stimulate and failure to support South Australians, and actually get on with the job.

You might think, Mr Speaker, that this is just a shadow treasurer trying to undermine the outcomes that this budget is trying to deliver. You do not have to take my word for it. You can take Treasury's word for it because, if you look at chapter 7 of Budget Paper 3, they lay out their verdict of this budget and tell South Australians in that chapter that they expect that this budget—the increase in debt and the \$2.6 billion deficit that we are going to go into this financial year—will deliver zero jobs growth. If Treasury do not have any confidence in this Premier and this Treasurer to deliver economic growth and jobs to the South Australian economy, how can South Australians have any confidence in this government?

What we need to see in addition to this budget is a government that can actually deliver, that the government can actually put to work the money that they are seeking the parliament's approval for, to get out and spend in the economy and support jobs. I am asking them to park their disunity, their dysfunction and their inability to deliver and actually get on with the job of governing. It would make a nice change for South Australia's future.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

#### *Petitions*

### **PFAS DISPOSAL**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson):** Presented a petition signed by 1,115 residents of McLaren Vale, McLaren Flat, Aldinga and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to prevent the Southern Waste ResourceCo from receiving, storing, treating and disposing of waste contaminated with PFAS at their landfill site on Tatachilla Road in McLaren Vale.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Art Gallery South Australia (AGSA)—Annual Report 2019-20  
 Museum Board, South Australian—Annual Report 2019-20  
 State Opera South Australia—Annual Report 2019-20  
 State Theatre Company of South Australia—Annual Report 2019-20

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

Casino, SkyCity Adelaide—Variation to Approved Licensing Agreement 2020  
 Community Visitor Scheme—Disability Services Annual Report 2019-20  
 Evidence Act 1929—Suppression orders made pursuant to Section 69A Annual Report 2019-20  
 Freedom of Information Act 1991, Administration of the—Annual Report 2019-20  
 Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and the Office for Public Integrity, Review of the operations of the—Conducted by Hon. J.R. Sulan QC 2019-20  
 Judicial Conduct Commissioner, Review of the operations of the—Conducted by Hon. J.R. Sulan QC 2019-20  
 Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal—Annual Report 2019-20  
 Ombudsman SA—Audit of compliance with the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007, 2020

Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995—Disputes Lodged—Report by the Principal Registrar of the Magistrates Court pursuant to Section 78 Annual Report 2019-20  
Small Business Commissioner, Office of the—Annual Report 2019-20  
Training Centre Review Board—Annual Report 2019-20  
Training Centre Visitor—Office of the Guardian for Children and Young People Annual Report 2019-20

By the Minister for Planning and Local Government (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Development Act 1993, Administration of the—Annual Report 2019-20  
Local Government Grants Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2019-20  
State Planning Commission—Annual Report 2019-20

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

Community Visitor Scheme—Mental Health Services Annual Report 2019-20  
Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner—Annual Report 2019-20  
Health and Wellbeing, Department for—Annual Report 2019-20  
Health Performance Council—Annual Report 2019-20

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. R. Sanderson)—

Child and Young Person's Visitor—Office of the Guardian for Children and Young People Annual Report 2019-20  
Child Protection, Department for—Annual Report 2019-20  
Safe and Well: Supporting Families, Protecting Children—Annual Report 2019-20

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

Passenger Transport Act 1994—Adelaide Rail Transformation Project: Provision of Heavy Rail Services for the Adelaide Metropolitan Passenger Rail Network 2020

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

Co-Management Board—  
Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park Annual Report 2019-20  
Mamungari Conversation Park Annual Report 2019-20  
Ngaut Ngaut Conservation Park Annual Report 2019-20  
Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Annual Report 2019-20  
Witjira National Park Annual Report 2019-20  
Yumbarra Conservation Park Annual Report 2019-20  
Dog and Cat Management Board—Annual Report 2019-20  
Government response to Standing Committee—Natural Resources Committee: Inquiry into use of off-road vehicles in South Australia 2020  
Nullarbor Parks Advisory Committee—Annual Report 2019-20

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. D.K. Basham)—

Forestry Corporation, South Australian—Charter, 2020-21  
Management Plan for the South Australian Commercial Spencer Gulf Prawn Fishery  
Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2019-20

*Parliamentary Committees*

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:05):** I bring up the 124<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Neighbourhood Renewal Program.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***ELECTRIC VEHICLES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier sign off on the tax on electric vehicles and, if so, why?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05):** I am not sure whether the Leader of the Opposition has been following this, but we haven't introduced the bill yet. We have said in the state budget that we will be looking to put a user charge on those people who have electric vehicles. We think that all people who use roads in South Australia should make a contribution, and that aligns with what the people of South Australia believe as well. Can I make it really clear that we do believe very strongly that we will be making a transition to electric vehicles, not just here in South Australia but right around the world.

That is why, last week, we announced \$18.2 million to go into our EV strategy. A large part of that is actually setting up a charging network across our state. What we know is that people want to make the transition, but at the moment there are a couple of things that are holding them back. We all know we are heading towards price and benefit parity, probably in the next five years, but to really realise the full benefits of this transition we need to have a network—

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —for charging infrastructure across our state. At the moment, because of the extraordinarily low numbers, the private sector is not in a position to provide this charging infrastructure, so we have allocated money in our budget to facilitate that, to make sure that augmentation can be made, not just in metropolitan Adelaide, which is, if you like, the easy part, but to actually have that network across the state. Part of that \$18.2 million is \$3 million, which is going to go into smart charging infrastructure, which will allow the EVs to feed into the grid.

I want to commend the Minister for Energy and Mining in South Australia, working with the entire cabinet, for looking at this practice around the world in terms of that charging infrastructure and network and bringing it to cabinet. So there is a significant investment that is going to go—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —into that charging infrastructure, and so it should. We have also announced that we want to make the transition of our own fleet in South Australia. We have hybrid cars in our fleet at the moment, but we also now have, for the first time, electric vehicles in our fleet. What we know is that the people who are using these vehicles are enjoying those vehicles. We can see that people are going to move over, and we need to be part of that here in South Australia as well. We note that other jurisdictions around Australia are also looking at this matter. It seems odd—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —that those opposite have ruled out the possibility of a user charge before they have actually even seen this. It really goes to the disposition of those opposite: they are negative, they are knocking and they are in fact ruling out before they have even seen the detail.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** You're knocking off another one of your tax breaks.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We have made it very clear that we think this is the responsible way to go. We think that other jurisdictions will be doing this because we do genuinely believe that all road users should be making a contribution to the maintenance of roads and the further rollout of further infrastructure that they themselves will be using in the future.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the leader, I call to order the member for Wright, the member for Playford, the member for Reynell, the member for Kaurna, the Minister for Trade and Investment—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** —order!—the member for Davenport, the member for Ramsay, the member for Lee, the member for West Torrens and the leader.

### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. How much will the Premier's electric car tax cost per vehicle?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10):** Well, again, I am happy to answer this question, and I can speak on it all day actually, but I have actually covered this information off—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and if those people opposite had been listening to the budget speech, which was delivered by the Hon. Rob Lucas in this place only on Tuesday, or if they had read any of the documentation or seen any of the public commentary they would know the answer, but I am happy to provide it. That is going to be determined, and we are consulting with other—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —jurisdictions on the best way—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to do this. But there are very few electric vehicles in South Australia at the moment—between 2,500 and 3,000 electric vehicles—and we expect this to increase in the future. We know we are making the transition from conventional vehicles over to electric vehicles and whatever might come thereafter, and there is plenty of work being done now on plenty of other different versions, but we do need to have a contribution made by—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** If it moves you'll tax it.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —road users to our road maintenance and to the creation of new roads and the upgrade of roads here in South Australia. What our budget is actually demonstrating is that we are a government which is very significantly investing in road infrastructure in South Australia—a major, major set of investments which were made right across the state from the Strzelecki Track, right through to projects which are in metropolitan Adelaide and then, of course, down to the South-East—right across this state.

We made that investment on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia, and also I might add with the cooperation of our federal colleagues in the Coalition government where they were providing funds as well. It is important that we continue to roll out these projects, and we do need sustainable funding for these projects into the future, and that is what the EV charge is designed to do.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the leader, I call to order the member for Cheltenham, the member for Badcoe and the member for Chaffey. I warn the member for Lee.

### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** My question is to the Premier. How is the Premier able to estimate that this budget measure would generate approximately \$1 million per annum if he is unable to tell us how much the cost will be per vehicle?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for that question. One of the things that the Treasurer has made really clear is that we want this charge to be lower than what people would be currently experiencing with the fuel excise they are paying, so we can easily—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —calculate that and times it by the number of vehicles.

#### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13):** It gets better and better. How will the state government know how far electric vehicle drivers have travelled in order to tax them?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13):** Well, I didn't mention that at all. I didn't mention anything to do with—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Maybe the leader can illuminate us.

#### STATE BUDGET

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:13):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the house on how the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mrs POWER:** —Marshall Liberal government's budget is creating more jobs, backing business and building what matters, and can he please include in his update what the reaction from industry has been?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13):** I can and I will. I am very excited to talk about the budget, which was handed down in this place on Tuesday and which delivered the single biggest shot of economic adrenaline that this state has ever seen: \$4 billion worth of stimulus incorporated in our budget in South Australia married together with \$1 billion from the federal government—\$5 billion worth of economic stimulus and support in South Australia. It is unashamedly a jobs budget designed to have massive infrastructure investment and maximum employment in South Australia.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** In fact, \$16.7 billion—a record in the history of this state—is going to infrastructure investment over the next four years creating 19,000 jobs—19,000 jobs that will be created. Tens of thousands of jobs have already been created since the beginning of this financial year.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Those over there can whinge, they can whine, they can carp, they can complain. We are getting on with delivering jobs for South Australia and the people of South Australia love it. Part of our economic stimulus, of course, is \$10,000 payments to businesses in South Australia that are still doing it tough—\$10,000 payments.

Already, since announcing this policy only on Monday this week, 1,500 applications have been received and the Treasurer tells me this money will be in their bank account within the next three to four weeks, so they will have that money so that they will be able to apply it to those things which are important to their business, whether it's paying their rent, wages, supplies.

Many people are doing it very tough, but they know that they have a government in South Australia that is here to support them just as they know that we are a government which is delivering

on the completion of the north-south corridor, a project which has been talked about and sabotaged by those opposite for 50 years.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The final 10.5 kilometres—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will cease interjecting!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —will be delivered. It's a major investment.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** In fact, it's the largest infrastructure project in the history of the state and will create up to 4,000 jobs, but that's not where it ends. The member for Elder knows that we are putting more money into the project, the Springbank/Goodwood/Daws Road intersection, a very important project and a project that she has lobbied for and we are very happy to accept it's a very important project.

Also down south—and it hasn't got a lot of publicity but it is a very important project—is the Line Zero project, which is a collaboration between the Flinders University and BAE. This is a very important project and it's going to be funded out of the Economic and Business Growth Fund.

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

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It is really an initiative looking at an industrial-scale testing and training environment to support the rollout of jobs in the defence sector as we start to build those excellent, excellent Hunter class frigates right here in South Australia.

We are building what matters to the people of South Australia and we are creating those jobs. The feedback that we have received so far has been outstanding. Let me tell you what some people have been saying. First of all, can I tell you what has been said by—this is a name I recall: Daniel Gannon from the Property Council. He says, 'This budget, I think, shines a bright green light to investors—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member on my left!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —looking to come to South Australia, invest their capital.' That's what the Property Council is saying.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kaurna!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** What's Business SA saying? They say, 'This is a budget which the business community can be confident with.' Fantastic news! In my own portfolio, tourism supremo, head of the Tourism Industry Council of South Australia, Shaun de Bruyn, has welcomed a budget saying, 'It's fantastic to see the Treasurer really seeing the importance of jobs and businesses in our sector and we have seen some good announcements today around nature-based tourism and some new investments in building infrastructure and visitor experience.' We are delivering jobs and economic growth for our state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The time for answering the question has expired. Before I call the deputy leader, I warn the member for Cheltenham, I warn the member for Wright, I warn the member Badcoe, I warn the member for Kaurna, and I warn the member for West Torrens for a second time.

**ELECTRIC VEHICLES**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier conduct any modelling on the impact that the electric car tax would have on the take-up of electric vehicles prior to announcing the additional charging stations?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:18):** Our government welcomes this focus on this outstanding electric vehicle program that we have: \$18.3 million to help enable, in partnership with industry, a new statewide fast charging network, \$3 million of which will be incorporated into smart charging as the Premier has already mentioned. Another key facet of this program—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —is that the \$80 million Fleet SA expenditure will start to transition away from diesel and petrol engines towards electric vehicles. We are putting our money where our mouth is. We are going to lead by example. Why are we doing this? Because we know that the cost of electric vehicles is coming down, we know that we want to contribute to help it come down faster and faster and we know that we need to put a fast charging network throughout all of regional South Australia as well as in metropolitan South Australia. People will have the opportunity to charge their electric vehicles at their homes, whether they live in the city or the country, but when they travel they will need a fast charging network so that they can travel comfortably and not have to stop for too long.

When it comes to travelling—and those opposite are asking how we are going to pay for our roads. It's very interesting. If you listen to the people opposite, Mr Speaker, they would have you believe that this has never been done before. That's just not true. Most people would consider the state of California in the United States to be the world leader with regard to the delivery of electric vehicle uptake in their state.

So to the member opposite's question with regard to modelling: we have looked very closely at what is done in California. They are the leaders; they are having the most success in this way. They recover funds towards the road network maintenance and development in exactly this way. We are saying we think we will have a look at it also. It is important to say that this measure will come to parliament. It will come to parliament, so everybody in this chamber and in the other house will have the opportunity to look at exactly what's on the table when the time is right.

Let me give you another example of why we know that this will only be a good thing for the rollout of electric vehicles: (1) it's proven to work elsewhere, and (2) we know that we will not be the only people in Australia—we will not be the only jurisdiction in Australia—to do exactly this. It is coming. Why is it coming? Because it's fair.

Anybody in this chamber, particularly those opposite, who believes that this should not go ahead—it means that what they want to do is penalise those people who drive petrol and diesel vehicles. Every single person in all of the electorates of all of those people opposite will be penalised when they drive petrol and diesel vehicles if we do not bring in this measure of fairness to ensure that drivers of electric vehicles are making a contribution as well.

Do you know what? Drivers of electric vehicles and potential drivers of electric vehicles are not complaining about this. They are not complaining about it. When you look at the cost of the vehicle, the saving in fuel, the lower maintenance and all the things that are incorporated into the cost of the life of running a vehicle—the things you look at when you're making your purchase decision—this will not be part of it. This will absolutely not be part of it.

Let me just finish by saying that an MG branded electric vehicle which a year ago retailed for \$50,000 now retails for \$44,000. That saving, which we are helping to contribute to with our programs, swamps any of the concerns of those opposite.

**ELECTRIC VEHICLES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware his own budget papers say that his electric car tax will include a variable charge based on distance travelled?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is on two warnings.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)**  
**(14:23):** Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Minister for Energy and Mining has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Mr Speaker, there is—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —no doubt whatsoever the Premier knows everything that's in the budget. He knows absolutely everything that is in the budget, and if those opposite—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —could put together a cogent question on any topic, he will be on top of it without any doubt whatsoever. So this charge—currently, petrol and diesel vehicle drivers pay a charge towards the road maintenance and road network development through the purchase of fuel. Directly, the purchase of fuel goes to the kilometres travelled; it goes to their share of their use of the road. We are applying exactly the same logic. Exactly the same logic is how this will be rolled out. More information will be available—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** No. That's a commonwealth tax; this is a state tax. They're different.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** More information will be available for those opposite. This is a very small part of our \$18.9 million expenditure to help bring down the cost of electric vehicles and to help increase and develop the charging network.

Members opposite think they have found one tiny chink of a problem. It is not true—it is absolutely not true. This is a very positive rollout. This is being done overseas. This will be done in other states in Australia. It will be done by Labor governments in other states in Australia.

We are working on developing the electric vehicle charging network. We have a draft of where that will be already. We have money on the table to partner with industry to invest in this new network. We are using our own purchasing capacity through Fleet SA to buy electric vehicles. That has already started and will only accelerate.

It shouldn't be a surprise to the Leader of the Opposition that it is entirely appropriate to have a charge such as this connected directly to the kilometres travelled. That makes perfect sense. It is how it works now and it is how it will work in the future. This is, again, a part of our overall program.

One of the things that is part of this important program is the capacity for the uptake of electric vehicles to reduce the cost of electricity for everybody in South Australia, whether they have an electric vehicle or not. This is already happening overseas. The cost of electricity across—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I know they don't understand. They don't understand. It is way past them. It is modelled. It is—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** It has been modelled overseas—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting. The member for Wright is warned for a second time. The minister has the call.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens can leave for 20 minutes under 137A. The minister has the call.

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The uptake of electric vehicles across South Australia will help to decrease the cost of electricity for all South Australians, even those who don't have electric vehicles. It is a fact. It may have gone over the heads of those opposite, but the \$3 million going towards smart charging technology is exactly what is going to help other people across South Australia. There are many positive facets to this program.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for King, I warn the member for Mawson and I call to order and warn the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport.

### TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:27):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall government is busting congestion, improving road safety, increasing access to better public transport services and building what matters in the north-east?

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:27):** Thank you very much—

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Unfortunately, the question includes argument: 'busting congestion', 'improving', 'building what matters'. These are all argumentative conjectures in the question and should be ruled out of order or asked to be reworded.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. Some terms of art have been used. I invite the member for King to reword the question, but I will give the member for King another opportunity.

**Ms LUETHEN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is planning to bust congestion, improve road safety and increase access to better transport services in the north-east?

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am sorry, sir, but the member for King fails on her use of the adjectives, not the verbs—the 'bust' congestion. It is not the 'planning' that means she has escaped her breach of standing orders.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right! The objection is to the use of the term of—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** 'Bust' congestion. It is argumentative, sir, and it is prohibited by standing order 97.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my right! The Minister for Education is called to order.

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Would you like a grammar lesson, Vickie? Would you like a grammar lesson? I mean, you talk so much, I thought you would be across it.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I will give the member for King one more go. Exception has been taken to the use of the word 'bust' or 'busting' for its use that might be regarded as in terms argumentative. The member for King has the call.

**Ms LUETHEN:** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is planning to improve road safety, reduce congestion, increase access to better public transport services and build what matters in the north-east?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Can I thank the member for King for her tireless work and her wonderful question. I tell you: we are going to do it by busting congestion. That's how we are going to do it, and we are going to build what matters for the people of South Australia and in particular the people of the north-east. I know that previously the people of that region were very poorly represented before the new member for King came along and the new member for Newland. Haven't they done an outstanding job since being elected—

**Ms BEDFORD:** Point of order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —in 2018 for their local community?

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

**Ms BEDFORD:** I take offence at saying the people of the north-east—

**The SPEAKER:** I'm sorry, I couldn't hear the member for Florey. The member for Florey on a point of order.

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** You have not been in the government for quite some time.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I take offence—

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier will cease interjecting. The member for Florey on a point of order.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I take offence to the minister saying the people of the north-east have been poorly represented in this place.

**The SPEAKER:** To the extent that the minister was referring in any way to the member for Florey, the member for Florey having taken offence, I ask that the minister withdraw.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I withdraw any offence to the member for Florey and say she has done an outstanding job since she left the Labor Party. She has been absolutely wonderful for the people of the north-east, but I was referring to the member for King and the member for Newland and the great job they are doing in the north-east. As you would know, the Marshall Liberal government is building what matters for South Australia. As the Premier has pointed out, there is a \$16.7 billion infrastructure spend, an infrastructure spend this state has never seen before.

In doing so, one of the projects we are looking at is the \$30 million upgrade to Golden Grove stage 2 after the member for King and also the member for Newland fought very hard for Golden Grove stage 1. The people of the north-east, and I am sure even in the member for Florey's electorate, would appreciate how good that is. It is a wonderful piece of infrastructure, and it is delivering great outcomes for the people in that region. Stage 1 has been delivered. We have been able to roll over straightaway into stage 2, delivering a \$30 million project that will create jobs along the way and deliver the infrastructure the people of that region need.

The Marshall government undertook the North East Public Transport Study. That explored options to upgrade the O-Bahn to Golden Grove, and it found a series of intersection upgrades was the preferred option. These intersection upgrades will include Grenfell Road-Golden Grove Road, Milne Road-Golden Grove Road and North East Road/Modbury Avenue/Golden Grove Road. These intersection upgrades will include bus priority jump lanes to reduce the time it takes to access the O-Bahn via public transport by about a minute for the people in that region.

Other options to extend the existing O-Bahn would have seen dozens of homes demolished—and that's not what the local members wanted—and around 300 trees removed at a

price tag of \$250 million. So \$250 million to remove all those trees and all those homes was not a good use of taxpayer money, and that was the finding of the North East Public Transport Study. The Marshall government does not think that bulldozing homes is a good move just to get that minimal investment in timesaving, spending \$250 million along the way.

Instead, we are delivering intersection upgrades that will reduce travel times for people catching buses and require no acquisition of homes along the way. When we talk about the O-Bahn service to the north-east, that brings me to the O-Bahn itself. Of course, in the most recent budget, again the member for King is delighted to have delivered for her community and secured the commitment to double the size of the Golden Grove park-and-ride, which is an absolutely outstanding achievement.

Again, she has advocated hard for this for her community and she is delivering. There is \$25 million in the budget, again for her community, to go with the money that was already there, so there is \$33 million going into that project. The extra cars that will be able to park there will be able to use this facility. It will make it far better for the people in her local community. They will be able to access the O-Bahn far more quickly.

When we talk about people representing the north-east and doing an outstanding job, the member for King is doing a brilliant job, as is the member for Newland. To be delivering projects like this, which are all part of our big infrastructure spend, to build what matters for South Australia, get people moving, get people where they need to go much faster on much smoother roads and delivering jobs at the same time, just goes to show that two members working hard in their communities can get great outcomes for the people of South Australia.

They will continue to do that, and this government will continue to deliver for South Australia as we spend that \$16.7 billion over the next four years to build what matters for our state.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order and the member for Playford is warned. I call the deputy leader.

### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** My question is to the Minister for Energy. Will the minister follow California's policy on electric vehicle subsidies? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Dr CLOSE:** The minister, in answer to a previous question, pointed at California's road user charge. I believe the minister was referring to a \$100 registration charge that California has for electric vehicles. However, California also has a \$7,000 subsidy for purchasing electric vehicles, and I'm interested in whether that means he will be completely following the policy of California.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:35):** In fact, I can inform the house that California is following us. California is actually looking at South Australia and saying, 'Look what a great job they are doing in energy down there.' They are looking at how simultaneously we are reducing the cost of electricity, we are making the supply of electricity more reliable and we are reducing emissions.

Do you know what they notice in California? In California, they notice how different things are now from how they were before. People in California looked at South Australia and saw an increase of \$477 over two years in the cost of electricity to the average South Australian in the last two years of the previous Labor government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Cheltenham is warned for a second time.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Of course, now they see a \$158 reduction in electricity for the average household in South Australia. They see blackouts, including—they don't like us to refer to it too often—one statewide blackout that happened back in 2016 under the previous government.

**Dr CLOSE:** Point of order: relevance. The question is about a subsidy for purchasing electric vehicles.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order.

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have the point of order. The question related directly to a comparison between California and South Australia. The minister is answering the question. The minister has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. In California they have noticed that we have not had one event of forced load shedding in South Australia in the last two years. These are challenging times, and I lose sleep over it. I'm not saying it is easy, but industry, government and regulators have all pulled their weight and all worked incredibly hard to make a big difference there. Simultaneously, emissions are reducing.

I don't know exactly what the penetration of electric vehicles is in the total fleet in California—I could look that up, and I will look that up—but the federal government says that in five years, in 2025, it expects a 27 per cent penetration, a 27 per cent share of the total fleet of passenger vehicles across Australia. Our ambitions are higher than that, our ambitions are higher than any other state in Australia and they are in fact higher than the state of California. We are looking around the world. We see that they have used the road user charge in the way we intend to do.

As I said before, we will make sure that everybody in this parliament gets a chance to look at exactly what is on the table before they decide how they are going to vote on it. With regard to the question about a subsidy—I think it was a \$7,000 subsidy—we have just seen a \$6,000 decrease in the cost, the retail price, of an electric vehicle from last year to this year. Our policies are working,

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Perhaps in California they hand over \$7,000 of taxpayers' money to give to the manufacturer. Do you know what we do in South Australia, Mr Speaker? We apply our energy policies in the smartest way possible so that the manufacturer hands over the \$6,000 to the consumer. It is a much, much smarter way to go.

So we look across the world. We don't think we know everything. We are learning every day from other jurisdictions, but we are trying very hard to make sure that the taxpayers of South Australia, the motorists of South Australia, the electricity consumers of South Australia, get the very best deal possible. Sometimes the smartest way is to use taxpayers' money to make it happen; sometimes it's not the smartest way to make it happen. We don't believe that it's just always about handing out a subsidy.

A \$6,000 reduction—from \$50,000 to \$44,000 in one year, retail price of that vehicle—is very significant, and that is a much better way of doing things than handing over a \$7,000 subsidy of taxpayers' money to the manufacturer. Keep in mind that money will go straight towards the purchase price of the vehicle, not towards the new purchaser of the vehicle.

#### INDIGENOUS DISADVANTAGE

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:40):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, what information can you provide the house on the Aboriginal Affairs Executive Committee working group to address the over-representation of Aboriginal people within the justice sector, and what new and additional powers will it have to effect positive change?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:40):** I thank the member for her question. What we have done in the government is to set up a working group—in fact, four working groups—to look at the major themes that have been contained in the Closing the Gap report, and one of those is the one that the member for Florey referred to earlier. What we have done with the working group that we have established is to have co-chairs, and these co-chairs mirror the co-chairs that were set up for the joint council, which looked at that refresh.

So we have an Aboriginal member of the Public Service, together with a chief executive of one of our departments. Importantly, in the area that the member referred to, we don't have the chief executive of the department that is responsible specifically for this. We have brought in another chief executive to do that work because we genuinely want to have the whole of the senior management council or committee here in South Australia focused on delivering significantly better outcomes for the people of the state.

I don't have the names of the joint chairs of the committee that the member refers to. I suspect that—in fact, I'm not going to guess, but I'm happy to provide that information to the member and, in fact, to the house. I think this is a very innovative way. It mirrors the work of the very successful refresh of the Closing the Gap strategy.

What we are also going to be doing is to look at making sure that what we do with the refresh of our Aboriginal action plan in South Australia is to bring those and put them together as much as possible so we don't have one document, which is the state government's response to the Closing the Gap refresh, and then a second response in terms of the Aboriginal action plan. We want to bring them both together.

We know that the federal government has made it very clear that they want a significant improvement in outcomes for Aboriginal Australians from the refresh, and we applaud the work that Pat Turner and Ken Wyatt did in chairing that council. We had representation on the committee from South Australia with Ruth Miller. She and I sat on that on behalf of South Australia. We have significantly increased our resourcing of our response to that Closing the Gap report, and you would have seen that in the budget that was handed down in this place on Tuesday.

We are taking our responsibilities very seriously. There is much to do, but I am feeling very optimistic with the refresh that has been presented at the federal level. Now the ball is in our court to do what we can at the subnational level to make sure that we align with the aspirations of that refresh.

#### INDIGENOUS DISADVANTAGE

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:43):** Supplementary: to date, Premier, how much success has there been in closing the gap in South Australia?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43):** A slightly odd question to ask because the refresh was only handed down, I think, four or five weeks ago, so the answer to that in truth is not much. As I said in my previous answer, there was a huge amount of work which was put into that refresh. This was something that was taken to COAG. I'm just trying to remember exactly when, but I think it probably would have been in late 2018. What was discussed in COAG was that we needed to have a different approach.

The Closing the Gap methodology, which was put in place under the previous Labor government following the national apology, hadn't worked and hadn't delivered. The time for the refresh gave us an opportunity to go back to including more Indigenous voices in the framing of what the objects of the Closing the Gap strategy were about. We welcomed that. We resourced that. We wanted to make sure that the Coalition of Peaks, who were represented in South Australia at the national level by Cheryl Axleby, had their say in the development of that plan and then, ultimately, we all worked together.

I have to say I was on that teleconference that finally signed off on that refresh. It was quite an incredible meeting. I have to say it was expertly chaired by Pat Turner, a very passionate health leader in Australia. Many people thought that the refresh would run very late because of COVID. Many people thought that what we would do would be to essentially delay and push off for another year. The Prime Minister was very focused on getting that refresh completed this year, so was Ken Wyatt and so was Pat Turner.

What transpired was everybody redoubled their effort during a very difficult year to make sure we had input from the Aboriginal controlled enterprises right across South Australia through their representative on that council of peaks, Cheryl Axleby. That was all fed in. Ultimately, the new themes were developed. What the success will be remains to be seen, but what we do know is that we have had Aboriginal voices around the table.

This is not a document developed by bureaucrats sitting in isolation thinking about what might be useful to close the gap on a range of metrics. Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people

have been involved in that refresh. Key components of this differ quite significantly, especially around making sure that there can be further Aboriginal controlled enterprise input into the delivery of the plan and also a very significant focus on building capability around governance. So there are some very good new themes and objectives. We are taking it very seriously.

We hope to have our response to this new document developed very quickly. We don't want to overly rush it. I am not promising it in the next couple of weeks, but what I can say is that we have acted very swiftly to put in place a very good mechanism for consultation so that we can work with the Coalition of Peaks, the Aboriginal controlled enterprises and the Public Service in South Australia to have our response in a timely way.

### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier consult with his Climate Change Council before announcing his new electric car tax?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:47):** Thank you for the question, an important question. It has been made very clear that we have consulted and there is still more consultation to go. There is plenty more to go. As it happens, I have a meeting this afternoon with the chair of the Premier's Climate Change Council. We have announced our intention. We have made it very clear that we will develop the model in more detail, that we will consult all along the way. That consultation will be broad and deep. We will do exactly that.

Again, I say it will come to parliament. Everybody here will have the opportunity to consider what is put on the table in front of them. There is no secret here. It was made clear in many different ways over the last 48 or so hours that there has been consultation enough and enough other examples around the world to give us confidence that this is the right way to go. But we will do more consultation as we work our way through it and develop the model in more detail. We have a broad structure. We will develop more detail and we will consult with as many people as we possibly can and as we think is appropriate on this issue.

Let me just come back to the core component here. I would be very surprised—very, very surprised—if those opposite actually wanted to penalise all of the people in their electorates who drive petrol and diesel vehicles by making sure that a smaller and smaller percentage of the total vehicle fleet over time, i.e., those who drive petrol and diesel vehicles, need to actually fund the entire road use. I would be very surprised.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** But they don't. It's not how fuel excise works.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for West Torrens!

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** It's not how fuel excise works; it's pretty simple.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I would be very surprised if the members opposite wanted to penalise all their constituents who drive petrol and diesel vehicles by making sure that that cohort, which over time will become a smaller and smaller percentage of the fleet, has to still fund the entire 100 per cent contribution. So, as we—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Elizabeth is called to order.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee will cease interjecting. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** How about if I use the numbers that I mentioned before? It is predicted by the Australian government that, in 2025, 27 per cent of the passenger vehicle fleet across Australia will be electric vehicles. Do those members opposite genuinely want the other 73 per cent that remains to be the only ones who make this contribution? I am sure they do

not. I am sure they do not want to penalise that other 73 per cent. Let me say again: we will consult on this; we will consult with everybody.

The question was particularly about the Premier's Climate Change Council. Yes, of course they will be considered as well—yes, of course they will be. As I said, I have a meeting with the chair of that council this afternoon.

This is part of an \$18.3 million program to improve the charging network, to get smart charging available and also to use the \$80 million state government budget on fleet vehicles to make sure that the cost of these vehicles goes down and down, to make sure that concerns about range anxiety go down and down, and it's going to work.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: his time has expired.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I have the point of order. The minister's time has expired.

### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on what action the Marshall Liberal government is taking to turbo-Tom charge the adoption of electric vehicles here in South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! The member for Lee on a point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It should be ruled out of order, Mr Speaker: it contains argument and debate—standing order 97.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, the leader and the member for West Torrens!

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Deaf and stupid.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will leave again if he continues to interject. I uphold the point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: members opposite are throwing interjections at us constantly, and you only seem to point us out when we respond. That is unfair and biased.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Yes, I bet you there isn't.

**The SPEAKER:** The member will resume his seat. I uphold the point of order of the member for Lee. The member for Chaffey will have one opportunity to rephrase the question. The member for Chaffey has the call.

**Mr WHETSTONE:** Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on what action the Marshall Liberal government is taking to supercharge the adoption of electric vehicles in South Australia?

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Mr Speaker, the use of the term 'supercharge' once again offends standing order 97. How many times do we have to raise this for government-written Dorothy Dixers?

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. I will move along. Is there a member seeking the call? The member for Lee.

### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:54):** My question is to the Minister for Energy. How will the government be informed of the distance travelled by an electric vehicle so that the variable charge based on the distance travelled can be applied by the government as the tax?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:54):** As I have said, we have done some homework, we have done a fair bit of research, we have looked at what works around the world and we have outlined the framework that we intend to deliver; and, as I have said a few times now, there is more work to do with regard to getting the details figured out. But to the member's question, there are a few ways that it could work. It could work potentially with GPS technology. It could work—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —just from an odometer reading—just declare your odometer reading. How many kilometres did you drive? It could be done, perhaps, service to service. It could just be that, when a vehicle comes in for a service, a qualified mechanic says, 'The odometer has changed from this point to this point. That's how many kilometres this vehicle has driven.'

It could be that the driver, the owner of the vehicle, declares the kilometres charged, and perhaps there are random checks. This is not—

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** You use fuel on private roads, too.

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is called to order. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** This will be very much about kilometres travelled in exactly the same way as existing fuel excise works. There are numerous ways in which it could be done. The government has not ruled in or ruled out any of these opportunities.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will cease interjecting. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The government has not ruled in or ruled out any of the ways that it could be done. We will do consultation, we will do our homework, we will look around the other jurisdictions that already do this. We will work in consultation with the other jurisdictions that will soon be doing this and we will come up with a very sensible, very fair, very effective way of delivering as suggested, and, Mr Speaker, everybody in this chamber will get a chance to have a look at it when it comes before parliament.

I say, again, that this is a part of our \$18.3 million electric vehicle rollout. It is focused very much on getting that charging network going. It is focused on making sure that smart charging is available. It is focused on making sure that the government uses its own fleet purchases to full advantage to help drive down the cost of vehicles, and it is also focused on making sure that drivers of other than electric vehicles are not penalised along the way—very important, Mr Speaker.

We are a very fair and open government trying to make sure that this works as well as possible for absolutely everybody. So, when we see in five years' time 27 per cent of new vehicle purchases rolling out being electric vehicles we will see that we have a fair approach so that those people who still have petrol and diesel vehicles are being treated fairly and those people who have electric vehicles are being treated fairly.

If the member opposite is suggesting that by doing it in any other way than at least in part being based on a per kilometre charge, then he will be very welcome to provide an amendment when this comes to parliament. It will be there for everybody to see. If he's got a good suggestion he can put it forward. In advance of the legislation coming, at the time of the legislation coming, that

opportunity will exist for all members in this chamber, and, of course in the other house as well. A per kilometre method is a sensible method.

### ELECTRIC VEHICLES

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:58):** My question is again to the Minister for Energy. Who will be responsible for holding this distance data within government?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:58):** The member opposite knows that there is not an answer to that question because I have just explained a few ways that it could be done. I have also explained that there are many other ways that it could be done. It would not be possible to answer that question until the methodology has been determined, so who in government will hold this information depends in very large part on how the information is collected and how the information is used.

We will be looking for a sensible, easy, effective, low-cost way of doing this, and we know that this is going to work. This is one facet of our electric vehicle strategy and it is already working. We already have electric vehicles in the Fleet SA fleet. More and more of them will become clearly evident. Members opposite will very soon be able to ask for an electric vehicle if they would like to. If they would like to stay with petrol and diesel, I am sure they will be welcome to do that as well. I am not running Fleet SA, other than to say our government will make sure the opportunity exists for members opposite to do this if they want to in the near future.

It will be a fast charging network from Ceduna to Mount Gambier, from Marla to the bottom of Yorke Peninsula. I don't know if there is actually going to—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, standing order 98: the minister is now debating the question. The question was quite specific about who in government would be responsible for holding the data that is required to be furnished to it in order for the tax to be charged. He has already said that he doesn't have an answer and now he is just continuing on, debating other points.

**The SPEAKER:** There will be no argument on the point of order. The question was quite specific. I have the point of order. The minister will direct his answer to the question. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Yes, sir, I am certainly happy to do that, but of course, in a very helpful manner, I want to provide as much information to the opposition as possible. They have asked a lot of questions on this topic today, so I want to make sure they are as informed as possible on this topic. As the Premier has courteously helped me, 'from Marla to Maitland' would be a good way to describe the north-south breadth of this new charging network we are rolling out.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order: he was just discussing something which had nothing to do with the substance of the question about a statewide charging network. You upheld the point of order, redirected him to the substance of the question and he went straight back to the irrelevant—

**The Hon. V.A. Tarzia:** What number?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It's 98, and if the former Speaker isn't aware of that that's his problem.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! There is no occasion for exchanges across the chamber. The minister will direct his answer to the question.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Yes, I will, Mr Speaker. Of course, the member's question about where the information will be held needs to be considered in the prism of things like the previous government privatising Land Services information. Where will the government hold information? Where will that information be held? If the previous government had that information, they would have flogged it. That's what they would have done.

We will make sure that it is done in a very sensible, responsible way. We will be looking after all the motorists in South Australia. We will do everything that we possibly can to make sure that we continue to deliver lower cost of living to all South Australians, as we are doing. You see us every

day, working hard on exactly that. It was in the budget speech just the other day that it's a reduction of over \$800 per year, on average, per household, in cost of living under our government.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order: this is now the fourth attempt to try to get the minister to answer the question, albeit, of course, he has already said in his opening remarks that he has no answer to that question.

**Mr Whetstone:** What number?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It's 98.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Do you want me to carve it into you, Tim?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Chaffey will not interject. The member for Lee will not introduce argument in the point of order. I have the point of order. I have directed the minister now more precisely to respond to the question. The minister has the call. The minister will respond to the question.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Notwithstanding the fact that 'Do you want me to carve it into you?' is not an appropriate thing to say to any member of parliament, what I said in my answer is that the member opposite knows from my previous answers that there actually isn't an answer that exists to the question that he has asked. I can only assume, given that he knows that, it was actually some other information that he was after. So I am trying to provide him as much other information as I possibly can on this topic.

We are incredibly focused on our policy. We know that we are going to make our electric vehicle policy work. We know that rolling out the smart charging network across the state, the fast charging network across the state helping electric vehicles reduce the cost of electricity for all other electricity consumers across the state, is going to work. We are going to do it in a way that is fair, not only to electric vehicle drivers and owners but also to combustion and compression engine vehicle owners and drivers.

## STATE BUDGET

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (15:04):** My question is directed to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. I would ask the minister whether he could advise the house about the investments the Marshall Liberal government is making in order to build a safer and more secure South Australia?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:05):** I thank the honourable member for the question. South Australia at the moment would arguably have to be one of the most safe and secure places in all of the world. Our government is proud to be investing in a whole range of measures—in fact, over \$93 million in the 2020-21 state budget to strengthen the safety and the security of South Australians.

Whether it is at the border, at the Airport, processing travel applications, screening in the Central Assessment Unit or also helping out at the medi-hotel operations, our police, sir, are doing a sterling job, as you would appreciate. SAPOL have worked incredibly hard to keep us safe, and the 2020-21 state budget includes over \$21 million over the next four years to increase police resources so that SAPOL can continue to respond to COVID-19.

Also in the budget is over \$8 million for new personal-issue stab and bullet-resistant vests. Not only did we deliver on our election commitment of the trial but we have gone above and beyond. We want to make sure that we protect those who protect us. Of course, we have also delivered on our election promise to fund a three-month trial, as I alluded to.

Mr Speaker, another historic funding moment you would have seen is in regard to Crime Stoppers. Of course, those opposite ignored Crime Stoppers for an extended period of time. Until now, Crime Stoppers SA never received—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —direct funding from the former state government—not a single cent. However, thanks to the strong leadership of our team, Crime Stoppers will receive more than \$800,000 over the forward estimates. The Marshall Liberal government are supporting South Australian police to protect our communities, and we are investing in their safety too. We are building a safer South Australia and we are building what matters.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:07):** I move without notice:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me move a motion without notice forthwith in respect of the workplace review by the equal opportunity commissioner.

**The SPEAKER:** There being an absolute majority of members present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

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

Motion carried.

*Motions*

**PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE CULTURE REVIEW**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:07):** I move:

That this house—

1. Notes the prevalence and nature of harassment in the parliamentary workplace, including the perception of workplace culture, the impact of any harassment on individuals and the workplace culture, and any contributing factors to the prevalence of harassment.
2. Requests that the equal opportunity commissioner consider the reporting of harassment in the parliamentary workplace, including existing complaint mechanisms and any cultural and structural barriers, including potential victimisation, to reporting.
3. Requests that the commissioner undertakes a review into the response to complaints made about harassment in the parliamentary workplace, including legal and policy mechanisms in place governing responses, any sanctions available where harassment is confirmed and the way incidents of harassment have been handled by the parliamentary workplace in the recent past.
4. Requests that the commissioner provides recommendations as to—
  - (a) any action that should be taken to increase awareness as to the impact of harassment and improve culture, including training and the role of leadership in promoting a culture that prevents workplace harassment;
  - (b) any legislative, regulatory, administrative, legal or policy gaps that should be addressed in the interests of enhancing protection against and providing appropriate responses to harassment; and
  - (c) other action necessary to address harassment in the parliamentary workplace.

In so moving the motion, I wish to briefly address the circumstances surrounding the presentation. I move this motion in the terms consistent with discussions with the acting equal opportunity commissioner. I have been advised by her, and have confirmed, that she has had conversations with both the President of the Legislative Council and you, sir, as the Speaker of our House of Assembly. She has outlined in correspondence to the presiding officers that she is willing and able to undertake a review of the handling of harassment in the South Australian parliamentary workplace at a cost to be met by the parliament.

Also included in this correspondence were terms of reference, which have been adapted and contained in the motion that I have just read out to the parliament. Consequently, the motion is narrower and, I would suggest, less ambiguous in comparison to previous motions but indeed reflects the terms of reference proposed by the acting commissioner herself.

I am confident that it captures what members of the parliament wish to see. I acknowledge the member for Reynell has presented a motion to the parliament herself and, indeed, has taken an active interest in this matter but, as I repeat, this has been drafted consistent with the proposal of the acting equal opportunity commissioner herself.

Members will be aware that the Legislative Council passed a motion in February this year to progress an inquiry by the equal opportunity commissioner; however, that did not progress. There is value in both houses agreeing to a review being undertaken to ensure that all members have the opportunity to contribute if they wish.

Consulting the acting equal opportunity commissioner is evidence that this matter needs to come to a conclusion. I should confirm, of course, that the equal opportunity commissioner, who was extant at the time of the previous motion, has since left South Australia. The parliament has already noted the appointment of Ms Emily Strickland as the acting equal opportunity commissioner.

To be effective, obviously, it is clear that this needs to be across the whole of parliament. To ensure this review is undertaken and concluded in a timely manner—again, this is an issue that has been raised by the member for Reynell—I propose to seek an extension of the acting equal opportunity commissioner's appointment, which, of course, is a cabinet decision. I look forward to reading the recommendations of her report, therefore, early in the new year. In those circumstances, I commend the motion to the house.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:11):** I rise briefly to speak in support of this motion. As the Attorney-General mentioned, I did move a similar motion a number of weeks ago. In speaking to this motion, I do place on record my disappointment that debate on that motion was not supported when I moved it in this place a number of weeks ago; in fact, every attempt I made to expedite this important debate at this time and to speak at length about the appalling prevalence of sexual harassment in South Australian workplaces was shut down.

Notwithstanding that, we will support this motion so that this review that has long been called for can be conducted by our acting South Australian equal opportunity commissioner. This review has the potential to ensure the culture of our parliament does not tolerate sexual harassment and that it is doing all that it can to prevent it from occurring at all and to ensure appropriate, robust, internal processes are in place to deal with any incidences of it. I believe that this review will send a clear message to every person in this place, to staff members, visitors and our community that we as a parliament believe that harassment is utterly unacceptable in any setting and that sound, appropriate processes are crucial in eradicating it.

Sexual harassment is experienced by way too many women in workplaces and in many other areas of life right here in our state. Unfortunately, our parliament is no exception. Our South Australian community has been somewhat perplexed about why particular sorts of inappropriate behaviours occur in parliament with little to no consequences for perpetrators, whilst if other workers engaged in them, they would be sacked.

Unchecked, harassment occurring in this place can be an impediment to attracting women into parliament, and a lack of clear process and procedure for dealing with it and any other inappropriate behaviour is more than an impediment; it is a firm deterrent. Progressing this review gives our parliament a chance to clearly say to our community that we as a parliament believe this review and our workplace culture are important. It represents an opportunity to make things better for us, for future generations of parliamentarians and for our community as a whole.

The Equal Opportunity Commission's own website sets out detailed advice for workplaces in dealing with harassment. This advice absolutely focuses on the need for every step to be taken to prevent harassment from happening before it starts. The review that this motion contemplates can help us to take those steps. The impact on those who are harassed can be terrible. It can feel embarrassing, frightening, sickening, debilitating and oppressive. It can impact mental, physical and emotional health and wellbeing and relationships. In this place and everywhere else, and as the equal opportunity commissioner suggests, we must do all that we can to prevent and end it.

Creating workplaces free from harassment must include our own. Our community expects nothing less. I thank the acting equal opportunity commissioner for offering her services to the review and look forward to the recommendations.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Mr Speaker, I have taken your advice, and I move:

That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

Motion carried.

### *Grievance Debate*

### **STATE BUDGET**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:16):** It is pretty obvious to everyone in the chamber that the government has finally jumped the shark. When it comes to electric vehicles, I feel a lot of sympathy for the Minister for Energy. I can only imagine being told by the Treasurer that I have to implement and roll out a brand-new tax on electric vehicles. The Premier, in explaining that he is rolling out a new tax on electric vehicles, could not tell us even the basics about how this new tax will work.

Interestingly, this decision had been taken by the cabinet probably weeks ago because the cabinet papers were drawn up, printed and ready to be published today. Last week, the Premier stood up and talked about rolling out EV charging stations for plug-in cars across South Australia as if he were on some road to Damascus and had been converted to the prospect of renewable energy. What he did not say to anyone at that press conference is that he is also going to introduce a brand-new tax.

In the short time this has been public, this tax has been universally condemned around the country by groups that want to see the expansion of renewable energy and a transition away from fossil fuels towards a green low-carbon future, something that this opposition, in government, championed. We were champions of it and criticised because of it by the government.

I will leave the discussion about the EV tax to the future because I suspect we will see the Premier coming in with a backflip relatively soon. He is the type of person, in my experience, who will stand up to anything but pressure. When that pressure is applied, he will act as he has on every new tax he has applied. On land tax, he backflipped. He will backflip on this too. Of course, if he does not backflip, the Labor opposition stands ready to protect people who believe in the transition.

I also point out to the energy minister that, in the logic he is using, it would automatically remove the diesel rebate for every mining company that gets a diesel rebate for driving on roads that they build themselves because they do not contribute to other roads. If it is about a universal charge, sure, but that is not what it is about. I also point out to the government that fuel excise is not a state-based tax. We lost that argument in the High Court a long time ago. We lost that argument: it is exclusively a commonwealth charge.

What the government is talking about is introducing a new state-based charge on cars, the equivalent of a toll on electric vehicles. The minister today would not even rule out a government-mandated GPS in your car. Just think about what that means. I think the government and Treasury are again planning—I think ambitiously—in terms of revenue here, given the massive deficit the government is running. I suspect this project will not last long.

In my remaining two minutes I want to speak about South Road. I congratulate the government on finally coming up with a plan for South Road. It was the fourth iteration of their plans; they delayed it four times. Two ministers, three budgets and we are finally there, we finally know what they are planning to do in five years' time.

With that project beginning in five years' time, they need to go out and consult now. They need to be talking to people now in the western suburbs and the south-western suburbs about exactly what this means, because the graphics they have released are ambiguous and the information they have given is vague. People's anxiety levels have been relieved in some parts and elevated in others. The minister has met with some groups but not others.

The place now for the government is to treat everyone equally. Meet all groups. Give the parents in the member for Badcoe's seat the security they need; they need to know what is happening. The member for Badcoe will continue to fight for those residents and continue to stand

up for those residents, but it is important that the government now be proactive: brief the member for Badcoe, brief the member for Elder, brief me on their plans.

Thus far we have heard nothing. We will find out more in estimates—at least I hope so, because the government has given us only half an hour for infrastructure. I wonder why Corey Wingard does not want much scrutiny.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for West Torrens' time has expired.

### ELDER ELECTORATE

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:21):** I rise today as part of the Marshall Liberal government which, led by the Premier, is working to help create more jobs and better lives for all South Australians. We are building what matters, creating thousands of local jobs and better lives for people all across our great state, with a record investment in roads, hospitals, schools, housing and infrastructure.

What does all this mean for people in my local community, in the great electorate of Elder? It means we are reactivating the Repat into a thriving health precinct, just as we promised. We are now reaching significant and exciting construction milestones as part of our commitment to redevelop the site into a thriving health precinct. Up to 400 new jobs have recently been created at that site, and in this budget we have announced \$6 million for a step-down unit to care for brain and spinal patients at the new site. This builds on the great investment we have already made at the Repat.

We are also delivering an \$8.5 million capital upgrade to the Flinders Medical Centre emergency department. The emergency department capacity will increase by up to 30 treatment spaces; it is almost doubling. It is absolutely incredible and is a real game changer for residents in our great South, residents south of the city, particularly in my electorate of Elder, so that they can access the care they need closer to home.

We know that Flinders Medical Centre has the busiest emergency department in the whole state, and we are committed to ensuring that the hospital is equipped to meet growing demand both now and into the future. Not only is the emergency department going to see capital upgrades but we are also going to see additional doctors and nurses at the site.

Building what matters means investing in the largest ever job creation infrastructure project in South Australia's history. Residents in my electorate are absolutely delighted at the news delivered in the state budget that we will deliver the final section of the north-south corridor. The 10.5-kilometre stretch between the River Torrens and Darlington will be transformed over the next decade, creating up to 4,000 jobs.

Once complete, residents will have access to a nonstop, free-flowing motorway from Gawler to Old Noarlunga, allowing motorists to bypass 21 sets of traffic lights—it is absolutely incredible—and saving up to 24 minutes in travel time. That is almost the equivalent of some sort of episode on Netflix. So people can spend less time in their car and more time doing the things that they love, whatever that might be.

This upgrade of the final section of the South Road corridor will remove 110,000 vehicles from South Road per day. By doing this, it will make it so much easier for residents in my local community to travel east to west and also within and around our local community. Importantly, this project will also save really special iconic places, preserving heritage buildings—and we have heard lots about the Thebarton Theatre and how pleased people are to see that saved.

Building what matters means we are fixing the Springbank Road intersection. I have heard that residents in my local area have waited up to 40 years to see this intersection aligned. I am super proud and pleased that it was our government that developed the plans, engaged the community, listened to their feedback and, importantly, funded the project—and now we are creating jobs by delivering it.

We are certainly getting on with the job, not only with the Springbank Road intersection but also with the Flinders Link project, where we are extending the Tonsley rail line all the way to Flinders Medical Centre. For the very first time, this line will have evening and weekend services. Residents

in Mitchell Park, Clovelly Park, Tonsley are absolutely thrilled with this announcement. Of course, they will also be getting a brand-new Tonsley station.

Building what matters also means that we are investing and upgrading our local schools. We have really significant upgrades happening at Springbank Secondary College, Hamilton Secondary College and Unley High School. Every single secondary student in my electorate is going to benefit from their local public high school being upgraded. We are also upgrading and providing funding to all our government primary schools—it is absolutely incredible—and a number of kindergartens and preschools.

There is so much in this state budget, so much that is not only benefiting South Australia but my electorate as we build better facilities, deliver better services and provide significant crucial jobs, creating economic stimulus for South Australia at a time when it needs it most. We are building what matters.

Time expired.

### REMEMBRANCE DAY

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:27):** Yesterday was of course Remembrance Day and, probably like most members here, I attended a wonderful Remembrance Day service down at McLaren Vale run by the local RSL. A representative at Kingscote on Kangaroo Island, Darry Fraser, also laid a wreath. Normally when we go to Remembrance Day we think back to Beersheba, Gallipoli, the Western Front and to those conflicts where so many men and women have served our country and many have paid the ultimate sacrifice. I was thinking about those people from those conflicts in World War I, World War II and then more recent conflicts, but what came over me during yesterday's ceremony, particularly during the minute's silence, was a more recent example of the wonderful work of our armed forces.

I was thinking of the wonderful young men and women—mainly young—who came to Kangaroo Island in our hour of need back in January this year. I was catching the ferry over to Kangaroo Island on the morning of 6 January, and there were troop carriers going over there and Army officers, some of whom looked quite young, who were part of that contingent. It was a little surreal to be in Australia and to have Army personnel there mixing in with the community, as we saw over the ensuing four, five or six weeks. More than 1,000 men and women from around Australia came to the island in various capacities, and in the middle of January it peaked at 650 personnel.

The Joint Taskforce 1111 Emergency Support Force on Kangaroo Island completed more than 500 discrete tasks that were undertaken by both the regular and reserve members of the Royal Australian Navy, Australian Army and Royal Australian Air Force. I would also like to acknowledge the valuable contribution made by foreign defence force personnel, most notably the C-130 Hercules air crews from Japanese Self-Defense Force and members of the 2<sup>nd</sup> Engineer Regiment of the New Zealand defence force.

There were so many contributions made by these people. I think one of the greatest contributions, as well as all the physical work that was done, was the boost to the mental health of people on the island. You could not miss these men and women from the Australian Defence Force. They were literally everywhere.

They had Army vets—as in veterinarians, not veterans—and veterinarian nurses who were helping with the wildlife, so I have wonderful pictures of these people in their fatigues with washing baskets with koalas in them as they were treating them at the Kangaroo Island Wildlife Park near Parndana. We had generators donated by generous people like BankSA and the Hotels Association, and the Army took control of those and made sure that they were serviced, and then another section delivered them to very grateful people who had lost everything in the bushfires.

Leader of the Opposition, Peter Malinauskas, and I were at the SA Water depot where the Army worked with SA Water engineers from around South Australia to get them to the desalination plant to make sure that potable water could be provided to the people of Kangaroo Island because so much infrastructure had been burnt and it was not safe to get back out to the desalination plant without some sort of protection. So they were ferried out there in these Army vehicles that made it safe.

They cleared hundreds of kilometres of roadside vegetation that had been burnt and had fallen onto the roads. They worked side by side with the BlazeAid people to help rebuild fences and they buried thousands and thousands of head of stock that were killed on farms across half of Kangaroo Island that burnt in those terrible fires in January.

But the great memory that I will never forget was from early February when the Army put on a concert for the people of Kangaroo Island. To have John Schumann singing *I Was Only 19* and Army people with their arms wrapped around locals, whether they were CFS volunteers or ambulance officers, all swaying and dancing with the young children, is something that we should all be very proud of. To all those men and women of the Australian Defence Force who came to Kangaroo Island, on behalf of the people of the island, we thank you from the bottom of our heart.

Lest we forget.

### NEWLAND ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:32):** Today, I would like to speak about some of my recent visits to schools in my electorate. For the third year now I have had the great honour of being the community panel member for the Global Citizens Medal at Banksia Park International High School. To be awarded this medal, students go through an application process where the final part is a presentation to a panel on a topic of their choice.

It is a process where students also demonstrate their commitment to the school community and the broader community. They made a number of very interesting and impressive presentations on a range of topics that included such things as space exploration, mental health awareness in schools, the environmental issues with fast fashion, poverty and education for girls in developing countries and music as a universal language, amongst a number of other topics.

These students also had to give a bit of a brief overview of some of their community involvement, which was quite impressive. It included organising quiz nights for a local mental health support group as well as work with sporting clubs—one particular student was a very good netball umpire and had been doing it from a very young age—as well as volunteers for the local council.

It was certainly a pleasure to once again be part of these medal presentations to see the commitment of the students to addressing and tackling some big issues, either within our local community or global issues, and their commitment to the local community. I would like in particular to acknowledge the efforts of Assistant Principal and Year 12 Manager, Bronwyn Eglinton, in coordinating the medal process.

I also recently had the pleasure of attending the Modbury South Primary School end-of-year concert, *Curious Creatures and Wild Minds*. I would very much like to congratulate the school staff and students, particularly the principal, Sharon Robertson, as well as the music teacher, Mr Trevor Swain, on all their efforts in putting this fantastic concert together. This year certainly presented many challenges and much uncertainty about the ability to hold events such as this, but they persisted nonetheless.

They had the school gym all set up with assigned seats for parents, spaced apart. There were two separate sessions and they had contact tracing sheets and all the other necessary things required to ensure a COVID-safe environment. I know that the principal, in particular, was really thrilled by how much it meant to the students to still be able to hold these performances. It really made all that effort worthwhile. Mr Swain also told me that for a while students were rehearsing for their performances without necessarily being certain about how the concert would actually be held.

They all did a wonderful job. The main feature was a family of teens or tweens watching TV, with individual class groups and year level groups performing shows, including such things as *Ghostbusters*, time travel, Harry Potter, Queen (both the monarch and the band) and much more. There were also two very impressive solo singing performances. I certainly take my hat off to anyone, particularly young people, willing to stand up and sing on their own in front of an audience. Congratulations to the Modbury South Primary School staff and students and the broader school community on such a wonderful event.

One of my favourite events of the year is being a guest judge for the Tea Tree Gully Primary School science fair. Groups of students design an experiment, a display or a poster on a scientific

issue. As always, each group did an amazing job, making my job as a judge—along with Belinda, who is a parent and also a scientist—very difficult.

Highlights included the year 6 and year 7 students who made a hologram using plastic laminate made into a four-sided pyramid and an iPad and managed to have a hologram of fish and a dragonfly. They had to troubleshoot to get it to work, which is certainly real science. A year 1 student made rubber eggs in vinegar and produced a time-lapse video to show how the shell changed over time. Another team created a model volcano that erupted, and another looked at jelly beans and how they broke down in water, lemonade and Coke, and there were many other very worthy projects.

Visiting local schools is certainly one of my favourite things to do as a local member. I congratulate all the staff at schools on their work in what has been a very difficult year, and I wish all students and staff the very best for the rest of 2020.

### UPPER SPENCER GULF

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:37):** Today, I would like to discuss what the Upper Spencer Gulf region has to offer the state in regard to growing our economy across the whole state. In the Upper Spencer Gulf, we have a very strong resource base of energy, minerals, infrastructure, businesspeople and natural attractions. The Upper Spencer Gulf is at the crossroads of Australia, with rail, ports and airfields. It has all the attributes: gas, water, high-voltage powerlines, a national railway network, national highways and, as mentioned before and above all, very dedicated people to achieve a great outcome with regard to employment opportunities and growth for our state.

However, more needs to be done to build on what we have so we can grow opportunities in the Upper Spencer Gulf. Some of those key areas are:

- embracing cleaner energy, not just through additional wind and solar but by placing ourselves in the forefront of the hydrogen opportunity;
- assisting existing export industries to expand, using renewable energy and infrastructure;
- supporting new industries to locate in the region. Due to our multiple sources of energy and how close we are to them, the Upper Spencer Gulf can offer new industry a competitive advantage by locating there;
- opening new frontiers, such as new mines, by investing in secure and renewable energy needed by these industries and refining their ores; and
- investing in universities, TAFE and other institutions essential to developing and improving the workforce.

The Upper Spencer Gulf is blessed with various energy opportunities. We have an abundance of wind and sun for renewables, which Professor Ross Garnaut described at the Global Maintenance forum last year. He stated that the Upper Spencer Gulf has the best attributes for any renewable projects in the world, and in Australia in particular, and the CSIRO reported this year that it is one of the best locations for the production of renewable energy and hydrogen.

Professor Garnaut also stated that, in his view, in a few years with the vast amount of green, clean renewable energy that will be available in the Upper Spencer Gulf and the total battery storage capacities, it would be silly for industries or manufacturing not to consider the Upper Spencer Gulf for manufacturing opportunities.

We also have the world's largest battery, which is located just outside the Jamestown area at Hornsdale. We are also connected to South Australia's gas resources in the Cooper Basin by gas and liquid pipelines with an export facility at Stony Point. We also have an energy or economic corridor along the east coast of the gulf from Two Wells to Whyalla, with strong connection to the electricity grid and thus access to the National Electricity Market (NEM).

The Upper Spencer Gulf has significant industries that use renewable and reliable energy for processing the minerals from the regions for their high-value exports, which are committed to increasing their businesses. As a government and as a state we need to look at further value-adding to these minerals extracted by the various companies in the Upper Spencer Gulf in the Far North.

The Upper Spencer Gulf, as I said earlier, has a talented workforce with a wide range of training facilities, especially with UniSA at Whyalla, the Uni Hub at Port Pirie and the emerging hubs at Port Augusta and Kadina. These facilities allow for young people and older people to be able to do tertiary studies without having to go to Adelaide.

Let me say that, to my knowledge and according to my information, this Uni Hub is the only one in South Australia funded by the commonwealth government out of 25 Australia-wide. It is in this regard that I have grave concerns with the proposed direction that this government appears to be taking in regard to downgrading the TAFE facilities and the opportunities to grow and to be able to provide the required training courses for our young people across Port Pirie and Port Augusta looking to improve their employment opportunities to gain employment in these previously mentioned activities, particularly in the Upper Spencer Gulf, and Port Pirie and Port Augusta in particular.

We need TAFE to deliver these skills, and this will set us up for the next generation of jobs. Another aspect of being able to achieve our great opportunities in this part of the state is for the state government and federal government to provide better transport and infrastructure facilities. These would include the duplication of the Augusta Highway from Port Wakefield to Port Augusta and also the reconstruction of the Horrocks Highway.

The reason I am doing this is that I see the great opportunity for Port Pirie and Port Augusta in particular to grow, and to be able to decentralise outside of Adelaide, and for people to come from other states to relocate into what I consider to be one of the best locations in Australia, if not the world. Also, with respect to the opportunities for the growth of our communities and our state we need to look at decentralisation far more than we have been doing in the last few years, and the Upper Spencer Gulf in particular is the place to go and the place to live.

#### **WAITE ELECTORATE**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:42):** I rise today to discuss the importance of protecting and promoting our local heritage. Throughout my community and, I know, so many communities across South Australia, we have wonderful historic buildings and places of historical and architectural importance and natural beauty as well.

In my electorate, from the Winns Road Historic Precinct in Coromandel Valley to the Urrbrae House Historic Precinct in the Waite Arboretum, there is so much heritage. When I spend time at these historic sites in my community, as I quite often do, I am reminded of simpler times, before such leaps and bounds in technology, when people were tied together by locality and a strong sense of community.

In recent weeks, months and years there have been quite a number of restoration projects happening in the electorate, in particular the \$3 million development at Carrick Hill—a development of the historic Haywood House with renovations to the visitor centre and a renovation and upgrade of the old coach house at Government House situated within Belair National Park. Both these projects are courtesy of the recent Adelaide City Deal.

It was lovely to join recently the Friends of Carrick Hill, represented by their president, Jill Argent, to hear the 2021 vision from Tony Kanellos, the new Director of Carrick Hill, Peter Kennedy and the Director of Benefaction, Richard Heathcote. They told us of their vision of what Carrick Hill is going to look like as a wonderful state asset going forward.

Of course, I also had the opportunity to have a look at the new renovations of the upper room loft, which is going to be such a great art space for so many in South Australia. I encourage people to go and check out this wonderful 20<sup>th</sup> century house, museum and garden venue.

Two weeks ago, I had the chance to receive a private tour of Old Government House in our beautiful Belair National Park and explore the recently completed coach house and garden upgrades. Built in 1861, this is a stand-out example of our state's early built heritage and I would encourage all to visit the house and grounds, both of which are so carefully cared for by the amazing Friends of Old Government House. A big thankyou to Wayne and Tina Gallasch for their tour and their constant advocacy for this wonderful state asset, and to all the active friends of Old Government House.

To better understand the funding of heritage outside of Waite, I would encourage people to search for the South Australian Heritage Grants Program. Round 2 of the program is open at the moment and there are allocations for important works across our community.

I would like to single out the Mitcham Historical Society, led by president, John Wood, for the advocacy for heritage in our community, including the preservation of the historic Peter Waite gate house at the corner of Cross Road-Fullarton Road intersection and significant trees in the Waite Arboretum as part of the ongoing consultation with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport on this road project.

The Mitcham Historical Society are full of knowledge and love and passion for all things Mitcham related and it was great to attend their AGM a couple of weeks ago—I believe the member for Elder was there as well—and to listen to Richard Harris recounting his stories of growing up in Mitcham in the 1940s and 1950s and also exploring and informing attendees about the importance of Mitcham Village at the turn of the previous century being a real key part of southern Adelaide.

The Coromandel Valley and Districts Branch of the National Trust also do a wonderful job in promoting heritage and tourism in Coromandel Valley and the greater Coromandel Valley district. It was really important and a great opportunity to join the Minister for Environment recently together with the Pope family and Trevor Conlon, who is President of the Coromandel Valley and Districts Branch of the National Trust, having a look at Frank Smith Park and dam and seeing the importance there.

We have seen a lot of debate about the Planning and Design Code. In March, there was a petition presented to parliament looking for increased community participation in the rollout of the code. It is so important that the new Planning and Design Code respects the importance of heritage, the environment, the needs of community and that we do not see development at all costs and we do not see development in our community at the cost of heritage and local history.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:47):** I move:

That pursuant to section 5 of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985, the Hon. S.C. Mullighan be appointed to the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee in place of Mr Brown, whose services, I am sure, will be sorely missed by the committee, but he has resigned; and Mr Cowdrey OAM MP, be appointed to the committee in place of Mr Duluk as the alternate member to Mr Treloar.

Motion carried.

#### *Bills*

### **EDUCATION AND CHILDREN'S SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:48):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Education and Children's Services Act 2019. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:49):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading speech and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

The Education (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020 will amend the *Education and Children's Services Act 2019* to address a number of legal and technical issues identified in the implementation of the Act.

The *Education and Children's Services Act 2019*, which commenced on 1 July 2020, represented the most significant reform to the State's education legislation in over forty years. It replaced both the *Education Act 1972* and the *Children's Services Act 1985* to provide a framework for the development and education of children and young people in South Australia.

During the implementation of the Act, a number of legal, technical and operational issues were identified as needing to be resolved or clarified by amendment of the Act. The Bill aims to address these issues.

In summary, the amendments set out in the Bill will amend the Act to:

- remove reference to step-parent from the definition of a parent under the Act
- update various references in the Act to TAFE SA
- clarify provisions in relation to the continuation of stand-alone preschools and children's services centres formerly registered under the *Children's Services Act 1985* and to make it easier to transition those services to a model of governance similar to schools, where appropriate
- clarify arrangements for the management of the assets of a governing council of a preschool or children's services centre closed under the Act
- expressly provide that the governing council of a school can fulfil a role in respect of the education, care, recreation, health or welfare of students outside of school hours
- make it easier for an existing school of a relevant kind to transition to a special purpose school without the need to formally close and re-establish the school under the Act
- enable the Minister to set requirements in respect to the information about a student that may be included in a report exchanged between principals under section 67 of the Act
- enable a principal's obligation to report persistent non-attendance to be met through periodic reports rather than through reporting on an individual, case-by-case basis
- provide for the Education Standards Board to delegate its functions under the Act in respect to the registration of student exchange organisations. This will enable the Board to delegate relevant functions to the Registrar or other senior staff of the board
- extend the protections for teachers and other staff to enable a person to be barred from departmental owned and occupied premises in addition to the premises of schools, preschools and children's services
- clearly provide for schools to be able to collect a voluntary component of a materials and services charge in addition to the compulsory component of the charge
- address issues with the permissible break in service arrangements for current and future term and casual officers of the teaching service in schools and preschools for the purpose of calculating long service
- address other minor technical issues with the Act

#### EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of Education and Children's Services Act 2019

###### 4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause updates definitions used in the principal Act.

###### 5—Amendment of section 26—Continuation of registered children's services centres

The clause provides that a reference in the principal Act to a stand-alone preschool or children's services centre continued under section 26 of the Act (being a reference that contemplates the stand-alone preschool or children's services centre being unincorporated) will be taken to be a reference to the body corporate comprising the stand-alone preschool or children's services centre (as the case requires). Additionally, a reference in this Act to the governing council of a stand-alone preschool or children's services centre continued under this section (being a reference that contemplates or requires the governing council being, or to be, a body corporate) will be taken to be a reference to the body corporate comprising the stand-alone preschool or children's services centre (as the case requires).

###### 6—Insertion of section 26A

This clause inserts new section 26A into the principal Act, which will allow the Minister to declare by notice in the Gazette certain stand-alone preschools or children's services centres to be taken to have been established

under Act. The clause requires that the Minister conduct consultation before making such a declaration. The clause details how a declaration will operate, including that the property, assets and liabilities of a stand alone preschool or children's services centre subject to a declaration will vest in the Minister. The clause grants a power to make regulations regarding declarations of the proposed section.

7—Amendment of section 29—Closure of stand-alone preschools and children's services centres

This clause amends section 29 of the principal Act to permit the Minister to transfer specified assets or liabilities of a governing council of a stand-alone preschool or children's services centre that is dissolved under section 29 to a specified person or body.

8—Amendment of section 41—Functions and powers of governing councils and affiliated committees

This clause amends section 45 of the principal Act to expand the functions of the governing councils and affiliated committees of schools to include the fulfilment of the roles specified in the constitution of the governing council in respect of the education, care, development, recreation, health or welfare of students outside of school hours.

9—Insertion of section 56A

This clause inserts new section 56A into the principal Act, allowing the Minister to declare an existing school to be a special purpose school. The Minister must consult with the governing council of the school before making such a declaration. The regulations may make further provision in relation to declarations under this clause.

10—Amendment of section 67—Principal may require other principal to provide report in respect of specified child

This clause amends section 67 of the principal Act. It specifies that where a principal is required to provide another principal with a report in respect of a specified child, the report must adhere to specified requirements.

11—Amendment of section 75—Principal etc to report persistent non-attendance or non-participation

This clause amends section 75(1) of the principal Act to provide that the principal of a school or head of an approved learning program need only cause the Chief Executive to be notified, rather than personally notify the Chief Executive, if a student is persistently failing to attend school or participate in the approved learning program.

Proposed subsections (2a) and (2b) clarify circumstances in which a principal of a school will be taken to have provided the Chief Executive with notice under the section.

12—Insertion of section 89A

This clause inserts new section 89A into the Act, providing a power of delegation to the Board.

13—Amendment of section 90—Application of Part

This clause amends section 90 of the principal Act to extend the application of Part 8 of the Act to prescribed departmental premises. This is defined as including any premises owned by the Department and any other premises prescribed by regulation.

14—Amendment of section 91—Offensive or threatening behaviour

This clause amends section 91 of the principal Act to extend the operation of that section to conduct occurring in prescribed departmental premises, as defined.

15—Amendment of section 93—Power to bar person from premises

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 93 of the principal Act in relation to prescribed departmental premises, as defined.

16—Amendment of section 94—Review of barring notice by Minister

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 94 of the principal Act in relation to prescribed departmental premises, as defined.

17—Amendment of section 101—Probation

This clause deletes section 101(9) of the principal Act.

18—Amendment of section 110—Interruption of service where officer leaves teaching service

This clause amends section 110 of the principal Act to clarify the circumstances, and period, in which an interruption of service and subsequent reappointment of an officer of the teaching service will be taken to be continuous service.

19—Insertion of section 110A

This clause inserts new section 110 of the principal Act to set out the circumstances, and period, in which an interruption of service and subsequent reappointment of an officer of the teaching service who is a term employee will be taken to be continuous service.

20—Amendment of section 111—Special provisions relating to certain temporary officers of the teaching service

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 111(1) of the principal Act to ensure consistency with sections amended or inserted by this measure.

21—Amendment of section 113—Entitlement of persons transferred to the teaching service

This clause amends section 113(7) of the principal Act, allowing the CE to approve certain employment as prescribed employment.

22—Amendment of section 121—Chief Executive may employ other persons for purposes of Act

This clause amends section 121(2) of the principal Act to include preschools in the scope of the subsection.

23—Amendment of section 129—Materials and services charges for schools

This clause amends section 129 of the principal, dividing a materials and services charge under the section into a compulsory component, which can be recovered as a debt under the section, and a voluntary component which cannot.

24—Amendment of section 138—Protections, privileges and immunities

This clause amends section 138 of the principal Act to delete subsection (1), and to delete the words 'and without negligence' from subsection (2).

25—Amendment of section 141—Regulations

This clause amends section 141 of the principal Act to provide regulation making powers in the specified additional areas.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

## **CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:50):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 and to make related amendments to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:50):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Children and Young People (Safety) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020, which makes a number of necessary amendments to the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. This bill honours my commitment that I would prioritise a 12-month stakeholder review of the act.

This bill has been developed in consultation with key stakeholders, including government agencies, peak bodies, Aboriginal organisations and representative groups, as well as relevant advocacy and oversight bodies regarding the first year of operation of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. This bill seeks to progress a series of amendments based on the consultation feedback, noting that there is a requirement under the act for a full review in 2022 when I anticipate a broader public consultation will take place.

The government has closely considered the advice received. The proposed amendments will strengthen the effective and efficient operation of the act and those proposals which received overwhelming stakeholder support. Given the scope of the review, not all proposals have been incorporated at this stage. Some of these have been deferred for consideration under the 2022 legislative review, either because they did not receive widespread support or were of such significance that they warranted further testing and consultation.

I will briefly refer to the key amendments contained in the bill. The first is the insertion of a subsection to ensure those involved in the administration, operation and enforcement of this act work in the best interests of children and young people. Members in this house will be aware that I have consistently advocated that all children and young people in care should expect that those responsible for their care have a focus on the child or young person's best interests, and that implicit in best interests is safety.

A number of stakeholders provided their support for the inclusion of 'best interests' and I am proud to be responsible for its insertion in this bill. While the bill maintains safety as the paramount consideration for the decision-maker, reintroducing 'best interests' is intended to further embed a principled framework which has a child's best interests as a key consideration.

We have responded to the calls of stakeholders and this bill honours the Marshall Liberal government's own commitment to improve outcomes for Aboriginal children and young people. We have elevated our previous commitment to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principles, at a policy level, to a legislative framework. This embeds into legislation what we aim to achieve in practice. Specifically, the bill:

- describes each of the five elements of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle; and
- embeds the commitment that any person or body performing functions under the act which involve or are related to the placement of Aboriginal children and young people will take active and timely steps to give effect to the principle.

These provisions are intended to ensure that those responsible understand the principle as a framework to guide their actions and that it is the government's commitment to continue to work with its Aboriginal partners towards full implementation of the principle over time.

I reiterate that each of these amendments is an important step as we work with our partners to embed our commitment to achieving the true policy intent of the principle, in the way its implementation was envisaged and articulated by Aboriginal stakeholders. This includes the Secretariat of National Aboriginal and Islander Child Care, more commonly known as SNAICC.

As we keep striving to do better, I want to acknowledge the continuing support and advice of our Aboriginal partners. The bill also includes significant amendments relating to provisions, which will enable the government's adoption from care policy.

Last year, in September I consulted on the practice of adoption from care as one of a range of permanency options in South Australia for children and young people in care. From the outset, I made it clear that adoption for Aboriginal children is not being considered. The Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle will continue to provide the framework for permanency planning for Aboriginal children and young people. As I have stated in the house before, whilst open adoption is not for every individual, it should be considered when it is the child or young person's best interests.

The core messages we heard throughout the consultations were that each child is different, and that decisions to support adoption should be made according to a child's individual circumstances, taking into account their best interests, wellbeing and wishes. This is consistent with the government's child-centred approach to permanency planning in general.

The proposed provisions included in this bill reflect this feedback by providing a specific pathway for adoption for children and young people in care while maintaining appropriate checks and balances. This approach acknowledges the unique circumstances of children under guardianship and the particular importance of permanency and stability to the wellbeing of a child in care.

Every child deserves to live in a safe, loving and secure home for life. Adoption from care as a permanency pathway is a new, exciting and much welcome policy. Open adoption can now be considered as a genuine option when undertaking permanency planning for children and young people in care.

The house will see that the bill amends section 59 of the principal act to limit the orders under which the onus of proof is reversed. This amendment provides that the reverse onus only applies to applications for long term guardianship—specified person orders. As noted, there are a number of small amendments which give greater effect to the principle of timely decision-making, which we know is in the best interests of children and young people.

These include the reintroduction of short-term investigation and assessment orders, consistent with those previously provided for under the now repealed Children's Protection Act 1993. This amendment makes clear that the court may make an order granting custody of the child or

young person to the chief executive for a specified period not exceeding eight weeks while an investigation of the circumstances of the child is carried out.

Finally, several minor amendments have been included to provide greater clarity in the administration of the act to support more effective and timely decision-making that will best serve children and young people in care and to remedy some minor technical issues identified following the current act's commencement.

The bill will introduce the rule requiring hearings for court orders to be commenced within 10 weeks of the application. This provides the court with the ability to make short-term custody orders of up to six weeks to allow an investigation of the circumstances of the child or young person to be carried out. It also reinstates the option available under the Children's Protection Act 1993 and will allow urgent applications to be dealt with more expeditiously. The short-term custody order can be extended by up to four weeks if necessary.

Importantly, it removes the potential conflict between the jurisdictions of the Youth Court, the chief executive and the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) in relation to inconsistencies arising over placement of children under guardianship and the application of the general and Aboriginal placement principles.

Finally, I thank my department and all those who have provided me with their comments, feedback and assistance that have enabled this bill to be presented in the house. I would like to thank each of the stakeholders who took the time to contribute to this process and provide feedback. I know we are all united in our goal to achieve the best possible outcomes for children and young people in care. I commend the bill to the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Commencement

###### 3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017

###### 4—Amendment of section 8—Other needs of children and young people

This clause inserts a new subsection (4) into section 8 of the principal Act, requiring involved in the administration, operation and enforcement of this Act must, when performing a function or exercising a power in relation to a child or young person, act in the best interests of that child or young person.

###### 5—Amendment of section 11—Placement principles

This clause repeals section 11(4) of the principal Act.

###### 6—Substitution of section 12

This clause inserts a new Part 3A into the principal Act, and makes provision relating to the placement of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander children and young people.

###### 7—Amendment of section 34—Chief Executive may investigate circumstances of a child or young person

This clause makes a consequential amendment following the insertion of section 53(1)(ba) into the principal Act.

###### 8—Insertion of section 34A

This clause inserts new section 34A into the principal Act, conferring on the Chief Executive or a child protection officer the specified powers in relation to the investigation of the circumstances of a child or young person under section 34, and creating an offence for a person who refuses or fails to comply with a direction under the new section.

###### 9—Amendment of section 35—Chief Executive may direct that child or young person be examined and assessed

This clause amends section 35 of the principal Act, conferring on the Chief Executive the specified powers in relation to the examination and assessment of children or young people, and creating an offence for a person who refuses or fails to comply with a direction under the new section.

10—Amendment of section 36—Chief Executive may direct person to undergo certain assessments

This clause amends section 36 of the principal Act, conferring on the Chief Executive a power to require certain parents, guardians or other people to undergo a mental health assessment in the circumstances specified.

11—Amendment of section 37—Random drug and alcohol testing

This clause amends section 37 of the principal Act to allow the broadening of categories of forensic material that may be taken or tested in the course of random drug testing.

12—Amendment of section 51—Parties to proceedings

This clause amends section 51(1) of the principal Act to include persons under whose guardianship a child or young person is to be placed, and the Chief Executive, to be parties to certain applications under section 53 of the principal Act.

13—Amendment of section 53—Orders that may be made by Court

This clause inserts new section 53(1)(ba) into the principal Act, allowing the Court to make an order granting custody of the child or young person to the Chief Executive for a specified period not exceeding 8 weeks while an investigation of the circumstances of the child or young person is carried out.

14—Insertion of section 53A

This clause inserts new section 53A into the principal Act, with the new section making special provisions applying to orders made under new section 53(1)(ba).

15—Amendment of section 54—Consent orders

This clause amends section 54 of the principal Act to clarify that it is a party who participates in the relevant proceedings whose consent is required.

16—Amendment of section 56—Adjournments

This clause inserts new s56(1a) into the principal Act, and provides that the Court cannot exercise its general power of adjournment in relation to a contested application such that the period between the lodging of the application and the commencement of the hearing to determine a contested application exceeds 10 weeks.

17—Insertion of section 56A

This clause inserts a new section 56A into the principal Act, limiting the Court's ability to make certain orders relating to contact and placement arrangement for a child or young person.

18—Amendment of section 59—Onus on objector to prove certain orders should not be made

This clause amends section 59 of the principal Act to limit the orders under which the onus of proof is reversed.

19—Amendment of section 77—Temporary placement of child or young person where approved carer not available

This clause inserts new section 77(1a) into the principal Act to allow the Chief Executive to place a child or young person with a person under that section despite it being reasonably practicable to place the child or young person in the care of a particular approved carer if the Chief Executive is satisfied that to do so is preferable to placing the child or young person with the approved carer.

20—Amendment of section 85—Review of circumstances of child or young person under long-term guardianship of Chief Executive

This clause corrects an error in section 85(1)(a) of the principal Act by changing the reference to the 'Minister' to the 'Chief Executive'.

21—Amendment of section 86—Direction not to communicate with etc child or young person

This clause amends section 86 of the principal Act to allow the Chief Executive to direct a person not to be in the company of, or otherwise associate with, a specified child or young person who is in the custody, or under the guardianship, of the Chief Executive.

22—Insertion of Chapter 7A

This clause inserts new Chapter 7A into the principal Act as follows:

Chapter 7A—Adoption of children and young people from care

Part 1—Preliminary

113A—Interpretation

This section defines terms and phrases used in the new Chapter.

113B—Application of Chapter

This section sets out how the new Chapter applies, including by providing that it does not apply to Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander children and young people.

113C—Modification of *Adoption Act 1988*

This section sets out a series of modifications to the Adoption Act in relation to adoptions to which the new Chapter applies. In effect, that Act applies as so modified when dealing with an adoption contemplated by the new Chapter.

Part 2—Eligible carers

113D—Eligible carers

This section sets out who is an eligible carer for the purposes of the Chapter.

113E—Assessment of suitability of prospective adoptive parents

This section requires the Court to be provided with the results of an assessment of the suitability of prospective adoptive parents conducted in accordance with any requirements set out in the regulations.

113F—Eligible carer need not be in relationship

This section clarifies that an eligible carer may be a single person, that is they do not need to be in a relationship of a particular kind or at all.

Part 3—Orders under *Adoption Act 1988*

113G—Applications for adoption

This section sets out who can apply for an adoption order under the Chapter.

113H—Copy of application to be served on birth parents

This section requires copies of an application to be served on the birth parents of a child or young person, and makes provision for where such service is not reasonably practicable.

113I—Consent of certain children and young people required

This section requires, other than where subsection (3) applies, that a child or young person who is older than 12 to consent before an order contemplated by the Chapter can be made.

113J—Consent of birth parent not required

This section clarifies that consent of the birth parents is not required in order to make an order contemplated by the Chapter.

113K—Views of child or young person to be heard

This section requires the Court to give a child or young person to whom an application relates a reasonable opportunity to personally present to the Court their views related to the proposed adoption.

113L—Right of birth parents etc to be heard

This section requires the Court to give the birth parents and siblings of a child or young person to whom an application relates a reasonable opportunity to personally present to the Court their views related to the proposed adoption.

113M—Court to have regard to additional matters

This section sets out additional matters to which the Court must have regard before making an adoption order contemplated by the Chapter.

113N—Child or young person to have legal representation in proceedings

This section requires a child or young person to which an application relates to be legally represented in the proceedings, unless the Court is satisfied that the child or young person has made an informed and independent decision not to be so represented.

113O—Court not bound by rules of evidence

This section provides that, in proceedings under the Chapter, the Court is not bound by the rules of evidence.

Part 4—Miscellaneous

## 113P—Additional annual reporting obligations

This section imposes annual reporting obligations on the Chief Executive in relation to the operation of the Chapter.

## 113Q—Minister to review operation of Chapter

This section requires the Minister to review the operation of the Chapter before the fifth anniversary of commencement and to report to Parliament on the review.

## 23—Amendment of section 152—Sharing of information between certain persons and bodies

This clause amends section 152 of the principal Act to correct an error in the title of the Committee.

## 24—Amendment of section 157—Internal review

This clause amends section 157 of the principal Act to remove decisions under s 112A of the Act from those that can be reviewed under the section.

## 25—Amendment of section 158—Review of decisions by South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

This clause amends section 158 of the principal Act to remove decisions under s 112A of the Act from those that can be reviewed under the section, and also prevents the SACAT from being able to require parties to an application from taking part in a compulsory conference under the SACAT Act.

## 26—Insertion of section 161A

This clause inserts new section 161A into the principal Act, restricting the publication of names and identifying information in relation to certain children and young people.

## 27—Amendment of section 164—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 164 of the principal Act to include amongst the permissible disclosure of information a disclosure is reasonably required to lessen or prevent a serious threat to the life, health or safety of a person or persons.

## 28—Amendment of section 167—Evidentiary provision

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the evidentiary provision in section 167 of the principal Act.

## 29—Amendment of section 168—Service

This clause amends section 168 of the principal Act to allow a notice etc to be served on a child or young person to be left with a parent or guardian etc of the child or young person.

## 30—Amendment of section 170—Regulations

This amends section 170 of the principal Act to allow transitional or savings regulations to be made.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions Part 1—Amendment of *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996*

## 1—Amendment of section 38A—Notification by court appointed guardians

This clause amends section 38A(4) of the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996* to clarify the definition of 'court appointed guardian'.

## Part 2—Transitional and savings etc provisions

## 2—Application of certain provisions to existing applications etc

This clause clarifies the effect of this measure on existing and future applications.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

**MOTOR VEHICLES (MOTOR BIKE DRIVER LICENSING) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:00):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:00):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Motor Vehicles (Motor Bike Driver Licensing) Amendment Bill 2020 amends the Motor Vehicles Act 1959 to enhance the Graduated Licensing Scheme (GLS) and improve the safety of novice motorcyclists, their passengers and other road users. Motorcyclists have a higher risk of death or serious injury than all other road users. On average in the past five years, 2015 to 2019, motorcycles accounted for around 4 per cent of all registered vehicles, but motorcyclists accounted for around 15 per cent of all lives lost on South Australian roads and 19 per cent of serious injuries.

In the case of novice motorcycle riders, data for the 16 to 19-year-old age group shows that over the last five years, 2015 to 2019, the trend in young rider serious casualties increased by an average of about 12.5 per cent per year. This is in contrast to the trend in young driver serious casualties, which has decreased by an average of 7.7 per cent over the same period. One strategy to reduce this road trauma is through an improved GLS for motorcycle riders.

A GLS is a staged approach to obtaining a full licence, with learners commencing in relatively low-risk situations. As the novice grows in knowledge, skills and on-road experience, restrictions are gradually lifted as they progress through to an intermediate stage and then to a full licence. The GLS for car drivers was strengthened in 2010 and 2014. In 2010, the minimum age for solo driving on a provisional licence was raised to 17 years. This is likely to have reduced the casualty crashes involving young drivers, as research shows that the older a young person is when they are licensed the safer they are when driving and riding unsupervised.

In 2014, the provisional (intermediate) stage was increased from two to three years along with the introduction of passenger and night driving restrictions. Such restrictions help to keep young people out of high-risk situations on the road. In 2018, the University of Adelaide's Centre for Automotive Safety Research (CASR) released the report 'Recommendations for a graduated licensing system for motorcyclists in South Australia', outlining key elements that could be included in an enhanced GLS for motorcycle riders in South Australia, aimed at reducing the crash involvement of novice riders.

Community feedback was sought on the recommendations via a consultation process with individuals and stakeholders and indicated support for most of CASR's recommendations. More recently, key stakeholders were provided with an opportunity to review the draft amendment bill, giving relevant parties an opportunity to make comments relative to their areas of expertise. A total of 107 stakeholders were invited to comment, and responses were received from a variety of road safety stakeholders, including motorcycling riding groups, motorcycle industry representatives and motoring bodies, as well as state and local government.

The measures included in this bill give effect to a number of recommendations from the CASR report and are supported by key stakeholders. In addition, the bill more closely aligns the requirements for novice motorcycle riders with this successful motor vehicle GLS approach to provide more riding experience under protective conditions and reduce the incidence of crashes involving novice riders.

While some stakeholders suggested further improvements to motorcycle safety should be considered, this amendment package is focused on the licensing system and does not extend to rider training and assessment. A review of South Australia's training and assessment program for motorcycle riders is currently underway by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport.

The bill includes the following provisions to improve the safety of novice motorcyclists. The bill raises the minimum age to obtain a motorcycle learner's permit from 16 to 18 years of age. Exemptions will apply for those who are 17 years of age and hold a provisional licence for another class of vehicle, or for a person who is 16 or 17 years of age and resides in a prescribed locality to attend tertiary education, vocational education or training, for work purposes or to participate in a sporting activity.

Raising the age to obtain a motorcycle learner's permit from 16 years to 18 years of age is supported by research, which has found that younger riders, whether new or fully licensed, have more crashes per distance travelled than older riders, suggesting age itself, irrespective of experience, is an important determinant of crash risk.

Between 2015 and 2019 there was a total of 324 riders aged 16 to 19 involved in a casualty crash. Of these, seven riders lost their lives and a further 66 sustained serious injuries. An improved

motorcycle GLS will be beneficial for novice motorcyclists and should contribute to a safer cohort of fully licensed riders once they have successfully completed the GLS.

Under the bill, a person aged under 18 years who holds a current provisional driver's licence will be eligible to apply for a motorcycle learner's permit in recognition that the prospective rider has already gained experience in the road and traffic environment while in the comparative safety of a car. However, unlike the Queensland model, this provision does not mandate that a person is required to obtain a car licence before being able to ride a motorcycle.

An exemption is also available for young people living in regional South Australia in recognition of the more limited transport services available in those areas and the need for young people to participate in training and employment opportunities. The bill allows a person who is at least 16 years of age and who lives in a prescribed locality to be issued with a restricted motorcycle learner's permit to allow them to travel from their place of residence to tertiary education, vocational education and training, for work purposes or to participate in a sporting activity.

The exemption does not extend to students travelling to secondary school—that is, high school—as they are already getting to school by other transport means prior to turning 16, and can continue to do so. 'Prescribed locality' is intended to cover regional South Australia and will be defined as a list of postcodes contained either in the regulations or by *Gazette* notice as appropriate. The postcodes will be consistent with those areas defined as District 2 under the Compulsory Third Party (CTP) insurance scheme, making it easy for applicants to identify eligibility for a restricted learner's permit.

Similar to the exemptions available for the passenger and night driving restrictions for young drivers, it is proposed that the onus would be on the learner's permit holder to prove they are riding a motorcycle in accordance with their exemption, should they be questioned by South Australia Police at the roadside. Riding contrary to these restrictions will result in an expiation fee and demerit points that will be prescribed in the regulations. It is intended the expiation fee and demerit points will align with other comparable offences that apply to learner and P1 drivers that currently carry a fine of \$382 and three demerit points.

The bill introduces a requirement for a person to hold a motorcycle learner's permit for a minimum of 12 months. Currently, learner riders holding a car licence classification do not have a minimum period they are required to hold a motorcycle learner's permit. To provide novice riders with more riding experience under protective learner conditions, the bill requires a person to hold a motorcycle learner's permit for a minimum of one year before being eligible to apply for an R-DATE (intermediate) licence classification, irrespective of any other licence held by that person. This will apply to new and existing learner's permit holders upon commencement of the new provisions.

The bill introduces a restriction for learner riders from carrying a pillion passenger or a sidecar passenger, including a qualified supervising driver, and from towing trailers. The act currently allows a person on a motorcycle learner's permit to carry a pillion passenger or a passenger in a sidecar provided that the passenger is acting as qualified supervising driver. It is not a requirement under the act for the holder of a motorcycle learner's permit to be accompanied by a qualified supervising driver, as is the case for the holder of a learner's permit for a car.

Due to the inexperience of the rider, the balance distribution while riding and possible distraction to the rider that a pillion passenger may pose, the bill no longer allows any pillion passenger to ride with the rider on a motorcycle learner's permit. This includes a passenger in a sidecar. Therefore, any person accompanying a learner rider will have to ride on a separate motorcycle. As towing a trailer may increase the risk of a crash, this practice will also be prohibited during the learner's permit stage.

The bill introduces a night-time riding restriction between midnight and 5am for all learner riders aged under 25 years, irrespective of whether that person also holds a P2 or a full driver's licence for another classification of vehicle. Currently, night-time riding restrictions are limited to riders aged under 25 years who hold only a motorcycle learner's permit or a P1 licence. The bill extends this provision and applies a night-time riding restriction between the hours of midnight and 5am to all motorcycle learner's permit holders aged under 25 years.

However, as per existing provisions, a motorcycle learner's permit holder will be exempt if the person meets the prescribed circumstances listed in schedule 2 of the act. This includes when riding for employment, education, or between home and an activity to participate in sports, artistic, charitable, religious or scientific activities provided by an organisation, association or club. As with the existing provisions relating to the motor vehicle GLS, no formal application for an exemption will be required; however, the rider would need to carry evidence they were riding within the exemption grounds.

A person issued with a restricted motorcycle learner's permit will be restricted to riding only for tertiary education, vocational education and training, work purposes, or to participate in a sporting activity at all times. Broader exemptions from the night-time riding restrictions (as referenced above) would not apply to the holder of a restricted learner's permit.

The bill introduces a restriction on riding only an automatic motorcycle if tested on one. RiderSafe courses currently allow participants to be trained and assessed on a motorcycle with an automatic transmission. As these courses include teaching and assessing a person's ability to smoothly take off and change gears, some students see the option to ride a bike with an automatic transmission as an easy way to pass. They are then able to ride a bike with a manual transmission on the road, which poses a risk to both the rider and other road users as they have not undergone the proper training, nor had the ability to practise gear changes in a controlled environment.

The bill will ensure that those tested at RiderSafe on a bike with an automatic transmission will be restricted to riding only bikes with an automatic transmission. Similar provisions already exist in New South Wales, Victoria, Western Australia, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory.

The bill raises the minimum age to obtain an R-DATE (intermediate) licence classification from 17 to 19 years of age. This will enable novice riders to gain more riding experience under protective conditions and will apply to new and existing motorcycle learner's permit holders upon commencement. Existing learner riders who are aged under 18 years will not be restricted from where they can ride, nor required to obtain a provisional licence in order to maintain their existing learner's permit, although it will require them to ride under protective conditions for longer before progressing to an R-DATE classification.

At the same time, I intend to amend the Motor Vehicles Regulations 2010 to extend the minimum time a person must hold an R-DATE licence classification from one year to two years. This will require the rider to continue riding a lower powered Learner Approved Motorcycle Scheme motorcycle for an additional year before being eligible to progress to an unrestricted R-licence classification, at which point they may ride a higher powered motorcycle.

The bill introduces a restriction for the holder of a driver's licence with an R-DATE (intermediate) licence classification to have zero blood alcohol concentration while riding a motorcycle, irrespective of whether that person also holds a full car or higher classification of licence. Alcohol consumption and riding a motorcycle is a dangerous combination. It is reflected in crashes. Alcohol impairs skill and decision-making and can increase confidence and aggression. Currently, the holder of a full car licence is able to ride a motorcycle on an R-DATE classification with a blood alcohol concentration of less than .05 grams in 100 millilitres of blood. The bill requires all R-DATE motorcycle riders to have a zero blood alcohol concentration whenever they are riding.

This will apply to new and existing R-DATE holders upon commencement of the new laws. A zero blood alcohol concentration already applies to the holder of a motorcycle learner's permit, all provisional licence holders and some other driver licence classifications. This bill further clarifies that a person must hold either a motorcycle learner's permit or a licence endorsed with R-DATE (intermediate) or R (full motorcycle class) to allow them to ride a motorcycle.

An anomaly in the legislation allows a person to ride a motorcycle under learner's conditions without holding a licence endorsed with R-DATE or R, or a motorcycle learner's permit, if they hold another class of licence. To resolve this issue, the act is being amended to clarify a person must hold either a motorcycle learner's permit or a licence endorsed with R-DATE or R to allow them to ride a motorcycle. This will address an enforcement issue that has been raised by SAPOL.

To maximise the impact of the proposed initiatives and create an immediate safety benefit for novice riders, the new offences related to towing, passenger, night-time riding and alcohol

restrictions will apply to all new and existing learner's permit holders and holders of an R-DATE classification as appropriate upon commencement of the new laws. While amending the licensing provisions under this act, the bill also takes the opportunity to broaden the provisions relating to testing and evidence provided to the Registrar of Motor Vehicles (the registrar) to allow for future innovation and to better meet customer needs and expectations.

The bill amends provisions relating to the learner theory test and the hazard perception test to allow these tests to be conducted by a method approved by the registrar. To obtain a learner's permit in South Australia, a person must undertake a theory test. Further, to obtain a licence, a person must undertake a hazard perception test.

Sections 79 and 79A of the act require an applicant to produce a certificate signed by a tester, as defined in the act. Options to improve service delivery associated with the licensing process include the potential for these tests to be provided via an online platform. The amendments within the bill allow for changes in the delivery of such tests into the future. Similarly, the bill amends provisions relating to the production of a logbook to allow the registrar to be satisfied a person has met the prescribed requirements relating to the applicant's driving experience by providing evidence, other than a written document/hard copy (i.e. electronically via an app on a phone), into the future.

Holders of a learner's permit for a car are required to complete a logbook demonstrating that they have met the minimum required supervised driving hours before they may progress to a provisional licence. Section 79A of the act requires the applicant to produce to the registrar a logbook that is approved by the registrar and has been completed in accordance with the instructions contained within the logbook.

To allow for future options for demonstrating that supervised driving hours have been completed, the bill allows the registrar to be satisfied by other evidence (which could be accepted electronically) that the applicant for a provisional licence has satisfied the prescribed requirements related to the applicant's driving experience. Removing the limitations around physical attendance at customer service centres and paper-based models will provide greater flexibility around service delivery models. This supports the government's move to digital first and will improve service availability in the future, particularly for those in rural and remote areas of South Australia.

The data is very clear. Young motorcyclists have a much higher risk of being involved in a tragedy on the road than they should have. We need to stop the carnage on our roads and we need to protect motorcyclists. We need to protect families as much as possible from that devastating knock at the door that SAPOL officers are all too often forced to make after a fatal crash. We need to implement a better licensing scheme so that novice motorcyclists gain the experience and the training that they need to be safe road users.

The government's bill will deliver a strengthened graduated licensing scheme for motorcyclists and will make our roads safer for all users. The Marshall Liberal government is dedicated to improving road safety for South Australians. The government looks forward to bipartisan support from the Labor opposition and the crossbench in the other place so that these important reforms can be enacted without delay. I commend this bill to the house and I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

4—Amendment of section 16—Permits to drive vehicles without registration

This clause amends section 16 to refer to the 'former' General Post Office because of the closure of the GPO.

5—Amendment of section 74—Duty to hold licence or learner's permit

This clause amends section 74 to make it clear that in order to be authorised to drive a motor vehicle of a particular class, a person must hold a driver's licence or learner's permit authorising them to drive a vehicle of that class, or a driver's licence and the minimum driving experience prescribed by the regulations for the grant of a licence that would authorise the person to drive a vehicle of that class.

#### 6—Amendment of section 75—Issue and renewal of licences

This clause amends section 75 to prevent the issue of a licence authorising the driving of a motor bike to a person who is under the age of 19.

#### 7—Amendment of section 75A—Learner's permit

This clause amends section 75A to prevent the issue of a learner's permit authorising the driving of a motor bike to a person under the age of 18 unless—

- (a) the person is at least 16 years of age and satisfies the Registrar that the person lives in an area of the State defined by the regulations as a prescribed locality; or
- (b) the person is at least 17 years of age and holds a provisional licence.

The clause also amends section 75A to impose additional conditions on learner's permits authorising the driving of a motor bike, namely, a condition prohibiting the holder from carrying any person on a motor bike, a condition prohibiting the holder from driving a motor bike to tow any vehicle, and a condition prohibiting the holder (if under the age of 25) from driving a motor bike between the hours of midnight and 5 am.

#### 8—Insertion of section 75B

This clause inserts a new section.

##### 75B—Special provisions applying to certain motor bike learner's permits

New section 75B prohibits a person who holds a restricted motor bike learner's permit (that is, one issued to a person at least 16 years of age who lives in a prescribed locality) from driving a motor bike except in certain circumstances prescribed by Schedule 2 (as amended by clause 13 of this measure) (driving for work purposes or driving to attend recognised tertiary education or training, vocational education and training or for the purposes of recognised sporting activity participation).

#### 9—Amendment of section 79—Examination of applicant for licence or learner's permit

This clause amends section 79 to allow the Registrar to require evidence to the satisfaction of the Registrar that a person has passed the prescribed theoretical examination required for the issue of a driver's licence or learner's permit. It also substitutes a new definition of *approved theoretical examination*.

#### 10—Substitution of section 79A

This clause substitutes section 79A

##### 79A—Driving experience required for issue of licence

Section 79A sets out the requirements for the issue of a driver's licence where a person has not held a licence during the period of 5 years immediately preceding the date of the application. The section has been re-drafted so as to require an applicant for a licence authorising the driving of a motor bike to have held a learner's permit authorising the holder to drive a motor bike for a continuous period of at least 12 months. If an applicant has been disqualified from holding or obtaining a licence and has not held a licence since the end of the disqualification, the applicant must have held a learner's permit authorising the holder to drive a motor bike for a continuous period of 12 months of which there must be a continuous period of not less than 3 months since the end of the period of disqualification.

#### 11—Amendment of section 81—Restricted licences and learner's permit

This clause amends section 81 to allow a Registrar to impose a condition on a licence authorising the driving of a motor bike, the effect of which is to limit the licence holder to driving a motor bike with an automatic transmission if the Registrar is not satisfied that they are competent to drive a motor bike fitted with a manual transmission.

#### 12—Insertion of section 81AC

This clause inserts a new section.

##### 81AC—Special provisions applying to certain motor bike licences

Proposed new section 81AC imposes a condition on prescribed motor bike licences, being licences authorising the driving of a motor bike of a class prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of the section. The condition is that the holder of the licence must not drive a motor bike, or attempt to put a motor bike in motion, on a road while the prescribed concentration of alcohol is present in the holder's blood, or a prescribed drug is present in the holder's oral fluid or blood. This condition is to apply to licences whether issued or renewed before or after the commencement of the section.

13—Amendment of Schedule 2—Prescribed circumstances (sections 75A, 75B and 81A)

This clause amends Schedule 2. The amendments are consequential on the insertion of new section 75B included in this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

## APPROPRIATION BILL 2020

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:20):** I am pleased to have the opportunity to rise to speak about the budget. I would like to focus particularly on the areas of my portfolio that are concerned with climate change, the environment and water. I will start with the overwhelming issue in the budget of the electric vehicle tax, which appears to be a direct affront to any claim that this government has had to take climate change seriously and to want to transition to a low-carbon future.

The government has come up with an excellent target of cutting our emissions by 50 per cent by 2030 and, of course, achieving the existing target of zero by 2050. To do that, we need to see the government not only continue to support the renewable energy profile that Labor initiated but take seriously the initiatives that are associated with transport. This electric vehicle tax of course runs entirely counter to every message and every policy approach that might help deliver a low-carbon transport fleet.

I will start with the process issue because often that is where these things go awry. This appears to have been an idea that has come probably from Treasury or the Treasurer and has been taken on board by the energy department, although it was spruiked and supported very much by the Minister for Environment and Water. In his speech yesterday he said that he made no apology for the policy. There does not appear to have been a lot of either research or evidence undertaken—certainly none presented to the public to justify why having attacks on electric vehicles would not inhibit people from purchasing electric vehicles—nor much consultation.

I have the highest respect for the Minister for Energy. I asked the Premier about consulting with the Premier's Climate Change Council, but the Minister for Energy answered today and he certainly did not say that they had consulted with the Climate Change Council, but he did say that he was meeting this afternoon with the chair, Martin Haese. That suggests to me that there was no consultation prior to the decision. There certainly was not any with the Australian Electric Vehicle Council's SA branch, because we spoke to them and they were astonished that this policy had come up. They had heard nothing about it, had not been included in discussions and had not had the opportunity to give feedback, nor had the Conservation Council of South Australia.

You always worry, when the process starts a little secretly and perhaps the wrong people are having the wrong conversations and perhaps not with all the relevant people, that there might be a problem. The message that comes through in this policy is, of course, 'Don't buy an electric car.' There can be no other message. When you put a tax on something, it is usually explicitly to say that you are going to charge for the use of that and that if there is an alternative please take it. Electric cars are already more expensive than similar vehicles that are fuelled with petrol. The one advantage they have is that they are cheaper to run, but that advantage is being eroded through this policy. The messaging about that policy change I genuinely believe to be disastrous.

The economics of it trouble me most. What we need is the creation or the encouragement of a very early market for more electric vehicles. We have one of the poorest electric vehicle markets in the advanced world. There are cheaper and a wider variety of makes and models in other nations, incidentally, and in subnational jurisdictions like California, where substantial subsidy has gone in to encourage people to buy these cars, and that has worked.

We have seen that happen in South Australia with the solar panels where some people railed against the idea of a feed-in tariff, but my goodness did it work, and with people having that massive uptake of solar panels down came the price. That is what we need to see here: a great enthusiasm to take up the option of electric vehicles and then, of course, the price coming down and making it accessible for all, because it is not enough for us to have a small number with electric vehicles. We

have a carbon challenge facing us, a carbon budget that is running out, and we must make the shift as quickly as possible to the majority of vehicles being electric or at least zero emissions.

The fiscal dimension of this I find very curious. The problem that this purports to solve is that there is a federal tax on petrol that is not hypothecated on road maintenance in South Australia and spent on road maintenance in South Australia—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** That's right, it's not.

**Dr CLOSE:** That's right, it is a tax on petrol—

*Mr Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Schubert will cease interjecting.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** I know you're under pressure.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** I know you're facing a lot of personal problems.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The deputy leader has the call. The deputy leader will be heard in silence.

**Dr CLOSE:** Mr Speaker, it is not hypothecated for roads and it is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for West Torrens and member for Schubert! I remind members of standing order 142, and I further remind members of standing order 141. The house will interfere to prevent quarrels. The deputy leader has the call.

**Dr CLOSE:** It is purporting to solve what is actually a federal tax issue that is foreseen sometime in the future, because when there are more electric vehicles there will be less petrol being bought and therefore less tax being raised by the federal government, but without any calculation of the benefits both to the state and federal governments of people owning electric vehicles instead of high emission vehicles.

The greenhouse emissions are not the only emissions from cars, of course. The impact on air pollution and therefore on people's health is significant and substantial. This is a little bit like when someone stops smoking cigarettes saying, 'Well, you're not paying the cigarette tax anymore, so we're going to have to take an extra charge off you in another way because we can't be having us losing this money,' although that money is required in part to deal with the health consequences of cigarettes.

The absurdity in the heart of this is not only in the jurisdictional element but also in what this is being spent on. I presume that this is made still more true by the fact that the government is not proposing to take this money and give it to the federal government in lieu of the money they are missing out on through the petrol charge. They are not saying, 'Well, because you're missing out on that we will collect it for you just in South Australia. Don't worry about the other states. They will work out what they're doing. We won't have a national solution, and then we will give it to the federal government.' Not at all. This is simply a state-based tax. They have found an opportunity for a market that they hope will grow in the future, but I will come to my theory about that shortly.

There are also concerns, of course, about privacy. It was rather alarming to hear that there is a prospect of perhaps GPS being used to track where private vehicles go in order to be able to have this charge that is related to what roads and for what period of time the cars are running so that they can accurately judge how much the cars ought to be charged.

I can actually help them out. It is going to be something like a \$330 charge per car, because I understand that there are about 3,000 electric vehicles in South Australia and they are saying that it is \$1 million. I have the old calculator out and I think it is about that. Anyway, they will work out how they want to do that using GPS or some other form of tracking citizens and where they are going—perhaps requiring a travel logbook. We do not know; we will find out in due course.

This brings me to the concerns about privacy, of course, which are overriding. But, more significantly, if the government are now turning their mind to thinking that what they need to know is how far each car is driving in order to know what impact it is having on which roads—perhaps state roads, local roads, federal roads. Does that mean that, in fact, this is the beginning of a shift in the way we will be taxed for the use of cars? Does this mean that this will not be confined only to electric vehicles?

I have to say that to raise \$1 million with not only the amount of pushback that is occurring already but also the administration that will be involved in it does not really make sense on the face of it, and it troubles me that this might be contemplated for a more extensive application of how we can fill the budget hole that is being generated, which I am sure the Treasurer is deeply concerned about. It is not in his nature to be happy with the amount of debt the government has taken on.

Is this a little sleeper that perhaps in a second term could turn into a more widely applied tax? I have no idea if that is the case, but it certainly puzzles me that, in an area where otherwise this government has been pretty consistent—they understand that climate change is real and they understand something should happen—they would come up with a \$1 million a year charge that runs entirely counter to their arguments.

The second area that I want to touch on is marine parks. The minister is often at pains to talk about how much he cares about our natural environment. I am very disturbed about the discordance between that statement and the decision to go ahead and change management plans for marine parks that reduce the sanctuary zones that have been protecting those areas for some years now.

The minister spent something like \$120,000 on a scientific review of marine parks. He said he would do that in the election campaign. He won the election, his team won the election and he duly went out and got a very reasonable firm, EconSearch, to do that work and they came back with a report which said leave it alone. So the scientific review he said he would undertake and undertook and received said, 'Leave these alone. They are working,' and they were set up in a sensible and sound way both in community consultation and on the scientific basis, yet the minister has proceeded to produce these management plans that tear up very important sanctuary zones in the marine parks network.

As part of preparing those management plans, he then went through the process of consultation that is required by the act and 95 per cent of the respondents said do not reduce the sanctuary zones—95 per cent of the respondents—yet he went ahead and did it. So no science and no community support. I struggle to understand why a minister who claims to care about the environment would nonetheless proceed.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** You mean he capitulated to Treasury.

**Dr CLOSE:** He may have capitulated to interests that want to get in there and commercially take from those sanctuary zones. I find it alarming that a minister—and perhaps, as an environment minister, with some gratitude—would not say, 'Well, look, I know that you really want me to do this, but the science isn't there and the community support isn't there, so I am actually going to stand up and say, no, I will protect the environment in this case.' That has not happened. I find that disappointing and I can only hope that we are able to achieve a disallowance in due course and protect those sanctuary zones.

Yesterday, the minister came forward in the context of the budget with an argument that more than ever, ever, ever is being spent on the environment, and I am all for spending more on the environment. I am on record as saying that I think there should be an acceleration in the amount of money that is spent on our natural environment in South Australia, particularly given the challenges faced through the crisis in biodiversity and global warming. But we need to be clear about what money is being spent and whose.

The vast majority of the money that is being spent is being spent on tourism infrastructure in parks. Lest the minister jump up at some point and accuse me yet again of being the lock-it-up left, as he accuses people who think that the environment matters—it suddenly turns into that we do not want people to be in the environment—that is not true. I am all for people engaging with nature, with seeing nature, enjoying nature and therefore, of course, becoming champions for nature. We are on a unity ticket there.

But spending money on that tourist infrastructure is not the same as spending money on species recovery, on habitat restoration, on weeding, on planting. That is not the same thing. When you are building a trail or you are building a campsite or you are fixing up fences (fences can have a biodiversity advantage), what you are doing is looking after the infrastructure for the people. Terrific, but the people are there to see nature, and we need to make sure that we are putting an equal effort into restoring and protecting nature. That is what the environment minister's job is; that is what the environment department's job is.

Equally, the vast proportion of the money that is talked about is federal money, and that is excellent: it is always good to get federal money. A lot of it is for various bits of the River Murray and for the Water for Fodder program. Terrific, take the money and spend it, but do not claim that it is your own; that is all I am asking. Let's not pretend that that is the largesse of this state government. Of that, \$45 million is insurance money. Of course it is because of the devastation of the fires. Of course I want that insurance money to come through. I am not decrying it; I am just saying: do not wear it as a virtue. Having insurance money is a sign of tragedy; it is not a celebration of prioritising the environment.

I will be asking more questions about this in estimates, but I note that \$48 million is associated with additional fees. So that is raising money from South Australians or South Australian businesses rather than, again, the largesse and generosity of the Marshall Liberal government. We will see in estimates whether we can get to a little more precision about how and why that money is being spent.

I am of course also delighted with my new suite of portfolios. I have maintained, as always, my deep fondness for the environment and water portfolio, having worked in the department for a number of years and previously having been quite active in the environment movement for a number of years. It is extremely important to me and I am delighted to have been able to add the title of 'climate change' to that. But equally important is the pairing with innovation, industry and higher education.

I am concerned that the government do not talk about industry. It is quite confusing. I do not think they know that industry is a thing that one usually talks about in government. They have an innovation and skills section and they have an investment and trade section. The areas that one would normally expect to be working together in lockstep are separated into different departments.

Defence industries is somewhere else because the Premier is that minister, and space and so on. It is a little confusing, but I am sure that all the public servants, who are largely excellent public servants, are doing their absolute best to pull all those bits together and not have too much fall between the cracks. In any case, if I look at the Department for Innovation and Skills, in which I have an interest from an industry perspective, I am disturbed to see that not only have there been significant cuts, in previous budgets, to that department, but that a further \$13 million cut has been put into this budget.

I am not sure how much is left. It is now a tiny department and it has another \$13 million cut. If this were to be taken in FTEs, it would be a reduction of something like 40 FTEs. I am concerned that we are starting to get to a cutting of that department that will make it very difficult to functional. Why do we need it to be functional? Well, 'skills' speaks for itself, and I will let my colleague the shadow minister for education and skills (member for Wright) speak on that.

The importance of innovation, of industry and of business in the context of the changing economy, we have before us has been made so much more complex and more difficult as a result of the pandemic. The changing economy we have is being rushed on by digitisation, automation and artificial intelligence and by the internationalisation of our economy, with the pressure that is applied from the need desperately to get to a low-carbon economy as quickly as we can, both for the future of the planet and also to ensure that we do not have stranded assets.

We need an innovation industry portfolio that is absolutely staffed with the best people who can work with small business—because that is largely what we have in South Australia—to make sure that their capability is being increased, developed and supported so that they are able to participate in this emerging economy. If you reduce the resources and the capacity of a government

department, in a state like South Australia you risk ruin because government is essential in a small economy.

Government is important in every economy but, in a small one like South Australia, if you do not have great people working in a government department and understanding what the pressures are on business in this case, understanding what can be done, how collaboration can occur and how grants can be applied sensibly and intelligently, then we risk not making that big shift that is so urgent. Every budget is essential. Every budget is important because every budget is a decision moment about where this state will go next.

This budget having this \$13 million efficiency tucked into an innovation and skills department I think really undermines any claim the government has that it understands what is happening in our economy, that it recognises where business wants to go and needs to go and will be able to do that collaboratively alongside business for the sake not only purely of economic growth but, importantly, of employment for all the people in South Australia, particularly all those who are currently looking for work either because they have none or, in very great measure, because they do not have enough because they are insecurely employed or because they are underemployed. That is what the government should be doing. I do not see that priority in this budget.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:39):** I thank the deputy leader for her contribution and for highlighting the issues and concerns that this budget does not seem to solve in the portfolio responsibility areas that the deputy leader is tasked with on behalf of the Labor Party. I wish to rise today on a couple of matters. First and foremost, it is always important to compare and contrast past budgets with the current budget, to know where we were, to know where we are going.

There were two very interesting statistics that bear out in the Budget Statement, Budget Paper 3. Budget Paper 3 is, without a doubt, the comprehensive account or the report card, as it were, on how the government is tracking. In the last year Labor was in office, for that financial year the expenditure on interest payments was set to be \$392 million. This year, the budget for interest payments in 2020-21 is \$464 million. The government somehow are trumpeting that as a success.

It is also interesting to note the general government sector revenue and expenditure as a percentage of gross state product, two graphs that are I think very important in the budget. These are graphs that are often overlooked by many commentators when looking at government expenditure, but they are by far two of the most important graphs and most important statistics in the budget papers. It is how much of the government's revenue and expenditure is a percentage of gross state product—that is, the economy we tax and the economy we oversee.

What you see in the current government forecast is pretty shocking. Total revenue as a share of the economy is projected to average 18.1 per cent. In Labor's last year, over the forward estimates, it was 16.9 per cent around the GSP, getting down to 16.1 per cent this financial year. This government has increased spending as a percentage of gross state product by over 2 per cent on itself. Its expenditure line gets above 20 per cent of GSP. Under Labor, it never passed 18 per cent over the forward estimates.

There used to be fiscal conservatives on the other side of the house. I make no comment about the current level of expenditure; I just want to point that out. The government says they are not baking in this expenditure. The graph published in their own budget papers shows something very different. It shows expenditure locked in and growing over the forward estimates. This is not a one-off increase in spending: this is baked-in spending. That might be exactly what the state needs right now, but let's not pretend for a moment that it is not baked in, because it is.

We are \$33 billion in debt and we still do not have the \$8.9 billion taken into account. To be fair, only half of that is the state's responsibility. The other half comes from the commonwealth if, indeed, it remains a fifty-fifty split. So far, we have not heard from the commonwealth government whether they will accept the government's plans for tunnels and whether they will accept the extra expenditure required for tunnels. I hope they do. We do not know whether it will be a fifty-fifty contribution. Darlington was 80:20, negotiated by the former Labor government, and I understand Regency to Pym negotiated by this government is fifty-fifty. It will be interesting to see what happens when we get to the north-south corridor.

I point out the level of opaqueness and vagueness about what the government is planning. While people were initially reassured by the government's announcement of tunnels, there is now a

growing level of anxiety about what that means. I encourage the government now to go out and speak to its citizens about what it is planning. This is by far the largest piece of expenditure this government will ever undertake if it is re-elected.

None of this work on the north-south corridor starts this term. The government is hoping to get re-elected, hoping it can start this project. Again, a concern the opposition has is that this project should be brought forward because, quite frankly, the stimulus is needed now. I doubt very much on the projections that this will all be completed by 2030. I think that is fanciful and quite frankly misleading. I do not believe for a moment that the government can complete this by 2030.

When the minister was asked if the construction would be consecutive or concurrent, he said, 'Concurrent. We are doing one section first and, when we complete that, we are doing the next section.' That was met with great laughter and hilarity by the media pack. I was also very concerned about the minister's transparency on some issues. At the press conference that the minister did with the Premier straight after the budget, where they were wearing hard hats and high-vis for no apparent reason other than as props and a stunt, Minister Wingard was asked a question repeatedly by journalists.

He said there was one heritage property that needed to be compulsorily acquired, and he would not say which one it was. He was asked repeatedly, 'Which one is it? Why can't you tell us?' The minister's response was this: 'I'm not going to say which one it is and I'm not going to discuss it before we have a chance to negotiate with the owners.' This back and forth went on for about two or three minutes.

Then the Premier stepped in and said, 'I will answer the question. It is the underground bunker on South Road, next to the Ashwin Parade community centre, just in front of a playground.' What concerned me about that exchange was not that the Premier was prepared to answer the question but that the minister was not. What does it say—when you have a Premier and a minister being asked the same question, and the minister refuses to answer, but the Premier then volunteers to answer the question—about the transparency of that minister? I have grave concerns about that.

For the remainder of my time, I am going to speak almost exclusively about the privatisation contract that is expressed within the budget papers. I have grave concerns about the probity of this transaction. I believe that ultimately it will end up at an integrity agency. I believe that this contract has serious probity issues from start to finish.

The allegations that we have been given by a whistleblower within the department include a breach of adherence to tender rules and tender processes by Keolis Downer; governance and frameworks, including roles and responsibilities, risk management and probity issues not being followed; evaluation processes being compromised; the inability for all bidders to be provided with equal opportunity throughout the bid process and information equally; and the negotiations between proponents and the department. What is the final sum compared with what it costs the taxpayer to run the operations? What are the recommendations that the department gave and the processes that led to those approvals?

A loser fee was announced, and that was announced because we discovered it through a leak. We have three different answers from the government about why there is a loser fee in place. The first one was 'standard practice'; it is standard practice to have a loser fee in place and the IP is owned directly by the government. That is what the Treasurer said publicly. Departmental leaked documents show that the IP is not owned by the government and that a loser fee was suggested by the department because of the COVID-19 restrictions not allowing proponents to fly to Adelaide to look at infrastructure. Already, two disparate versions of why a loser fee was introduced.

The third reason, according to an inside informant who is giving information to the opposition, is that the loser fee was asked for by Keolis Downer or they threatened to walk. A proponent threatened to walk unless the government of South Australia paid them money to stay involved in the process. I believe that is corrupt.

Is the privatisation value for money? We know the government commissioned Ernst and Young. How do we know that? Again, a whistleblower has come to the opposition and told us that Ernst and Young were commissioned to do a baseline report on the cost of providing heavy

rail services to South Australians through the public transport system Adelaide Metro. That was then given to all three bidders as a baseline.

We understand that the cost of running Adelaide's rail network is about \$125 million per year, including GST and including maintenance. It will surprise members in this house to know that the cost of a Keolis Downer outsourcing exceeds that amount. It is more expensive for the private operators to run this system.

The minister went on radio, and when he was asked specifically how much taxpayers would save through this privatisation he said, 'Hundreds of millions of dollars per year.' How humiliating; how humiliating that a minister who is responsible for some of the largest expenditure in the government can get something as basic as this right—sorry, wrong. I apologise, I just did a Corey then. Again, the government will not release the report—and they should.

I believe there was preferential treatment for one bidder. I believe, the opposition believes, that Keolis Downer were always going to win this contract. Former Minister Knoll met with Keolis Downer when he should not have. How do we know that? The Auditor-General says so in his own report tabled in this parliament. We are told that the minister was warned not to meet them, but he did anyway.

We know that representatives of Downer EDI were briefing government members, giving them fake and false quotes attributed to me, the shadow treasurer and former Premier Weatherill, claiming that we wanted to privatise our rail network if we were successful at the 2018 election. They were working behind the scenes to give the government ammunition, give them the political will to go out and privatise our trams and trains—and surprise, surprise, the very people who did this are the ones who end up winning the contract. That type of behaviour is, I believe, corrupt.

Keolis Downer was always going to win this. We know from leaked documents that one proponent wrote—this is a letter I gave to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure when he said that the letter was fake, the emails were fake, and then said they were fake until two minutes ago—in a letter dated 18 August to probity officers, Bombardier Transportation Australia stated:

To date, Bombardier Transportation has received negligible questions in relation to any aspect of its submission. In our experience of competitive tenders, this is highly unusual.

The department were not interested in Bombardier's submission; they had made up their minds before the process started. I believe that as time goes on we will find the corrupt negotiations that went on behind the scenes that gave this to Keolis Downer.

In terms of rail safety accreditation, Keolis Downer did not operate heavy rail anywhere in Australia—nowhere. Their only expertise in running heavy rail is, I understand, Downer operating heavy rail in France. It is a different system, a different continent, yet the government championed and trumpeted the idea that Keolis Downer run trams—not heavy rail—as the reason they should be awarded this contract.

We were told that the department—people who were looking at and assessing this bid—warned the government that Keolis Downer might not receive accreditation to operate heavy rail, yet they were awarded the contract despite having no experience in doing so. They have also been awarded the maintenance contract despite it being Bombardier's trains. What is going to happen, sir? You can bet London to a brick that Keolis Downer are going to hire Bombardier—who currently do our maintenance—to do the maintenance. So we are going to add a middleman to the expense of maintaining our trains. Why? A corrupt deal.

We are told that one of the bidders involved in the tender process raised concerns about the equality of opportunity throughout the bid process. We are told by whistleblowers that the evaluation team were immediately directed to the Keolis Downer proposal and focused on what they had missed and how they would cost the difference. They were advised not to waste time on the Adelaide Next proposal, another bidder, and that focus should be on the gaps in the Keolis Downer proposal so the overall outcome could be fully costed knowing the difference between the two proposals would still be large enough to justify the Keolis Downer decision—corrupt to its core.

We now find out through leaked documents about a Mr Fergus Gammie. I think this is the most alarming part of the entire process. The public were never made aware that Mr Gammie had been appointed to oversee the Adelaide Rail Transformation Project by a direct appointment by his

former colleague and the current CE, Mr Braxton-Smith. We first became aware of Mr Gammie's appointment to oversee the ARTP by a whistleblower contacting us.

Mr Gammie's personal work history shows that he resigned the previous role he held in New Zealand under extraordinary controversial circumstances. He was appointed CE of the New Zealand Transport Agency in March 2016 and resigned two years later in December. He had been publicly criticised for failing to adequately carry out the department's basic regulatory functions, which led to the death of at least one person due to a frayed seatbelt in a vehicle that was issued a WoF, which is a regulatory inspection certifying safety and roadworthiness. A QC in New Zealand was engaged to investigate the matter, with over 20,000 dodgy regulatory approvals granted according to New Zealand media reports.

Another independent investigation completed by Deloitte found that the New Zealand transport department's innovation unit had, and I quote, 'An extensive disregard of the proper processes for business finance, governance, procurement and staffing.' The report went on to conclude that it was largely the result of the leadership of McMullen and the former CE, Fergus Gammie. The media quoted the Deloitte report saying it offered 14 key findings, starting with the concerns over the bypassing of the New Zealand TA governance and controls, including the way staff were hired. This is the man in charge of the privatisation of South Australia's rail network—Fergus Gammie.

Mr Gammie was initially appointed without process to the South Australian Public Transport Authority in July 2019; then, without a public call, he was appointed by his old friend—they still worked together—Mr Braxton-Smith to head up the Adelaide Rail Transformation Project. I do not believe he should have been, and I believe that should be the subject of an inquiry. Mr Gammie and Mr Braxton-Smith are friends. If you are going to appoint someone to privatise public assets, do not choose your mates. Hold a public process. And if you do know someone personally, how about recusing yourself from the decision-making because there might be a conflict.

Given all the information and all the documents we have received, we believe the entire process is compromised, rotten and corrupt. The very idea that the government has outsourced the operation of our trains and trams, especially our heavy rail, to be run at a higher and greater cost than it costs us ourselves to operate, quite frankly, is stupid. The very prospect of having to pay people \$15,000 to keep their job or just transfer from the Public Service to Keolis Downer is laughable.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (17:00):** I rise to make my contribution to the appropriations debate. I want to start by talking about trade. We are now in a time of challenge. We have had dry conditions, bushfires, COVID-19, rising trade tensions with China, and the decisions of Brexit have put us in a new position with our relationship with the United Kingdom.

But what I see from this government is inaction. We are underprepared for this time of challenge. The budget papers show a 5.7 per cent decline in the real value of goods exports from South Australia. That is a fact. The Marshall Liberal government came to lead South Australia with the initial target of a 7 per cent share of national exports. It was a key part of their election policy. They felt that we had been underdone for some time and that we needed to improve South Australia's share of national exports.

I know that even before COVID we were nowhere near that goal. In fact, we were going backwards. This government has been trending on average around 3 per cent of national share and, year on year, our goods exports are down by 700 million. So let's have a look at what this government has been doing when it comes to trade. It has ripped up our regional trade strategies. It sacked our regional trade advisers. There have been constant machinery of government changes and we are onto our second minister for trade, all in a very short period of time.

We lag behind in rolling out trade missions and then we rolled out a trade office program that came at the cost of direct assistance in our state. I have said it before in this place but I will say it again: my message to the Marshall Liberal government is just to get on with it. Trade is incredibly important to South Australia. Listen to the experts, act on that advice, and stop cutting and shuffling the deckchairs.

It was very clear to me that there was a dismantling of the previous trade strategies based on a political vendetta. Of all the things that we make decisions on, trade should be something on which we agree the way forward, but we know they just could not help themselves. So all the combined work of people involved in exports to develop those trade strategies was ripped up overnight because it happened to be under a Labor government. How insulting to the people in that industry.

What that brings me to is our big risk, and the clear strategic risk that we have with our global trade is the lack of diversification. For example, let's look at the international education sector. Prior to the pandemic, the top export market for international education in South Australia was China. It had a 40 per cent market share. That market is nearly the equivalent of the next top nine markets combined. It is significant. It had been growing and it had been substantial, but that made us very vulnerable—40 per cent market share.

In our merchandise exports, there is a similar story. In the 12 months leading to September 2020, our goods exports to China were 3.75 billion—that is, 30 per cent of our total export portfolio from South Australia goes to China, which means that we are more heavily exposed to the potential challenges of trade with China. When we look at our key export industries, such as international education, tourism, wine, minerals, wheat, timber and rock lobster, I have my concerns.

As shadow minister, I think this government needs to get the most at-risk industries around the table and work through a plan. I am sure that if I spoke to any business and said, 'Would you be worried about a shutdown of 30 to 40 per cent of your total income?' the answer would be yes—not only yes, but there would be a mad scramble to address this issue. I am not seeing concern or energy from this front bench—in fact, quite the opposite. Where is the leadership and expertise for these challenges for us now? Where are the plans to support these industries?

These are industries that employ South Australians all over South Australia, whether it be in the South-East, with the rock lobster or timber, or our beautiful wine regions exporting, Barossa Valley, Clare, Fleurieu, Adelaide Hills; there are many. Throughout these areas where there are high exports, there are jobs. There are 79,000 Australians employed in export industries—11 per cent of our workforce—yet there is inaction and a lack of urgency from this government about the challenges of trade before us.

There are 165,000 South Australians who are actively looking for work. We know that in this budget paper there is zero per cent job growth this financial year, yet a key part of our employment industry—trade—barely got mentioned in the budget. Where is the urgency? Where is the money in this budget to make sure that our trade remains at the levels it is? We can only hope that it gets to 7 per cent of the national share. We are not even where we were when Labor left government. Get on with it, but where is your urgency and your action?

When we turn to the area of investment, the government's budget papers report a decline in South Australian business investment by 4.8 per cent last financial year. The opposition has made it consistently clear that this Marshall Liberal government made a terrible error in disbanding Investment Attraction South Australia, an agency that brought the likes of VeroGuard and Boeing to South Australia, creating thousands of local jobs before it was abolished in 2018.

Until this day, it still astounds me that this government made the decision to abolish the Investment Attraction agency, an agency dedicated to encouraging investment from companies that will be looking for future work opportunities to relocate to South Australia and dedicated to being a smart state and building jobs for the future, but once again political vendetta come in and says, 'We can't have that just because you did it.'

We need increased business investment to flow for more jobs, and that is why we recommended in our budget reply the reintroduction of an investment attraction agency. We proposed that you put \$50 million from the Economic and Business Growth Fund to assist that work because we need to be out there, aggressively bidding for that investment. We have an opportunity. We have done a very good job in responding to the health needs of COVID. We need to follow that up with aggressively going out there to market South Australia as a safe place to invest.

We now have this moment in time when we can show to the world the runs on the board in terms of what we have been able to achieve, but we need to get out there because there is lots of

competition. Everyone wants jobs for the future, everyone wants industries for the future. This is our moment, and we need to get out there and grab it.

When I have talked about tourism I have often spoken about the very challenging conversations that I have had with tourism operators. I have spent most of the time during COVID, during lockdown, calling people, talking to them. They asked, 'What's happening?' The single biggest issue was the uncertainty that, overnight in March, everything switched off and people did not know when that would end.

We have seen some rebounding in our regional areas, but there are still many areas of the tourism sector, including tourism operators, that are focused on international guests, and our very own travel agents are still in a world of pain. We know that JobKeeper came in and that helped us survive, but when that finishes in March there are still people in tourism and hospitality who will struggle to survive. One of the areas that I am concerned about is the lack of focus on those who make up our tourism industry.

Tourism Research Australia in June of 2019 showed in their data that 90 per cent of all employing businesses in our state tourism sector are classified as micro or small. These are smaller businesses, normally family run, that employ between one to 19 employees. These are the people our tourism stimulus should focus on. These are the real people who have mortgaged their homes, built their businesses from scratch, spent their life savings and their blood, sweat and tears to build their business and who are now trying to survive through this COVID challenge.

My message to the Marshall Liberal government is: do not forget the small operators. That is why not only did I call for a tourism voucher back in July but also I criticised the Great State voucher because of its narrowness, because it did not encompass any accommodation providers who had less than 10 rooms and it did not give the opportunity for tourism operators to participate. They feel ignored because of the limited scope of these vouchers.

Recently *The Advertiser* quoted Ben Neville from the Off Piste four-wheel drive tours on Fleurieu Peninsula, and I quote:

We were disappointed the first round was only for accommodation and would love a round where tour operators were included—our guests spend on all sorts of things on a tour so there is a ripple effect.

Mark Gleeson from Food Tours Australia told Channel 9 news, and I quote:

There are a whole lot of small operators like me out there who are holding onto a very fine thread to whether or not their business is going to survive in the next six months.

The government needs to focus its efforts on making sure that our SME tourism operators can survive. The existing stimulus does not spread far enough, and I have called it out many times that only 3 per cent of tourism operators registered on southaustralia.com can even be part of the voucher system. We need a broader scope and investment on the sector that is currently available.

In anticipation of this budget, the Transport and Tourism Forum called on this government to invest in efforts to attract new direct flights to appropriate locations, such as the trans-Tasman bubble, as well as major investments in new tourism-related facilities and infrastructure. According to their analysis, the South Australian Tourism Commission would need at least \$400 million over the next four years to address the economic black hole that the pandemic and the bushfires have left, but instead we see a continuation of the cuts that tourism has to continue to accept. The trend of cuts continues.

In the previous budget, the government made cuts to tourism to the tune of \$11 million. This cut meant a reduction in international marketing and direct flight attraction. The cut meant a reduction in sector development, activity and projects that help small business and this led to cutting the support for events such as the Adelaide Fashion Festival and the Adelaide Motorsport Festival. Now, of course, the shock is still reverberating. We know there is a rally this weekend about the biggest cut of all and the biggest shock of all—the Adelaide 500.

As I said many times, if you are going to make a big decision like this, if you are going to cut a major event, you need to have a plan. We have no plan. We have no plan to replace the economic hole that is going to be left by the Adelaide 500. For all the concerns I had previously about the other

cuts to those festivals, festivals that gave us an extended calendar of events through the year, nothing came close to my shock about the cut of the Adelaide 500.

There is no plan to reshape our festivals and events. We have decades of history with the Adelaide Festival of Arts and the Adelaide Fringe. We are known as the Festival State and I am very proud about that. In this budget there was no reference to our homegrown festivals and events, such as the Fringe, the Festival of Arts, OzAsia, WOMAD and all the major festivals that contribute to the vibrancy of Adelaide and deliver economic returns to the state and we saw no mention in this budget of additional support for these events.

This has been the most challenging year for people in tourism and hospitality. We have seen the visitor economy reduced from \$8.1 billion to \$6.5 billion. The tourism sector in South Australia is losing on average \$453 million a month. Every mechanism that is available to government should be used to support this industry.

If it were not for the advocacy of the Labor opposition and the bus and coach industry, the concessions on bus and coach licences would not have happened. If it were not for the advocacy of the Labor opposition and the outdoor tourism sector, there would not have been a clear pathway for these accommodation providers to open. The government was slow and reacted to taking a holistic approach in supporting this sector. We called it out months before, that tourism and hospitality had been fundamentally impacted, but they were too slow to respond.

I have mentioned many times the cuts to tourism in the first and second budgets that have been presented to South Australia. I have to say to you I thought, after this most difficult year, with our national borders shut and our state borders reduced, that these cuts would have been reversed. It is very, very clear in the budget papers that these cuts remain—\$10 million worth of cuts in the forward estimates.

I say again: has tourism not suffered enough? We know that businesses are fighting to survive. They are not thriving: they are trying to survive. Now that some of the bank loans have unfrozen, people are questioning whether they will be able to do that. It is a really challenging time for them, so let's reverse these cuts, let's take them out of the tourism budget and let them get on with it.

Today, we talked about what we would do if Labor were here. We talked about an investment attraction agency with the \$50 million. We talked about accelerating infrastructure projects. We would encourage South Australians to buy local. From a tourism perspective, we said the underspent tourism vouchers should be rolled out again in a matched program, with \$200 matched for interstate and for South Australians, because we want to support our tourism industry going forward. There is going to be a lot of competition out there, so we want to put our best foot forward. These are some of the hardest hit sectors and I remain bitterly disappointed that they did not get the attention that they deserve in this budget.

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (17:20):** Like other members, I also rise to make a contribution in relation to the 2020-21 budget. In most extraordinary times is the handing down of this state budget, several months later than usual, obviously on the back of a global pandemic. I would like to talk about a few things that are key to my electorate. The elements in the budget around support for the Country Fire Service, local businesses, schools and community groups, road infrastructure and the environment are really big key issues to the people I represent.

It was great to see some \$30.5 million in funds for bushfire response and recovery on the back of the Mick Keelty review, which was obviously on the back of a devastating bushfire season last year. I think the additional funding that we are seeing going to the CFS, the SES and, to a certain extent, the MFS is symptomatic of the lack of funding that these services have received for many, many years. There is a lot of catch-up being played and there is a recognition that our volunteers need the best equipment that they can get.

In terms of government going out there and investing in CFS infrastructure, new trucks, new fleet and new equipment, there really should be an insistence on the government using South Australia-based suppliers almost primarily and, where it is not possible, to look at interstate suppliers and then finally overseas suppliers for these investments. I think it is so important that we not only support our CFS in terms of the equipment that they need but go to Australian made and South

Australian made policies around that to support the local jobs and the people who provide services to the CFS.

As I said, there will be new money for new fire trucks, safety protection, regional staffing enhancements and replacement of fleet and rollover. Really, the automatic vehicle location system is something that many have been calling for. I remember earlier in the year when I was out at the Eden Hills brigade something that was certainly mentioned to me about their experience in the Cudlee Creek fires was the lack of those systems in their patrols. Mental health support is so important, and, as I said, capability and resourcing, which needs to be done.

On top of this, \$16.7 million in federal and state government funding will be invested over five years into the South Australian Disaster Risk Reduction Grants Program, while a further \$11.5 million will go to the MFS for new urban appliances. I look forward to further reviewing the budget in terms of these details in the budget estimates program and ensuring that in my electorate the Sturt brigade and the Sturt CFS and SES brigades receive their fair share of funding.

We know that over the last 12 months small businesses have been heavily impacted by this pandemic as a result of decisions made by the government that have limited their ability to trade and to go about their normal business, so it is good to see the state government supporting the small business sector. There is another round of sole trader stimulus grants of up to \$10,000 and \$3,000 grants for eligible businesses that do not employ staff, including sole traders and partnerships operating from a commercial premise and suffering financial hardship as a result of this pandemic.

It is about striking the right balance. We have no doubt seen a lot of traders and industries doing quite well or relatively well. Certainly, those in the home industry—garden centres, nurseries and large chains, such as Bunnings—have done extraordinarily well, as people have been spending money on their homes because they have not been able to travel or go out. They have been investing in lifestyle and the like. I think that places like Bunnings have also been assisted in a way by a perverse outcome of their being able to trade all through the pandemic, whilst other businesses had restrictions put on them.

It was really good to see a further extension of payroll tax relief. Businesses with revenue greater than \$4 million and on the extended JobKeeper will also not have to pay any payroll tax until January 2021, and of course there are payroll exemptions on JobKeeper payments. Larger businesses will also be able to defer payroll if they continue to be impacted by COVID restrictions, and there is no new payroll for any new trainee or apprentice brought on for 12 months.

Of course, this is something that should be a long-lasting policy. It is a perverse notion that a business that seeks to bring on trainees—and it does not matter what they are, whether it is a butcher bringing on a trainee, a business in the motor vehicle industry, a carpenter or a builder—should pay payroll tax on trainee labour.

One really good part of the budget that has not really been talked about and I think is sort of tucked away in the agency papers is support for newsagencies and lottery agencies, which will hopefully see a pay rise for employers and employees. In the budget, there are mooted to be changes to the State Lotteries Act to remove agent commissions from the calculation of net gambling revenue in South Australia. This will allow the level of lottery agents' gross commissions payable by Tabcorp on lottery products sold in South Australia to rise from around 7 per cent to 10.3 per cent.

The taxation mechanism within the act has long prevented any adjustments to agent commissions. This will enable our hardworking lottery agents to receive their first commission rate change in a very long time—a rise of more than 40 per cent—and will bring their commissions in line with other lottery retailers around the country.

I know that in my community, whether it is Alan, who runs the Blackwood newsagency, or Ben, who runs the Mitcham newsagency and obviously sells a whole suite of products, including lottery tickets, this is great news for them. They are small business traders, they are open six or seven days a week and they are a really important part of our communities. You know as well in your community, sir, how important the local newsagency is. Of course, this measure is supported by Tabcorp, the Australian Lottery and Newsagents' Association, the AHA and Clubs SA.

Another thing I am always very supportive of is investment in sporting clubs and community groups. Of course, I am glad to see there is a sport and rec plan with additional funding and \$35 million for new community sporting and recreational infrastructure, including an expansion and extension of the existing grassroots football, cricket and netball program to now incorporate all sports, because we know that in our communities people do not just play footy, cricket and netball. They play softball, basketball, volleyball—

**Mr Odenwalder:** Soccer.

**Mr DULUK:** Soccer, of course, thank you, member for Elizabeth. The Sturt Lions Football Club is one of the biggest clubs in the state and they play all throughout my electorate. I look forward to working with my community clubs in ensuring that they participate in the upcoming grant funding rounds.

School is so important. Education is the key to anyone's future, and we are continuing to see a rollout of the year 7 to high school programs. In my electorate, that is additional funding for Unley High School and Urrbrae Agricultural High School. But one thing that has come to me, especially through my local schools, is sometimes the inability for the department to meet the needs of the school community because of the requirements to tick many boxes.

It is great to see big capital investment in schools and I am very supportive of the early childhood centre \$20,000 capital investment project. There is no doubt that all primary schools across the state, including the schools within my community—Eden Hills Primary School, Coromandel Valley Primary School and Bellevue Heights Primary School—are looking for funding for additional projects that I know will create immediate workforce jobs for them to be met.

At this stage, they have had trouble negotiating with the department because they do not tick the necessary boxes. At Eden Hills, they are looking for a replacement of their astroturf. Coromandel Valley is in much need of new landscaping due to the topography of the school, as many of the garden beds are shifting and there are cracks in the concrete. Bellevue Heights Primary School is looking for new air conditioning for the gym.

One of the biggest impacts of COVID on primary schools has been their inability to hold fundraisers this year. Normally, these capital works projects that need investments of \$30,000, \$40,000 or \$50,000—the parents and friends associations or school governing councils have not been able to hold their quiz nights and movie nights, etc., to raise these important funds. It would be fantastic if the department could meet the schools halfway on these matters.

Infrastructure is so important and it is good to see in the budget the north-south corridor will be happening. I think there probably have been one or two missed opportunities in terms of looking at statewide nation-building infrastructure projects. In terms of responding to the budget, Ross Womersley, CEO of SACOSS, said that the budget 'has missed the opportunity to really make some very big investments back into the social housing system', and I could not agree with him more.

Master Builders Association of South Australia's CEO, Ian Markos, said, 'There are no new large-scale construction projects in the budget.' That is quite an interesting comment from Ian. As we know, he is a passionate advocate for his industry. On that note, I would like to thank Ian Markos for his service to the MBA over the past five years. I think they have done a great job representing their industry in the time he has been the CEO. The Master Builders Association represents thousands of South Australians and their industry. I wish Ian all the best in his retirement and look forward to working with Will Frogley, the new CEO of the MBA. COTA CEO, Jane Mussared, said:

Without funding for incentives and training, there is no clear pathway back to work for older people who continue to face ageism in their job search.

I think that is another important statement from the CEO of COTA, as of course South Australia still has some of the highest unemployment in the nation and we need to encourage people at all levels—not just young apprentices and school-leavers but also older South Australians—to continue to be in the workforce.

One issue I constantly talk about and I think is another missed opportunity in this budget, as it could be a fantastic nation-building project, is an alternative freight bypass that will ensure that we do not have big freight trucks going down the South Eastern Freeway. Once again, on Tuesday

morning, I think, we saw another accident on the South Eastern Freeway involving a truck and the delay that caused.

The KPMG report that was released by the government earlier this year stated that South Australia has some of the slowest roads in the nation and reported Adelaide to have the lowest traffic flow speed of all capital cities. Sitting in traffic rather than being productive members of society is what that causes. I believe we need an alternative nonstop corridor diverting road freight from the South Eastern Freeway and away from Cross Road and diverting rail freight out of the Mitcham Hills.

The KPMG report noted that the Melbourne to Adelaide rail corridor is amongst the tightest and steepest corridors, so there is certainly a need to fix that. It has also noted the need for an alternative truck corridor. We know we cannot get B-triples down the South Eastern Freeway. I know that my community does not want B-doubles going down Cross Road.

For many, many years, a discussion about an alternative truck bypass through Truro has been mooted. I believe it can be achieved. It would be a perfect time to be part of a state building project that will create many jobs and, not only that, guarantee a safe and reliable truck alternative, which will not only create safety and efficiency for our freight industry but also take away and alleviate so much stress and concern about the constant complexity of the South Eastern Freeway and the constant fight we see between motorists, commuters and the freight industry.

In the budget, it is good to see ongoing funding for existing road projects in my electorate, including the Mitcham Hills corridor, which is so important, and the allocation of that funding. It has been a bit of a slow process, so I look forward to working with the department over the coming months to see further community consultation on that Mitcham Hills road corridor and making those projects shovel ready.

We know there is additional funding for road maintenance in the budget. It is so important that the Civil Contractors Federation has been talking about this a lot this year: the need for shovel-ready projects and to fix the road maintenance backlog in South Australia. Certainly within my electorate, Old Belair Road and James Road, which has been focused on in the Mitcham Hill study, is also prime for investment, as is the resealing of Belair Road at Lynton, below Windy Point. The Laffers Road-Main Road intersection at Belair certainly needs a lot of attention. Sargent Parade and Shepherds Hill Road at Bellevue Heights is another intersection that needs to be looked at and warrants investment from the department, as does Main Road through Coromandel Valley. People who drive along that road know it is in very poor condition.

I am glad to see a lot of investment in the environment in this budget and also an investment, through the Department for Environment and Water, for prescribed burns. That really feeds into the recommendations out of the Keelty review. One of the big numbers in the budget is the staggering \$33 billion of net debt that is projected in the forward estimates. For South Australia and our economy, this is a phenomenal number.

Matthew Abraham, veteran political commentator on FIVEaa, made some very interesting points about this debt figure and what it means for South Australia. I would like to quote Matt Abraham. He states:

One of the key figures of the debt isn't the total amount of debt but how much you can afford to pay for that debt as a state. Consider this is your household budget: it's ok if you've got a huge mortgage if you've got a huge salary...

There's a thing called the net debt to revenue ratio. This is your capacity to pay debt. At around the State Bank time that hit an alarming 65 per cent—

so we are talking about 1992 to 1993—

and everyone said we are going to die. The magic number is meant to be around 70 per cent—you go over that you're in huge trouble...

Since [around] 1999 it's...slowly coming down. It's been about 3 per cent in 2009, then 2011—[up to] 19 per cent, so it's slowly been going up. Last year it was sitting on 30 per cent. That's ok...this year, 51 per cent. Ok, 51 is not bad. Next year, 78 per cent. 2022: 92 per cent. 2023: 99.8 per cent. By 2024 when our debt is projected to hit \$33 billion it will be 104 per cent—way over the tipping point. Is that a worry? Nobody seems to be worried anymore.

Where debt sits on the balance sheet of any budget is very important. We know that we are sitting in a historic low interest rate environment at the moment, but we will not always be in a historic low interest rate environment. Economies and interest rate environments move up and down over time.

There is no doubt that over the next five to 10 years we will see interest rates increase and we will not be sitting in historic lows as we are at the moment. Of course, servicing a \$30 billion debt at an interest rate of 0.5 per cent is very different from servicing a rate at 5, 6, 7 or 8 per cent. As a state, we cannot be lulled into thinking that, year on year, we can continue to increase this net debt figure over the forward estimates.

We need to invest in productivity to increase our GSP. We need to grow that state pie. We need to grow the population of our state. We need to continue to keep up with the eastern seaboard. Population growth is a huge part of that, a flexible economy is a huge part of that and investing in productive infrastructure is a huge component of that as well. Ensuring that over time we balance the budget and responsible financial management are paramount for any government.

*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan.*

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (17:41):** I rise to speak in relation to the Appropriation Bill and this year's state budget. I begin as other speakers have in talking about the situation we are in at the moment in relation to COVID-19 and the pandemic. Clearly, this is the all-encompassing issue of the world this year and is likely to be for at least a significant part of next year, as well.

I think we can all acknowledge that South Australia and, indeed, all of Australia has done exceptionally well. We should be thanking all South Australians for their efforts in following the right advice and in doing their part to keep our state safe and particularly thanking all our leaders in the public administration of the state for playing their role under the Emergency Management Act in terms of their leadership.

In particular, the response under our legislation has been led by Grant Stevens as the police commissioner and State Coordinator. He has been the one under our legislation making the decisions and he has done so in an excellent way. He has been ably advised and assisted by Professor Nicola Spurrier, and I think all South Australians are tremendously proud of her exceptional role in handling this pandemic.

Right through the bureaucracy, through our health services, through our hospitals, through our police force and through every department, people have done an exceptional job in terms of managing this. I acknowledge the role of the cabinet as well, in playing their role under our Emergency Management Act. The decision-making is made by the State Coordinator, of course; the Premier is not part of the Transition Committee that meets to decide and to advise the State Coordinator. I think it is appropriate that he has taken the decision not to be actively involved and leave those decisions to the State Coordinator. I think that has left us in a good position.

We as the opposition have continued to play our role in assisting the government to move legislation through this house on a bipartisan basis to make sure that our state is protected. We have been constructive in offering a number of proposals to make sure that we get the resources where they need to be over time, and we appreciate that the government have taken up and implemented many of the constructive proposals that we have put on the table since this began. It is a very different situation that we have seen in South Australia compared with other states around the country, where there has been a lot more politicking of the COVID-19 situation than we have seen here in South Australia.

However, when it comes to the state budget, these are decisions that are not made by the State Coordinator. These are not decisions that are made by the Chief Public Health Officer. These are decisions that are made by the cabinet, made by the Liberal government and their members of parliament and elected representatives. Unfortunately, we do see a significant difference in terms of the management of the pandemic and the management of the budget and the economy, and some of these decisions, particularly in my portfolio as the shadow health minister, in relation to the running of our health services.

We can see the continuation of the approach from the government since the get-go in health, which has been to put cuts at the forefront, to put privatisation at the forefront, to put corporate liquidators at the forefront of their approach to the health system and to our public hospitals. It is disappointing that that continues again in this state budget. We can see in the budget papers in black

and white that the government is still proposing to cut hundreds more health staff this year. These are our frontline doctors, nurses, allied health professionals, people on the frontline. All around the world, there are health systems preparing, hiring more, getting more people on the frontline.

The response of the Marshall Liberal government has been to cut health staff. According to the Auditor-General's figures in his latest report, over the past year, in which we were battling this global pandemic, the Liberal government did not increase the number of nurses in our public hospitals. They did not even keep the number of nurses at the same number. They have reduced the number of nurses in hospitals in our public hospital system.

There are 112 fewer nurses now than there were a year ago. That is because of the decisions by this government, by the Liberals, to cut frontline clinicians. Despite their promise that they would not do that before the last election and their confirmation afterwards they would not be cutting frontline doctors and nurses, we see the number of nurses go down by 112. This budget sets out in black and white that they hope that that continues and we see hundreds and hundreds more health staff cut.

Unfortunately, we have seen a continuation of dangerous, record levels of ambulance ramping. What we saw during COVID was that there was a dip in terms of presentations at hospitals while people were basically staying away, but we have now seen the number of people being ramped in ambulances soar back to those record levels. It is almost double the level it was under the previous government. It has gone from a once in a few weeks situation to a daily situation when our hospitals are ramping and patients are waiting on those ambulance ramps for hours to get into public hospitals.

Last year, we saw three examples reported publicly in which a patient died within minutes of being stuck on the ambulance ramp. We do not know if that was the full extent of what happened. This is just what has been revealed publicly, but potentially there have been others this year the government will not reveal either. It just goes to show how dangerous the situation is and how little is being done to address it. Cutting nurses is only going to make that situation worse.

It also means that our paramedics are under even greater pressure. Our paramedics on the frontline, responding to cases, responding to 000 calls in the community, instead of getting to those cases, they are stuck on the ambulance ramp, waiting for hours and hours. It means that they are under more pressure, they are under more fatigue, causing them more stress. It also means that the response time for getting to those people in the community for urgent cases is at a record low.

That clearly impacts upon those people waiting. It is delaying their treatment, delaying getting them to hospital to get the care that they need, delaying even the paramedics starting that treatment, given we have very well-trained paramedics in South Australia. That means that this situation is going from bad to worse. This budget does not increase the resources going to SA Ambulance Service but reduces the resources going to SA Ambulance Service. They are dealing with this outrageous level of ramping, and they are now going to have to do it with fewer resources and more cuts.

There are more staff cuts to come, with 80 staff to be cut from the Ambulance Service this year. These issues flow through to all the other hospitals. We know that a number of very significant issues have been revealed in the past year at the Women's and Children's Hospital. A year ago, 215 doctors from the Women's and Children's Hospital wrote an unprecedented letter, concerned and outraged about the state of services at that hospital. In October 2019, just over a year ago, they said:

The universal concern, expressed by all medical staff, is that many services that our community (a catchment...of [approximately] 2 million [people], in a developed country) should expect to receive from a specialist Women's and Children's Hospital, seem unachievable in South Australia. The resulting adverse effect on the safety and quality of the care that we can provide has become increasingly hard to justify to our patients and the community.

These doctors went on to say:

There is concern that medical advice relating to the provision of appropriate contemporary care is being consistently ignored without explanation or justification. This relates to the resourcing of both hospital and community departments. The medical interventions and equipment provided at the Women's and Children's Hospital are falling behind those available in peer hospitals [across] Australia.

These 215 doctors went on to say:

Responses from junior and senior medical staff in the recent WCHN 'Your Voice' survey consistently demonstrated dissatisfaction with Executive leadership, vision, behaviour and communication despite being highly

satisfied with relations between and within clinical teams. Worryingly, medical staff did not feel confident that safety concerns that they raised with management would be acted upon. Similar concerns with medical engagement by Executive and Executive performance, action and transparency have been repeatedly raised at [Medical Staff Society] meetings.

The reductions across nursing and allied health services such as social work and psychological services, in particular, are negatively impacting on the overall quality of patient care. Medical staff are having to independently seek supports from other LHNs due to lack of our own care resources. This is not in the best interests of either patients and/or their families.

You can see the extent of the concerns raised by those frontline doctors at the Women's and Children's Hospital, and what has been the response from the government? Nothing. There are no extra resources going into the Women's and Children's Hospital to address those concerns. The minister is out there triumphing a CPI increase this year, which is not going to address those issues whatsoever.

These doctors are being consistently ignored, and we are seeing issue after issue. We saw the very eminent Dr Michael Rice, one of the most respected doctors in South Australia, speaking out on his concerns about oncology patients, kids with cancer, not getting the care they need at the Women's and Children's Hospital. They have been ignored. Nothing has happened. There is not one dollar in this budget to address those concerns that have been raised.

We have an inquiry underway in relation to four deaths of kids with cardiac issues that have occurred at the Women's and Children's Hospital. We are still waiting for that report. The board have made a decision that they are not going to go down the path of surgery even though they have not seen what that report says yet. It is completely baffling that they would put the cart before the horse in such a serious matter like this.

We heard that doctors at the hospital tried to raise concerns about those deaths through the appropriate mechanism, the Safety Learning System, but they were denied, in an absolute cover-up, being able to raise those concerns about those patient deaths. That means that clearly we have a situation where doctors have to speak publicly. If it were not for Professor John Svigos, a very respected doctor, raising those concerns before a parliamentary committee, clearly the government's intention was that no-one should ever know about it, because we know Minister Wade was told about it and he did nothing.

Now we see the new Women's and Children's Hospital, which does not have a budget, does not have a number of beds attached to it and does not have a number of services attached to it. No details have been released about it except that we have obtained, under freedom of information, a document to the minister that shows they are planning to have fewer overnight beds at the hospital and fewer car parks at the hospital than are currently available.

All of this for a \$1.85 billion cost, which is far in excess of the costs of other women's and children's hospitals around the country, far in excess of the cost—probably double the cost—per bed of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and clinicians are not being consulted about the plans for that hospital.

Clinicians are not being given the task force report, which the government keep under lock and key of cabinet confidentiality and they are not allowing those clinicians to see what they have decided in their secret task force report about this new hospital. It is absolutely shocking, the way that clinicians are being ignored about that. This is a pattern across the delays that we are seeing with the Women's and Children's Hospital—which has been delayed at least two years, probably 2½ years or more now—that is being repeated in other hospitals around the state.

At The QEH we have seen a two-year delay in starting that project and significant cuts to what is being proposed in the scope of those works. At the Lyell McEwin Hospital we are seeing a delay to the emergency department there. There is a delay at Modbury Hospital, the high dependency unit, of years compared to what was originally promised. Even at the Flinders Medical Centre—where the government are triumphing their apparent \$80 million upgrade, even though the budget papers say it is only \$11 million—that upgrade is only going to deliver, according to their own papers that were released, five extra beds. Only five extra beds is not going to deal with the situation that is unfolding.

The Auditor-General's Report reveals that the infrastructure spending over the past two years of this government has been the lowest in a decade. It has ground to a halt. What these

budget papers reveal is that we have yet another year of where they had promised they were going to spend a lot of money on capital but they just did not do it: \$80 million less spent on capital works in our hospitals than was planned. In addition to the year before, there was another \$80 million less spent than was planned. That means fewer jobs for people, which are desperately needed right now, and it also means fewer services and fewer upgrades for those important services.

Mental health is one of the key priorities as well and, as I spoke about in the house earlier today, we are clearly dealing with a very serious situation in terms of mental health and the response to COVID. Clearly, this is a worldwide issue, it is a country-wide issue, but here in South Australia we have the lowest per capita spending on a COVID mental health response of any mainland state in Australia. Their response is to spend just \$15 million compared with \$79 million in Queensland, \$74 million in WA and \$79 million in New South Wales. All these other states have spent significantly more than us on their COVID mental health responses.

We are hearing from clinicians on a daily basis about their concerns on the frontline. We heard, even before COVID, about some of these issues. We have had the issue at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, where the emergency department was so overwhelmed with patients from mental health care that the Chief Psychiatrist had to intervene in terms of the running of that emergency department and put restrictions in place around the use of restraints, because patients have been stuck there for days and days on end.

Twenty-eight doctors have written to the government—once again completely ignored—raising their concerns about what is happening in mental health care in our emergency departments. They stated:

We have been forced into unethical, inappropriate practice by a health service that cannot provide timely access to inpatient care. These incidents of restraint are a symptom of an underlying problem that is not being adequately addressed.

It goes on to state:

We know that many restraints occurring in the ED are avoidable, and we know why they occur—because patients are left for many hours or days in an inappropriate environment...We already know that there is a clear, present and well-documented risk to patients from prolonged stays in the ED.

It continues:

The Emergency Department continues to be forced to 'ramp' on a daily basis [with consequences for all patients, SAAS and the community]; it is not difficult to see how this could largely be avoided by resolving Mental Health access-block.

So here we have more doctors speaking out about their very serious concerns regarding what is going on in our health system at the moment and, once again, those concerns—in particular about mental health—are being absolutely ignored.

What the government should do is take the approach it has taken to COVID where, instead of putting Rob Lucas and Stephen Wade and the Premier in charge, it has been listening to the clinicians, listening to Nicola Spurrier. Clearly, under the legislation, as I said, it is actually the commissioner, not the Premier, who makes decisions in relation to COVID, and in that relationship we have had decisions being made on the basis of advice.

Here, in the running of our hospitals, we have these politicians making decisions about cutting services, and we have decisions being made by KordaMentha, interstate corporate liquidators whose only goal is to cut money from the health budget. They are succeeding in cutting the number of nurses in our hospitals, and they have been brought back now after COVID to cut more money from our hospitals. Instead of listening to our clinicians, we have the corporate liquidators and the politicians making decisions around making cuts.

We do not see the investment in mental health care, there are no additional beds going into mental health care, there are no additional services going in. The only small service the federal government is funding is going to be a privately run service that the government chose to privatise, instead of the public option, which was actually going to provide more services. Even the COVID mental health services are going to expire soon.

We need a boost to mental health services, we need the cuts to stop across our health system and we need to stop these continual privatisation of services and listen to the clinicians—because what is continually happening is not working for patients.

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (18:01):** As others have rightly said, it has been an extraordinarily difficult year for South Australians. Many have struggled with worries about their physical health and with mental health challenges as they contemplated the health risks the pandemic brought, worries about the loss of loved ones to that, as well as dealing with the devastation of job loss, ongoing employment insecurity, economic inequality and the rising cost of living, sudden change and isolation.

Many who continued to work faced new and unprecedented challenges. To keep us safe, cleaners, allied health workers, nurses and doctors dealt with enormous risk day in and day out. Early childhood educators, SSOs, teachers and other school staff, in the midst of uncertainty carried on providing education and support, innovating in ways that kept our youngest South Australians connected to their learning and to their school community. Our police and other emergency personnel took on new roles and carried them out in an exemplary way, and the leadership shown by our police commissioner and our Chief Public Health Officer was excellent, giving our community confidence, clarity and hope.

These unprecedented challenges that COVID brought us came after sorrow—the terrible loss caused by bushfires here in South Australia and across the country. The member for Mawson, and his beloved Dusty, has recounted just how heartbreaking and hard it was and continues to be for those on Kangaroo Island as they contemplate what they will deal with in the weeks, months and years ahead as they rebuild their homes, their businesses, their local clubs and, again, deal with loss.

More than ever, South Australians needed a state budget that delivered action and, through that action, hope that the future can be brighter. As our leader and others have said, many will not begrudge debt, but debt without a clear vision and action to bring that vision for recovery immediately to life is unforgivable. It leaves many who have already dealt with way too much unclear about the way forward, frustrated and deflated by the fact that no immediate action will be taken.

Crisis and hardship demand action and empathetic leadership that focus on the best opportunities and equitable outcomes for all, that include people, that are forward thinking and that provide a sense of purpose underpinned by compassion—not simply a repetition of poorly workshoped clichés.

No-one cares if those opposite repeat 100 or 1,000 times their tired and untrue cliché that they are 'building what matters' when that building is maybe, possibly, perhaps happening in 2023 or beyond and if that building is subject to 'looking into the detail' and some unspecified final plans purported to be 'delivering for South Australians' at some later, unspecified date. Clichés and vagueness are ice-cold comfort to those who have lost their job, fallen ill or are wondering how to keep the doors of their small business open.

South Australians needed and deserved better from this year's state budget. Delivered during the biggest health and economic crisis our country has seen, this budget has failed to deliver one new job this financial year despite plunging the state into \$33 billion in debt. Again, we hear those opposite roll out their 'We're creating more jobs' cliché when their budget actually says in print that there will be zero jobs created. With more than 165,000 South Australians out of work in our state, people rightly could have expected the Marshall Liberal government's priority was job creation. What it seems to be is the creation of tired old clichés and spin.

Before COVID-19, the Marshall Liberal government had increased debt from \$13 billion to more than \$22 billion in the space of just a couple of years and managed to deliver the highest unemployment rate in Australia at the same time. This budget will come as a huge disappointment for thousands of hardworking South Australians who look to governments to guide them through tough economic times like this to offer hope, compassion and understanding. Whatever lines those opposite wheel out and no matter how much they repeat them, their own budget says there will be no jobs created this year. It is an inescapable fact.

Sadly, we will also see no major works on our state's two biggest infrastructure projects—the final stage of the north-south corridor and the new Women's and Children's Hospital—at a time

when the economy is screaming out for stimulus. Nor have we seen any progress on these projects from those opposite for 2½ years and no action on any others either, that is, the South Road duplication, social housing and the list goes on.

Many, many questions remain about what some of the COVID-19 stimulus was actually expended on. It certainly was not spent on sport and recreation and it was not spent supporting sole traders. It is utterly unconscionable that this Liberal government could blow our state debt to \$33 billion and not offer a single new job this financial year, no progress on any major project and no plan to specifically focus on those who have been hardest hit through the pandemic.

At times of crisis people want their governments to be there for them. This government is not there for South Australians. This budget fails them. This Marshall Liberal government's budget utterly fails to provide desperately needed support to South Australian women adversely affected by the COVID-19 crisis. Budgets are an expression of a government's priorities, and this budget makes it clear that this government does not prioritise women. Jobs that are predominantly undertaken by women were hardest hit by the pandemic in industries including child care, hospitality, tourism, retail and many others.

Women are twice as likely to be engaged in insecure work than their male counterparts, with data showing that 22 per cent of women work fewer than 20 hours a week compared with just 10.6 per cent of men. However, like the Morrison Liberal government before it, this Liberal government has completely overlooked the disproportionate impact on women in its budget stimulus measures and focused on male-dominated industries. They have done so without any plan to encourage women into those male-dominated professions.

Despite the pressing need for our economic recovery to clearly consider the situation of women, no plan of action, nor economic stimulus nor any other budget measures, has specifically focused on women. The COVID-19 crisis has compounded existing pressures on female workers, including the persistent gender wage gap and the fact that women on average continue to retire with much less superannuation than men. Women were economically behind before the pandemic and are even further so after this budget.

This budget fundamentally fails to specifically fund and target programs that could make a real difference to South Australian women. This government does not seem to understand what it takes to achieve gender equality nor what equity is, which is unsurprising given their appalling lack of female representation in their parliamentary ranks.

This budget lets down half of our population. It fails to specifically target programs that make a difference for women. It has no specific job creation strategy for women, no strategy to address insecure work, nor the gender pay gap, no state money for domestic violence prevention, no money for new domestic violence prevention hubs, nothing for dedicated female sporting facilities and a reduction in the Office for Women FTEs.

As I have said in this place before, protecting children and their wellbeing requires a steadfast commitment to improving the lives of South Australian children, particularly those who most need our support. It is about positively and collectively addressing some of the most difficult and complex social issues impacting children and their families through a focus on prevention and early intervention.

It means relentlessly prioritising the health, the safety and wellbeing of children, and taking real action to ensure all South Australian children—no matter their background, their postcode, their starting place in life—are nurtured, loved, heard and engaged.

Despite the number of children in care growing exponentially, the Marshall Liberal government is insisting on cutting \$4.5 million from the department's budget each year over the forward estimates. These savings will be achieved by cutting about 22 full-time staff each year over the forward estimates.

The government says spending on child protection has increased by 8 per cent this year, compared with 2019-20. Sadly, the number of children and young people entering care is projected to continue to increase, resulting in the government needing to commit funds over the next four years simply to cover the growing costs associated with these growing numbers of children in care.

Despite this growing need, the budget shows \$7.2 million in employee benefits not spent in the last financial year because of delays in recruitment. Given the huge increase in children entering care under this government, this is simply unacceptable.

Likewise, a further \$3.2 million was not spent on staff development and training because of these delays in staff recruitment. How the government can justify a more than \$10 million underspend on child protection staff whilst record numbers of children are in state care is of the deepest concern.

Sport and recreation plays such an important role in engaging and supporting both children and adults. It is fundamental to our way of life in our suburbs and regional and remote areas. The camaraderie, bonds and friendships that endure through sport, sometimes over years and sometimes over generations, are as important as the competition itself.

As we move through the COVID-19 crisis, it is more important than ever that our sporting clubs and codes have what they need to keep supporting our community to keep bringing people together and giving them a sense of belonging.

Given sport's capacity and role to support and include all, it must always be a bastion of equality. The Marshall Liberal government's revised grassroots program will continue to overwhelmingly favour wealthier areas because they have not changed the unfair funding model at the heart of the problems with it.

The sports minister announced on Sunday he would expand the program to include other codes but under the same co-contribution model that saw the overwhelming majority of projects in the old program go to Liberal areas.

The third and final \$5 million round of the Grassroots Football, Cricket and Netball Facility Program went almost exclusively to Liberal areas. Fifteen projects were funded, only one of which was in a Labor area. The previous \$6 million round 2 funded no clubs in Labor areas. In total, just six clubs in Labor areas have received funding from 47 successful bids. This is despite roughly half the state's population living in these areas.

The formula underpinning this program is fundamentally flawed because it is geared towards more financially secure clubs. The government's required 50 per cent co-contribution from clubs is skewing the grants program towards those with the most money, many of which have also received federal funding. The minister has said that clubs 'don't give a rats' about electorate boundaries. If you are in a club like the South Adelaide Football Club, that has consistently missed out because of this flawed formula, you care deeply about being overlooked by this government.

This government has again also failed to respond to concerns from the racing industry about the point of consumption tax and the formula for funding return to the industry. Despite the minister's big grievances containing multiple repeated clichés, again there is no concrete action.

This Marshall Liberal government's initial decision not to participate in the FIFA Women's World Cup bid sent a terrible, terrible message about their well-known lack of regard for women's sport and was a severe blow to those hoping to see the event in Adelaide.

The 2023 FIFA Women's World Cup is a defining moment for women's football in this country and for women's sport generally. It presents a fabulous opportunity to move towards equality in sport, and to shift how women are seen and respected.

After scrapping plans for a second city stadium earlier this year, the government has announced it will now spend \$45 million upgrading Hindmarsh to a contemporary elite sports standard.

The upgrade is said to include, and I quote, 'a new shade covering over the eastern grandstand, new lighting, upgraded change rooms and toilets, a replacement pitch and improved disability access, media, broadcast and corporate and catering facilities'.

There is, however, absolutely no mention of any new seating to meet FIFA standards for Women's World Cup finals matches, a failure that has the potential to weaken our bid.

The reality is that this government weakened our potential to host games from the outset. It was only after our campaigning with the community, and thousands of people signing our petition, that they even agreed to be involved. It is only at a very late stage that they are promising an upgrade

to Hindmarsh and, given their appalling track record on getting any projects moving, who really knows when this development will start.

Backing women's sport means fighting really, really hard from the outset to participate in bids, including for one of the greatest sporting contests in the world, the Women's World Cup. This government has hardly fought at all; it simply fell over at the first hurdle.

I am proud every day to represent, advocate for and bring together the incredibly kind, connected community members of Reynell, people who have reached out to one another in kindness throughout the difficulties of this year, people who go out of their way to support one another, understand struggle and what a difference a listening ear, kindness, a willingness to act together makes, people who also know how to campaign together around what is important.

After two years of collective campaigning by our community, rec fishers, the Christies Sailing Club, the Sea Rescue Squadron, Volunteer Coast Guard, the boat ramp kiosk, Sullies Social and legendary Onka Stompa fishing comp creator Mark Mills, the government finally responded to our calls for an upgrade to the O'Sullivan Beach boat ramp. The promise again comes with no detail, and I eagerly await a response to my correspondence seeking much needed detail from the minister.

Whilst this was good news for our southern community and the people of Reynell, despite more than 15,000 people signing our petition to Save the Hopgood Theatre, and repeated short-term funding extensions due to our community's action, no sustainable funding commitment for our beloved theatre has been made.

This government fails to understand what this much loved social, community and heart's hub means to the fabric of our community and how important access to the arts for all is. Shame on you, Premier, for refusing to make this commitment. Again, this speaks to what you value and what you do not.

Thank you to the incredible people who have relentlessly fought for our theatre: Harry Dewar, Don Chapman, Bill Jamieson, Erin Thompson, Amanda Rishworth, Kate and Jenna Turner, Luke Wagner, and so many others. We will keep fighting until we save our theatre forever.

Our community will also keep fighting until we have a funded domestic violence prevention hub in the south. Our Southern Women Matter campaign group is utterly committed to preventing and ending the terrible prevalence of domestic violence and is resolute that we will not stop campaigning until women have the support they need.

South Australian Labor has an actual immediate plan with real strategic recommendations, not just cliches, to economically recover and to ensure we build on the success we have had in avoiding the worst health impacts of the pandemic.

Our leader outlined a number of these recommended strategies in his speech earlier today. Amongst them is an \$8 million recommendation to bring back Brand SA to encourage South Australians to buy local.

It has been heartening to see just how much South Australians want to support local and this strategy would be very well engaged with. Alongside this is a \$20 million 'Made in SA' program to support manufacturers to innovate and grow.

Unlike those opposite, we have clearly contemplated the challenges facing South Australian women and made clear recommendations on how we can best support them to equally and actively participate in every aspect of life, including in decent secure work and in sport.

We have committed to bringing back the Adelaide 500, an event that just last year created over 400 jobs which are incredibly important to hospitality, tourism and other workers and their employers. As our leader said, we will fight for these workers and fight for those families who absolutely love this event.

In the wake of appalling stories about how people with mental illness are kept waiting in our emergency departments, we will also fight for better health care. This budget has been delivered at a difficult time; however, it is a time when clever and compassionate leadership is most needed, when jobs simply have to be created, when South Australians are crying out for empathy and understanding.

This budget is one that does not respond to the immediate needs of South Australians, and it has been delivered by a government that does not understand struggle and certainly not what is needed to make people's lives better.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

At 18:22 the house adjourned until Tuesday 17 November 2020 at 11:00.