

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 24 August 2021

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **SPEAKER, ABSENCE**

**The CLERK:** I inform the house of the absence of the Speaker. Pursuant to standing order 17, the Deputy Speaker is to take the chair.

The Deputy Speaker took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

**The DEPUTY 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.

### *Parliament House Matters*

#### **PARLIAMENT HOUSE SAFETY MEASURES**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER (11:01):** Honourable members, before I call Mr Clerk, I can advise the house that I am informed that, with agreement between the Leader of Government Business and the opposition, there may be allowance for all members to be in attendance in the chamber during the COVID-19 pandemic.

I have authorised the use of the Speaker's gallery for the seating of members. I believe the Leader of Government Business will shortly move a motion to suspend standing orders to allow this to occur. As a result, the Speaker's gallery will only be accessible to members. Members of the Legislative Council, members' staff and others will therefore need to use the public gallery on the mezzanine level until further notice if they wish to observe proceedings of the house.

However, there are some matters that I will raise concerning members being recognised by the Chair and being heard while in the Speaker's gallery. Firstly, members who wish to be recognised by the Chair should stand as normal in their place in the Speaker's gallery. Rest assured, members who wish to be recognised will be. Secondly, the Speaker's gallery is not provided with microphones. Members, once acknowledged by the Chair, who wish to speak to a matter or raise a matter of privilege or point of order will need to come down to an unoccupied seat on the floor of the chamber so that their remarks can be heard and recorded by Hansard.

As has always been the case, interjections are out of order. Every member has a right to be heard, and I do ask for the cooperation of all members to make this possible. I thank members for their understanding.

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:03):** I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended up to and including Thursday 26 August to enable ministers and members to speak and conduct business from any seat within the chamber and the Speaker's gallery and that members of the Legislative Council be prohibited from admission to the Speaker's gallery.

I understand that, if the house agrees to this, the wearing of masks will not be required in the chamber.

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

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

Motion carried.

*Bills***APPROPRIATION BILL 2021***Estimates Committees*

The Legislative Council has given leave to the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink) and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade) to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

**COVID-19 EMERGENCY RESPONSE (EXPIRY) (NO 3) AMENDMENT BILL***Standing Orders Suspension*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:04):** I move:

That standing orders and sessional orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the introduction of a bill without notice forthwith.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There being an absolute majority present, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:05):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020 and to make a related amendment to the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:05):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the COVID-19 Emergency Response (Expiry) (No 3) Amendment Bill 2021. Laws aimed at ensuring the state can take all necessary measures to protect South Australians have been fundamental to this state's ongoing successful response to the COVID-19 pandemic. The declaration of major emergency, in place since 22 March 2020 last year, provides the authorising context for the important social distancing and public health measures issued by the State Coordinator through directions.

The COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020 amended South Australia's legislation to temporarily adjust some legislative requirements that are difficult to satisfy during a pandemic. The COVID act came into effect in April 2020 last year and will expire on 17 September this year. This bill proposes to extend the operation of the COVID act to 28 days after the date on which all relevant declarations relating to the outbreak of COVID-19 within South Australia have ceased or 30 April 2022, whichever is the earlier.

While it is essential that the COVID act be extended, there were a number of measures that were implemented in the early days of the pandemic that are no longer necessary. Those provisions have either been expired or will be expired. Some of the provisions of the COVID act have also been made permanent by the Statutes Amendment (COVID-19 Permanent Measures) Act 2021, which will come into operation on 9 September. Upon commencement, the respective provisions of the COVID act will be expired.

Once the provisions that are no longer necessary are expired, the only provisions that will be left in the COVID act are those amendments to the Emergency Management Act 2004 that clarify the scope of powers given to the State Coordinator and authorised officers to issue directions under section 25, such as for quarantine, contact tracing and border closures. Extending these provisions is necessary for the ongoing management of the risk of COVID-19 in South Australia. By extending these provisions, we will ensure that the State Coordinator has the power he needs to issue the directions required to keep South Australians safe.

In addition to extending the COVID act, the bill also includes an amendment to remove section 302B(8) of the Local Government Act 1999. Section 302B was inserted into the Local Government Act in March 2020 through the Local Government (Public Health Emergency) Amendment Act 2020. This section enables the minister, by notice in the *Gazette*, to vary or suspend the operation of specified provisions of the Local Government Act in circumstances where a public health emergency exists, and the minister is satisfied that a variation or suspension is reasonably necessary as a result of the public health emergency.

The minister has made four such notices under section 302B, all of which relate to critical aspects of council's operations: council meetings, public consultation, public access and public information, and the adoption of annual business plans and budgets. The notices have enabled these functions to continue effectively within any requirement that may need to be in place to protect public health.

Section 302B(8) states that the section will expire on 31 December 2021. It is now clear that there is a high probability of the need to continue the operation of existing notices and have continuing capacity to make future notices, given the ongoing nature of the COVID-19 pandemic. This amendment therefore proposes the removal of section 302B(8).

Given the importance of the notices to the continuing operation of our local councils in the public health emergency, the Local Government Association has expressed support for the removal of section 302B(8), subject to the retention within the Local Government Act of the limitations to the minister's power to make notices under the section. These include an automatic expiration of notices 28 days after the cessation of the relevant emergency and the application of section 10 of the Acts Interpretation Act 1915 to make the notices disallowable.

The minister must also consult with the LGA before making a notice and may not make a notice that imposes restrictions or limitations on the power of a council to impose rates and charges in its area. There is no proposal to remove or amend these safeguards.

The amendment also makes consequential amendments to section 302B(9). This section requires the minister to cause a review of the operation of section 302B to be commenced at least six months before the day specified in subsection (8) and completed by 31 December 2021. The consequential amendment will require the minister to table a report on this review in both houses of parliament by 31 December 2021 to ensure that the intent of parliament to have this section reviewed within this time frame remains. I therefore commend the bill to the members and seek leave to insert a copy of the explanation of clauses.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

###### 1—Short title

###### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020*

###### 3—Amendment of section 6—Expiry of Act

This clause extends the expiry date in section 6(2)(b) to 30 April 2022.

##### Schedule 1—Related amendment of *Local Government Act 1999*

###### 1—Amendment of section 302B—Public health emergency

This clause removes the current sunset provision (of 31 December 2021) but still requires the report on the operation of the section to be tabled in Parliament before 31 December 2021.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **STANDING AND SESSIONAL ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (11:11):** I move, without notice:

That standing and sessional orders be so far suspended as to enable Private Members Business, Bills, Order of the Day No. 15, Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Shopping Centre Parking) Amendment Bill, set down for Wednesday 25 August, to take precedence forthwith over Government Business.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The leader has moved that standing and sessional orders be suspended. I will count the house. There being an absolute majority present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

**Honourable members:** Yes, sir.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** It is absolutely critical and urgent that this parliament forthwith debate and address this bill, simply because unfortunately time is against this parliament and the people of the north-eastern suburbs in seeking to stop the introduction of paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre.

It is unfortunate that, some months ago, Westfield—or Centro Group—Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre's owners, announced their intention to install boom gates and paid parking arrangements at that institution of the north-eastern suburbs. They have made it perfectly clear that it is their intention to start to impose very substantial costs on the residents of the north-eastern suburbs and workers at the Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre for merely attending that particular location. They have made it clear that is their intention, so it is absolutely critical that this parliament urgently passes this legislation to stop the introduction of paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza Shopping Centre. I understand the urgency is a function of the impost that this would place upon those users of the shopping centre.

The nature of shopping centres has changed. They are now more than just a place to transact and buy goods. They are a place where people get access to critical health services and critical government services. Shopping centres are a place where people congregate to engage with each other socially and healthily, not just through conversation over a coffee but maybe in attendance at a restaurant or a movie.

They are a place where people express their very basic and essential human desire to be able to interact with each other. Now more than ever this is important. But they are also a place where people get access to the essentials of life, none other than food, bread and milk, or the basic goods families need to be able to get by.

When a large company of the nature of the owners of Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre decide to take advantage of their social licence to unfairly introduce a cost on people who are only accessing the services that they seek to provide, that is wrong. That is an act of greed in a way that this parliament should not tolerate.

The residents of the north-eastern suburbs do not want paid parking introduced at Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre. On this side of the house, we have heard their call. We understand that expecting workers who would potentially face a cost of \$10, \$15, or \$20 a day to simply show up and do their job is wrong. These are not the highest paid workers in our society. They cannot afford such an impost that may result in over \$50, \$60 or \$70 a week just for them to do their job.

For them, we should stop paid parking. For all the residents in the north-eastern suburbs—who go to TTP day in, day out, to be able to engage with each other, get basic goods, get access to essential services—we have heard the call that they do not want to see paid parking introduced at the shopping centre.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader, I have given you some latitude, but I just remind you that we are debating the motion to suspend sessional orders, rather than the bill itself.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Indeed, Mr Deputy Speaker. The urgency of passing this bill goes directly to the heart of the fact that Westfield are acting as we speak. It is their plan to install the boom gates forthwith, so we need to intervene as a parliament in a united way—the member for Newland and the member for King acting with me as the leader of the Labor Party to come together to stop these boom gates.

If this house resolves today to suspend standing orders and pass this bill, there will be no paid parking at TTP shopping centre if Tea Tree Gully does as it says it will do and stop the introduction of paid parking. The only thing that stands between the introduction of paid parking or

not is whether the government, the Liberal Party, will support the suspension of standing orders and pass the bill. We owe it to these people. They voted for the member for Newland and they voted for the member for King expecting them to stand up for them in this parliament against excessive corporate greed.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order: the leader has ignored your direction and is straying a long way from the substance of this debate, which is about whether or not an urgency exists, and is moving towards personal attacks.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order, in the sense that the leader was digressing from the current debate, and that is a motion to suspend standing orders, so I will bring the leader back to that. It is your motion, leader.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. We will not be silenced in trying to progress this bill as quickly as we possibly can because, if the parliament chooses not to suspend standing orders, if the parliament chooses to delay the progress of this bill, then that will give Westfield the ability to introduce paid parking.

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** Like they did down at West Lakes when you were in government.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** If the Premier, who is interjecting—I am not too sure why—and members of the Liberal government determine that Westfield should be able to proceed with paid parking, then they can vote against this resolution.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** But on this side of the house—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader, can you take a seat for a moment, please. There are interjections occurring from both sides of the chamber. I am particularly looking at the member for Lee and the member for Chaffey.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** It was actually the Premier, sir. It was the Premier that kicked it off.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, well, I—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** I would have expected better, sir, but—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Don't answer back, member for Lee! What I heard was the member for Lee and the member for Chaffey. Regardless of who it was, the interjections will cease and the chatter across the chamber will cease.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** If the Liberal government determine that they are happy for paid parking to proceed, which is the current plan from the owners of the shopping centre, they can vote against this resolution.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order.

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Again, I ask you to bring the leader back to substance of the debate. What we are debating is whether this house sees an urgency to debate this now, not what the leader is talking about.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I take your point. I am not going to uphold it at this point. Leader, what have you got left? Four minutes to conclude your remarks.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** I will seek to make my point again, hopefully without interruption. If the Liberal government determine that despite Westfield, the owners of the shopping centre, already having the application in—

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

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** For the leader to say 'if the Liberal government determines X, Y, Z' has nothing to do with whether this needs to be debated right now.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The leader is putting a motion, speaking to his motion, and I am prepared to give him some latitude, having explained to him that he is speaking to the suspension of standing orders. And you are bearing that in mind, leader?

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Of course. I will seek to make the point once again and, hopefully, third time lucky. The owners of the TT Plaza shopping centre have already expressed their immediate desire to introduce paid parking at the shopping centre. The parliament has the ability to stop that through the progress of this bill. So if any member of this parliament is of the view that paid parking should be introduced at the shopping centre, then vote against my motion. If, however, you have the view—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! There is a point of order, leader.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Thank you again, Deputy Speaker. For the leader to talk about a vote for or against paid parking is completely out of the realm of whether or not this is urgent enough to debate right now.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, I do not agree, minister, and I do not uphold the point of order. The leader is down to three minutes. He will conclude his remarks. I am sure there will be a speaker from the government who will make the government's position clear, and then we will vote.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** It is clear that those opposite do not want to be held to account on this issue. If, however, you hold the view—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader!

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** If, however, you hold the view that paid parking should not proceed at Tea Tree Plaza shopping centre, then you have no choice but to support this resolution, so debate will be brought on and the bill will be brought on forthwith and we can collectively stop it. I fear that if this motion is not supported and we do not get to debate the legislation, then the owners of the shopping centre will be able to proceed with the installation of paid parking without this parliament having a say.

I think every resident in the north-eastern suburbs expects this parliament as a whole to do everything we can to act to stop this introduction of paid parking. Anybody who votes against this resolution today will only be doing so if they believe paid parking should go ahead at Tea Tree Plaza. I do not believe that should be the case. I desperately hope that those members of the Liberal government, particularly the member for Newland and the member for King, do not believe it should go ahead, but if they do they can vote accordingly.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:24):** The Leader of the Opposition would have people believe that, if they make a decision on whether debating this issue now is urgent enough to set aside standing orders, that decision automatically implies all the types of things he has tried to apply to members of this chamber. We are talking about whether it is relevant to deal with this at the moment, to put aside the system that we have in place of dealing with private members' bills in the order they are introduced.

I would suggest that the argument from the Leader of the Opposition is actually incredibly disrespectful to his own colleagues because he would like to delay discussion about disposal of PFAS. He would like to delay coercive control issues. He would like to delay throwing objects at vehicles. He would like to delay a whole range of other things.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: I think the member may be confused and may be inadvertently misleading the parliament. The Leader of the Opposition is attempting to suspend standing orders to debate his motion now, not during private members' business. Perhaps the Manager of Government Business might read the standing orders to understand what we are actually doing.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** What was the point of order, member for West Torrens?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That he did not know what he was doing, 303, sir.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am not going to uphold that, member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Standing order 303. On the basis of that, I will not take the Leader of Opposition Business's advice to brush up. Those opposite would have us make this issue a higher priority than any of these other issues. Those opposite could bring forward any of these issues if they thought they were more pressing than the other things that we have on the *Notice Paper*. This is not—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** This is not urgent business. To claim that it is urgent business is incredibly disrespectful to the house. To claim that how people make a judgement and how they choose to vote on the suspension of the standing orders and the urgency or otherwise of this issue is an implication about how they would see the broader issue is completely inaccurate. On this side of the house, we do not believe that this is a matter of urgency that means we need to change the rules that work so well for us.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (11:27):** It is very simple. We on this side of the house have heard the genuine concern that exists amongst residents in the north-eastern suburbs about the impost on them that paid parking will result in. These are people earning very modest incomes who are now facing the prospect of a very substantial hit to their hip pocket for nothing more than doing their job. They do not want the paid parking to go ahead. This motion allows us to stop it from going ahead.

Secondly, we have heard the calls of people who use the shopping centre. These are good people living in suburban Adelaide simply trying to live their lives in a civil and healthy way. The shopping centre is central to that, whether it be buying groceries, buying basic goods for themselves and their families, or interacting in a really healthy and social environment. They want to be able to do that without a massive hit to their hip pocket as a result of what can only be described as corporate greed.

There are already time limits in place for those people parking at the shopping centre that they are not allowed to exceed or they are subject to a fine. The introduction of paid parking by the shopping centre owner is only about greed and only about excess profit at the expense of those people who can afford it the least. We understand it is urgent. We are willing to stand up and make that move in the parliament and I really hope we can do this in a bipartisan way across the chamber.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....21  
 Noes .....21  
 Majority .....0

AYES

Bedford, F.E.	Bell, T.S.	Bettison, Z.L.
Bignell, L.W.K.	Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.
Brown, M.E.	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P. (teller)	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J. (teller)
Cregan, D.	Ellis, F.J.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Harvey, R.M.	Knoll, S.K.	Luethen, P.
Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.	Murray, S.

## NOES

Patterson, S.J.R.  
Power, C.  
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Pederick, A.S.  
Sanderson, R.  
Whetstone, T.J.

Pisoni, D.G.  
Tarzia, V.A.  
Wingard, C.L.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There being 21 ayes and 21 noes, the vote is tied. As the Acting Speaker I have the casting vote, and I vote with the noes.

Motion thus negatived.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Members, due to the lack of an absolute majority, the previous motion does not pass.

*Bills***APPROPRIATION BILL 2021***Estimates Committees*

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:36):** On behalf of the Deputy Speaker (member for Flinders), I bring up the report of Estimates Committee A and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

**Mr COWDREY:** On behalf of the Deputy Speaker (member for Flinders), I bring up the minutes of proceedings of Estimates Committee A and move:

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

Motion carried.

**Mr COWDREY:** I bring up the report of Estimates Committee B and move:

That the report be received.

Motion carried.

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

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

Motion carried.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:37):** I move:

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

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:37):** Once again, now two years in a row, we have had an Appropriation Bill being considered in the committee stage interrupted by a snap lockdown in the state in response to concerns about the COVID virus spreading throughout the community.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, are you the lead speaker?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am, yes.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That has meant that, while we have had some interruption to the consideration of the Appropriation Bill, some of the circumstances were the same. It also meant that some of the issues the committee considered were the same as well. I can remember, with the government's late budget last year handed down in November, there was ongoing concern from the business community about how much support would be provided by the state government to help insulate them from the worst impacts of the COVID restrictions.

At that time, the Treasurer rather glibly responded that the government certainly did not expect to save every business. Certainly, the language from the government has changed. They like



to give the appearance that they are doing more to support business, but of course the grim reality for thousands of small businesses in South Australia is that they find ongoing restrictions, at varying levels, incredibly onerous and that they restrict them from being able to trade profitably.

There are thousands of business owners who continue to this day, even with the most recent easing of restrictions, to watch their livelihoods slipping away from them. Of course, last year in 2020, when we were faced by the pandemic and restrictions were being imposed at varying levels across different jurisdictions—some states in lockdown, some states subject to restrictions—the federal government came to the aid of the business community and to the aid of workers with their JobKeeper scheme.

You would not have to go very far in the community to find somebody who will tell you that the JobKeeper scheme was largely responsible for them being able to keep their job with their employer, or if you went and spoke to an employer, that they were able to not only maintain the employment of those workers but also maintain some semblance of their livelihoods as business owners and operators.

It is a very, very different environment now. What we are now seeing is the Prime Minister encouraging, in the strongest possible terms, all states and territories to get past a situation of snap lockdowns being called in order to limit the spread of the virus, to start opening up more than we have done in the last 18 months, and try to get the community back to normality. Of course, all of us would look forward to that, but it is the state and the territories that have the responsibility for managing the health outcomes of their communities. That is why the states and territories of all political persuasions have continued to impose restrictions, if not lockdowns, when they have deemed it necessary in the face of the coronavirus.

Although the federal government is encouraging the states to remove those restrictions or to ease up on those restrictions, or to perhaps be a bit more circumspect about applying snap lockdowns to their communities, we do not have the same level of support from the federal government. For example, we do not have JobKeeper anymore. Instead, what the federal government is doing is relying on its own health advice to determine where there is a hotspot and will only be providing commonwealth financial support for those people who are within that hotspot. That is greatly reducing the number of people who are able to access financial support.

Obviously, that is designed to reduce the financial exposure of the commonwealth to providing those levels of financial support. But I think everybody in this place realises that, regardless of whether you are in a declared hotspot or not, when restrictions are imposed on a community people feel the implications of those restrictions beyond the hotspots. The two industries that have experienced that the most, of course, that we are most aware of are those of the tourism industry and the hospitality industry, as well as, some people might be surprised to learn, some parts—not all, but some—of the retail industry.

There are some parts of the economy that are doing very well at the moment, and that has been attributed to the fact that Australians are not able to travel overseas with the same freedom that they have been used to. The same spends they would have conducted overseas on holidays and trips and that sort of thing have been thwarted, and hence they have more money to spend back here locally. Some of that money is pouring into increased economic activity in some parts of the economy. That is not true across the board, and there are some parts of the economy that continue to struggle.

When estimates was eventually reconvened after about a week's delay, once again, as it was back in November for the previous estimates process, this was the nature of the first questions from the opposition to the Treasurer: what additional support is being provided? The government has chosen to go down a path of providing sporadic financial support to businesses in the form of one-off cash grants, depending on the size and nature of the business.

Those cash grants could either be \$3,000 or \$1,000. Cast your mind back to last year: cash grants were \$10,000 or \$6,000 for a business qualifying against more stringent criteria. The scale of the financial support has not only reduced significantly from the commonwealth government but also reduced significantly from the state government.

It is worth bearing in mind that even though last year JobKeeper was being provided, and even though last year there were larger cash grants available from the state government, there were

still thousands of businesses, and hence their staff, that found it very difficult to get through calendar 2020. There were many businesses that ate into their own financial reserves, that ate into their own savings, that perhaps even borrowed more money—which is a refrain I have heard very often from small businesses both in my electorate and around the state—and so they entered the period of 2021, as most of us did, looking forward to seeing COVID and the restrictions that it required starting to fade in our rear-vision mirrors.

That has not eventuated and those additional financial burdens that people were looking forward to paying off through the course of 2021 and onwards have not been able to be met in that same way. That means we have now had a period of more than 18 months when businesses have continued to struggle as a result of not having the ability to trade as they would normally trade, perhaps when they established their business or perhaps as they had been used to trading over the last few years, and also in the face of these restrictions have not received the same level of support they had in 2020.

At the moment, the government certainly has the financial reserves to provide additional support to the business community. In a way I have not seen before in the near two decades that I have been following state budgets and reading budget papers assiduously, this year the Treasurer has set aside \$300 million in contingency funds. I cannot ever recall such a large amount of money being set aside in state government contingency funds before.

One would like to think that has been done for altruistic purposes, that such an extraordinary amount of money being set aside for one year in contingency provisions is being done on the basis that the government might need to respond financially to further pressures on the community—for example, providing more support to the business community or even just providing more support to our health system if it is required.

When the government announced a round of small business grants several weeks ago, it was explained by the Treasurer that that money would come from contingencies and that a maximum of \$100 million had been allocated—only one-third of the contingency provisions. But it does not stop there because the government has also ensured that \$200 million is available in the government's rebranded Jobs and Economic Growth Fund, or whatever it is called. I think this is the third naming of these business support funds being provided during the course of this government.

There is \$300 million in contingencies and \$200 million in this support fund, so that is \$500 million altogether, and only \$100 million has been allocated. All the while, calls for additional support from areas of the business community have continued. They have continued because not only did we have a snap lockdown but, just before that snap lockdown, the government reimposed restrictions requiring that the maximum capacity of venues be limited to one person per four square metres or, as those people in the hospitality industry know, about 25 per cent of maximum usual capacity. We then had the snap lockdown, and then, coming out of that, we had a 25 per cent capacity reimposed and then 50 per cent. Of course, it has only been in recent days that we have moved back up beyond that 50 per cent.

Most small business owners will tell you that it is simply not feasible for them to trade—to meet their costs of operating the business, of securing stock and making it available for sale or providing services—at 50 per cent, and it is certainly not viable at 25 per cent. Of course, having been given a demonstration by the federal government that there is a way in a public policy sense to provide ongoing support to businesses when they are struggling, when they are not able to reach revenue levels that they would normally reach, the call from the business community was clear: 'If you're going to keep these restrictions on, then you've got to give us ongoing financial support.'

One-off doses of, in the scheme of things, relatively modest amounts of money for businesses simply do not meet the need of the business community. When a business that might employ five or 10 staff is either locked down or placed into a period of restrictions of being able to operate only at 25 per cent, giving them a grant of \$3,000 is certainly welcome—no-one, of course, will rebuff any financial support—but for the government to pretend that this is meeting the need of those businesses that are impacted, well, you do not have to take my word for it; it is simply not meeting the need of the businesses themselves.

That was certainly the message that was put by not only industry leaders like Business SA, the Hotels Association, the hospo collective, which has formed with more than 100 South Australian hospitality venues. In many cases it would not even pay a small proportion of wages for employees of that business for a week.

These businesses, almost without exception, I have to say, will do whatever they can to support their employees during these restrictions and lockdowns, not just because they do not want to lose them, because finding good staff is hard—although that is always a concern of these business owners—but also because they have a relationship with their employees. They care about their employees. They know their employees' families in many cases—their spouses, their children, their parents. They want to be able to continue remunerating their employees so that they can keep the lights on at home, and they can put the food on the kitchen table at home. That means that business owners, as I mentioned before, quite often are going into very significant extra indebtedness in order to not only keep their own heads above water but that of their employees as well.

So, a couple of weeks ago, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Croydon, and I stood with small business owners and called for the government to put more effort into providing additional support. This is additional support above and beyond what the Treasurer advised the estimates committee was available for South Australian businesses. We were calling on the state government to provide additional support, but we were also calling on the state government to encourage the federal government to get back on the hook for supporting employees and the businesses that employ them.

If the commonwealth could possibly see fit to reinstate a level of support for workers and the state government could come up with a support scheme for small businesses, that together would ensure that South Australian businesses and their employees had the best possible chance of getting through this period of dealing with COVID with their livelihoods intact.

Unfortunately, that call has been rebuffed not only by the Premier and his Treasurer but also by the federal government. We were calling on the state government—aside from the federal government assistance—to dedicate a fund of \$200 million for South Australian small businesses, not limited to hospitality and tourism but for all South Australian small businesses. They would need to have suffered a revenue decline of a minimum of 30 per cent, and their operations would also need to have been impacted by the restrictions that were imposed by the state government.

If they were able to do that, then the state government should sit down with industry leaders, who know their industries better than anyone else, and work out a way of compensating those businesses. I will not say entirely compensating them, but I will be honest and say only partly compensating those businesses for some of the financial impacts which those restrictions are causing to them and their workers.

So, based on the level of financial support which the New South Wales government has now rolled out for a number of months to its affected communities, take that precedent and apply it in a South Australian context. If a business suffers a level of restrictions of 50 per cent or more—so they are restricted from their operations by 50 per cent or more or, rather than one in two square metres or 50 per cent, they are required to operate at one in four square metres or 25 per cent—and their revenue has declined, they can make a case for accessing additional daily payments from the state government.

This will not meet all the need—of course, it will not meet all the need. It will not meet all the operating costs of that business, which is why we called for the federal government to also be involved and meet some of the employment costs of the workers themselves. If the state government could support the business itself and the federal government could support the workers, we are giving the South Australian business community the best possible chance of weathering the current difficult climate.

As I said, that money would be allocated towards a daily payment. That daily payment would need to be negotiated and agreed with those industry leaders according to the needs of their industry. Not all businesses will have the same needs. Businesses, of course, are different sizes with different obligations and have differing requirements around meeting those obligations.

There is no point paying money to a business that simply does not need the support. While there have been hundreds of thousands of businesses across the country that have been extremely

grateful for the support, for example, from the commonwealth government with the JobKeeper scheme, we know now from reports in the national media just how many national companies have unfairly taken advantage of that scheme.

They have unfairly taken advantage of Australian taxpayers and they have claimed extraordinary amounts of JobKeeper payments. They have banked extraordinary profits, mostly as a result of being able to access those JobKeeper payments. In some cases, they have paid their executives bonuses in excess of \$1 million a year, or they have managed to distribute additional largesse to their either private or public shareholders, all of this at taxpayers' expense. No-one wants to see that continue again and that means, of course, that there would have to be a lot of dedicated effort from the government in assessing small business's claims about getting access to this financial support.

If we cannot be certain about the future, if we cannot be certain about whether Delta is going to get into the community and proliferate, or if we cannot be certain about whether we are going to succeed at holding it out and making sure that we do not have to be subject to either stricter restrictions or further snap lockdowns, then an indication from the state and federal governments about certainty of government support will do a lot to ease the concerns of South Australian businesses.

There is nothing worse than not only having the uncertainty of the environment around you of what is going on with the coronavirus and whether restrictions will be imposed, whether consumer spending habits will change, whether the business has been irreparably damaged as a result, but not having any certainty about what the government may or may not do to support you only exacerbates that dreadful mindset to which so many South Australians have been subjected. So that was the first area of questioning when it came to the estimates committee.

Of course, no-one could advocate—certainly no-one in this chamber who would like to spend more time here, particularly beyond March next year, who has a concern about the state's finances—that there is a bottomless pit or that there is no amount of money that is too much to try to get the community through here.

That is why this call was only made on the basis that the government had already set aside substantial funds within its own budget metrics to provide for this level of support. The call from Labor, while far in excess of what the current Liberal government is providing and far more generous, is not excessive and is not unaffordable because we should keep an eye to the sustainability of the state's finances going forward.

The state's finances have irrevocably changed in the last two years, not just because of COVID but even before COVID. This government has made much of its first budget and how much it is allegedly investing in infrastructure spending and, as a result, how much additional money it is borrowing to do that. If you rewind the tape, Deputy Speaker, and you asked anyone in this chamber whether they would have expected that the state's debt levels would have doubled from \$12 billion at the end of June 2018 to nearly \$24 billion before COVID across the forward estimates, and increase again to \$33 billion now, I do not think anyone would have believed you.

I make that point and spell out those figures for an important reason. We are not solely racking up a nearly tripling of state debt levels because of COVID; this was largely baked in before COVID. COVID is adding, of course, budget deficits and the need to borrow more money to cover those deficits on top of what was already a rapidly escalating debt position under the Liberal government.

As somebody who is, I was going to say, relatively young—perhaps I can look back on my youth fleetingly now—it worries me that over the next five years, over the next 10 years, there is going to be a significant additional burden on state finances and, as a result, on South Australian taxpayers as a result of our additional debt burden.

Even more worryingly, interest costs in the state budget are now projected to reach \$1 billion per year—that is \$1 billion each and every year—which is money that must, of course, be spent on servicing debt costs and is not available to be spent on employing more doctors and nurses, teachers and police officers, and all those other areas the community expects the government to fund. But that will only increase into the future, because what else came out of the estimates committee you

will be interested to know, Deputy Speaker, is that that \$33 billion of debt will not be the peak of it—there is more debt to come.

There is a \$9.9 billion project that has been committed to by the state, and the forward estimates, this current year and the next three financial years, contain approximately a third of the funding that is required for that. This is a fifty-fifty funding arrangement between the state and the federal government, we are told, and of the approximately \$6½ billion that is still needed to be found to deliver the remainder of that project, half will have to come from the state government. So there is an extra \$3.25 billion, in rough terms, that needs to be found in additional debt. That takes us up to nearly \$37 billion.

We also have a new Women's and Children's Hospital that needs to be built. We know that the minimum cost for that will be in the order of just under \$2 billion, \$1.9 billion. We are told finally, after this government has sat on a report from its own staff for nearly two years, that the initial estimate of costs for this new hospital will be \$1.9 billion. There are not too many infrastructure projects, particularly hospitals, that I can think of which have had an initial cost and then the ultimate cost has been lower, so we know that we are up for, in round terms, at least \$2 billion for this hospital. Only \$885 million of that is provided across the forward estimates so there is, roundly, another \$1.1 billion which is required in debt. We are now up to \$38 billion that will be required. Then we have the Premier's basketball stadium, a \$660 million commitment—only an initial cost for that project—and, again, this is money which will need to be borrowed.

So to deliver only the existing commitments before this government, state finances will have to grow their level of indebtedness from the current \$33 billion to nearly \$40 billion. Those interest costs will increase. When I asked the Treasurer about this, he initially did his best to evade giving a straight answer about the increased interest costs the state will have to suffer; however, if you look at the budget papers themselves, they say that a 1 per cent increase in interest rates attributable to government debt leads to an extra \$250 million a year across government for those net interest costs.

It is going from, roundly, \$1 billion—or for the total government sector, well over \$1 billion—a year in net interest costs, and then adding an extra \$250 million to that. How do we know that? If you look in the tables in the back of Budget Paper 3, the Budget Statement, they show that this year we are now projecting interest costs to be approximately \$300 million a year higher for \$33 billion of debt than what last year's papers projected interest costs to be for \$33 billion of debt. The government is factoring in that there will be increased interest costs.

As the Treasurer was forced to admit to the estimates committee, the South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA), responsible for borrowing money on behalf of government to fund operations and projects, is already experiencing an increase in interest costs. At our current debt levels interest costs are already going up by \$300 million a year, and now we know that in the period just beyond the forward estimates we have, roundly, an extra \$5 billion that needs to be borrowed, so we will have increased interest costs going forward.

That means the level of debt burden imposes even further strictures on how money can be spent in the public sector. The only choice for government now, going forward, to try to maintain the state's finances—let alone improve the state's finances—is to ensure that expenditure growth does not exceed revenue growth. We have had a period when, out of necessity and in response to COVID, we have had a couple of financial years when expenditure growth has massively exceeded revenue growth. Not only has the level of expenses gone up, but the level of revenue has dropped at the same time.

That is principally, of course, due to a drop-off in national economic activity and the GST receipts we receive as a result of that. While GST receipts have recovered somewhat—quite significantly in the previous financial year and in the current financial year—we will need very significant increases in GST receipts going forward in order to make sure that the state has as much revenue as it wants in order to deal with this increased fiscal challenge.

Of course, as you would recall from the estimates committee, sir, South Australia cannot bank on an increase in its GST receipts going forward; South Australia cannot rely on national economic growth driving up GST receipts into South Australian state coffers. That is because at the end of 2018 and the beginning of 2019 this government, this Premier, and this Treasurer—Rob Lucas, in the other place—participated in discussions with the federal government as they set about

rewriting what had been decades of stable and successful distribution of GST revenues across the country. The GST deal that was signed up to back in 1999 has now been unpicked.

The fundamental principle that underpins that GST arrangement—horizontal fiscal equalisation—means that every state and territory should have the financial capacity to provide services to its community of the same standard as anywhere else in the country. That fundamental principle has now been removed. South Australia and the other smaller jurisdictions, with the exception of the Northern Territory—South Australia, Tasmania and the ACT—are all now to be significantly worse off as a result of undermining the original GST deal.

A new GST deal was struck. The Premier and the Treasurer of this government were more than happy to play along with Scott Morrison and Josh Frydenberg, and it was only when federal MPs and the state opposition started raising this as a significant issue in the local media that, belatedly, this government wrote to federal MPs and said, 'Actually, don't support that legislation going through.' Too late; too little and too late. By then, the die had been cast and South Australia, along with the other jurisdictions, would now be materially worse off as a result of this new GST deal.

How was it described? When the opposition was asking questions about this in question time, the Premier said, 'We will not do anything that is contrary to the state's interest. We will not do anything that will leave the state worse off.' What happened? A deal was negotiated that left the state worse off and the Premier described it as a massive win for South Australia. The Victorian Treasury is tasked by the commonwealth Treasury to do GST modelling on its behalf. That has been the arrangement that has occurred for many years.

The Victorian Treasury did some modelling on how this GST arrangement, this changed GST deal, might affect states and territories around the country. They modelled six different scenarios, ranging from the current mining boom scenario in Western Australia—which of course we seem to experience on a regular basis in Australia, particularly as with global economic growth, or growth in key markets like China, demand remains strong for iron ore, etc.—to an average scenario where the GST relativities, as they are called, fluctuate depending on regular assessments from the Commonwealth Grants Commission. If we took a regular average across the last 10 years, what would South Australia's GST revenues look like?

On the first scenario, South Australia would be \$258 million a year worse off, each and every year. Under the average scenario, it would be about \$200 million a year worse off. That is what we can look forward to from the new deal that has been signed up to for the GST distributions to South Australia. In the medium term, we know that we have high interest costs coming and at the same time we have lower revenues coming. We will have at least \$300 million a year of high interest costs and something in the order of \$200 million a year less in GST revenue—a half a billion dollar annual turnaround in the state's finances.

I have not come across many areas of government in my time that do not constantly put pressure on cabinets, and on treasurers in particular, to provide them with more funding for additional pressures. You only have to look at the health system at the moment to realise how significant the task is of providing health services to an ageing population, and that is even without the impact of COVID really being felt by our health system. We are not having dozens, if not hundreds, of admissions to hospital because of COVID, the filling up of intensive care units and so on with COVID cases.

We know that the pressures for spending will continue to increase, particularly in areas like health. Of course, those of us with young children, or indeed others of us who are just interested in these matters anyway, are always interested in things like education spending. Those pressures in those key areas of government will continue to increase at the same time that we have higher cost obligations and less revenue to meet them.

As a prospective state Treasurer, that is something I find very concerning, and it should be very concerning to those people with an interest in state finances going forward. The burden of the cost of providing the services necessary to the community will only increase, and that is going to be a very difficult act to juggle in the future. At the same time, the budget made the bold commitment or the bold claim that, unlike in some previous years, no additional savings were being required of government departments as a result of this budget.

As it turned out in the estimates committee, that quite simply is not true. The Treasurer was forced to admit that that statement in the budget was wrong: additional savings have been required of agencies. Each year, agencies receive an allocation from Treasury to meet their annual expenditure on goods and services. Of course, given the different nature of departments, that amount of money differs between agencies.

Each year, much like for employee costs in public sector agencies, that amount is increased off a baseline, and 2½ per cent has been the standard practice of increasing an agency's goods and services budget. The Treasurer was forced to admit that they did not receive that full allocation of their goods and services budget for both the 2021-22 financial year and the 2022-23 financial year. In fact, that allocation had not been made and a much smaller allocation had been made.

All those agencies that may have planned how to spend that money will need to find savings in order to offset the lesser appropriation being made for that purpose. That is quite a bit of money—tens of millions of dollars a year. Surprisingly, the Treasurer could not furnish that amount to the committee but said that he would take it on notice and bring it back to the committee at a later stage. However, for the budget to claim that there are no further savings in this budget and then at the same time for it to be shaken out in the estimates questioning process that in fact savings requirements had been imposed on agencies is nothing short of disingenuous.

We also had the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment appear before the agency. This is an agency that has had a massive hollowing out under the current Liberal government. The commissioner, Erma Ranieri, used to superintend basically the human resources policy function for government as well as the enterprise bargaining negotiation process on behalf of government.

The current Treasurer, Rob Lucas, took a different view when he came into government. He cut that from Erma Ranieri and the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment (OCPSE) and took it back into Treasury. Now, as far as we can tell, it is really up to the commissioner to publish information on behalf of the public sector about public sector employment—numbers of people employed and so on—as well as come up with and promulgate policies about public sector management and employee management, staff management, to public sector departments.

The commissioner is also required from time to time to run chief executive recruitment processes. After speaking at a function several weeks ago, I was approached by somebody who runs a human resources consulting company and who was absolutely furious that an interstate firm had been recruited to provide those recruitment services for a new chief executive for a government agency, namely, the new Chief Executive of SAFECOM.

A Victorian company was awarded that contract. That is surprising, I think, because in this day and age it is very easy for somebody to advertise nationally, if not internationally, for a public sector chief executive position, and then providing all the services involved in the receipt of applications, the assessment of applications, the sorting of them, interviewing and recommending some to government, that they be accepted or otherwise, can all be done by South Australian companies.

There are South Australian companies that are excellent at this and have a long track record of providing these recruitment services to the state government with success. I will not name all of them, but certainly Morton Philips or Philip Speakman used to provide those services. Hender I think is based here in South Australia and Locher consulting is based in South Australia—South Australian companies, yet a decision was taken to award it to an interstate company.

It is doubly galling, of course, because a South Australian company had previously already recruited a head of one of the emergency services divisions for government, so it is not like local companies did not have runs on the board for this particular type of recruitment. I was grateful to have the opportunity to raise that again before estimates because I had hoped that by providing some sunlight on this episode, and some additional transparency about which consultants the government is using, it would continue to dissuade people from needlessly reaching out to interstate goods and services providers without looking locally first.

You only need to look at the record of this government to know that this sort of behaviour is endemic. Not only were the corporate liquidators imposed on our hospital system but there was not one phone call, not one offer. Even if you were of a mind to appoint a financial administrator to a

hospital—even if, and that is a very big if because you would have to be a certain type of person to believe that those sorts of financial administrators are best to run hospitals rather than clinical administrators, doctors and so on—South Australia has a wide and deep talent pool of people who are experienced in this.

You do not even need to look at the large professional services firms or the major law firms to find deeply experienced, eminently qualified people to provide these sorts of financial administration services. You can look at some of the independent small practitioners who either operate solely or with small practices: there are many of them. Given that it is the Liberal Party that claims to be the party of business—of course that has been cast asunder in the performance over the last 3½ years of this government—if you were a Liberal politician you would like to think that you would have some contacts with those people who practise in those areas in the local Adelaide business community.

As I am aware, several Liberal politicians opposite do have those connections, so why they were all deliberately overlooked to provide a contract worth in excess of \$40 million to those corporate liquidators, KordaMentha, to come in and run our hospitals I find absolutely gobsmacking. Bear in mind that a large part of that \$40 million was spent on flights to and from Adelaide, and for hotel room nights for those staff of KordaMentha, who of course do not hail from Adelaide, do not have any local accommodation in Adelaide and most likely do not have any prior connection or familiarity with Adelaide. They were flown in from interstate at taxpayers' expense to provide these administration services. It does not end there, though.

We understand that the education department rushed over to Victoria several months ago and directly approached prefabricated modular construction supplier Sensum to project manage \$600 million worth of the government's schools infrastructure program. Can you imagine what sort of a slap in the face it is to South Australian professionals when that sort of project management contract is awarded to a Victorian firm, and not only awarded to a Victorian firm but awarded to a Victorian firm without a process.

Even if you assume that the margin Sensum is going to be taking off the top of that is something in the order of 10 per cent—it might be less, it might be seven, it might be more, it might be 12 or 13—if you imagine that it is 10 per cent as a margin for managing those works, that is a \$60 million payday going to a Victorian company for overseeing the construction of South Australian schools. How on earth can that be justified? The simple answer is that there is no justification; that cannot be justified.

There are South Australian companies, South Australian project management firms, South Australians with long and deep roots here, who know the schools and sometimes even have a deep familiarity with the schools, who could have provided those services. The justification that was provided to the media was, 'Well, it's a pretty good deal for South Australia. They are going to fly in here and open up an office.'

I had a look at the office that Sensum opened in South Australia and it was a very small office in McLaren Street, just off Hutt Street. For those of you who are not familiar with McLaren Street, I want you to picture in your mind a road barely five metres wide with a row of small cottage houses in an older part of Adelaide that has not yet been redeveloped for commercial or other purposes. It is a small residential street.

Sensum has come in, obviously struggling to find commercial premises that befit them skimming \$50 million of taxpayers' funds as a margin for their work, and set up there. I understand they have subsequently moved. This is such a frustration to those industry associations that are constantly banging the drum for their members to get better access to government work and to see so much of it handed over to an interstate firm is absolutely gobsmacking.

Of course, it does not end there. Recent reports, as late as last week, show that the north-south corridor project—that \$9.9 billion project that I mentioned before—with a contract for financial advisory services that is expected to last for more than five years, with a value of at least \$10 million, has been handed to a firm based in Sydney.

Nothing could be more offensive to the corporate community in South Australia than suggesting to them that they do not have the skill or the experience to provide financial advisory



services for the north-south corridor project. There are many very experienced financial advisory experts—practitioners in small firms, practitioners in the Big Four, practitioners even in some of the larger corporate law firms, who have worked on projects and deals of a similar scale to this. To not allow them to do that work is extraordinary.

What that means is that that money that will be spent on those services over the course of the next five years could have meant that a corporate advisory team in South Australia could have worked on that project and, in addition to that, used not only the existence of that contract and the length of that contract to continue to operate their business successfully but also used it as a base to grow their business and grow their practice.

We are forever complaining in South Australia about the lack of corporate head offices in South Australia. When you deny companies and experienced professionals who have sufficient skill and experience the opportunity to work on projects like this, you are basically denying South Australian practitioners and South Australian firms the opportunity to grow their practices and to become successful, thriving, larger businesses. That is a strong role for government procurement and one that continually gets overlooked by this government.

The question also came up in the estimates committee—we had much song and dance—about the state government's secret Productivity Commission. You will remember in the early days of this term of government that we had a bill brought before this place to establish by legislation the South Australian Productivity Commission, and not unreasonably we asked for some transparency about its operations and its membership. The government said, 'If you want us to be transparent about the Productivity Commission, we will simply withdraw the bill from the house and we will establish it administratively.'

I do not know whether it is because it has been established administratively or not, but I have to say that there are a lot of people in the community who are pretty underwhelmed with the output of the Productivity Commission. We had extensive debates in this place around fuel pricing, for example, and the Productivity Commission was asked to look at fuel pricing schemes and the two existing different fuel monitoring schemes in Australia—the Queensland model and the Western Australian model—to provide a robust assessment of these models and some advice to the state government.

We saw the report from the Productivity Commission and it was a table of different characteristics of a fuel price monitoring system and there was—and I was hitherto unfamiliar with it—the old one, two or three-tick assessment model, where the different Western Australian and Queensland models received one, two or three ticks depending on how efficaciously it exuded one of those characteristics. It was hardly a robust assessment that the parliament could bank on in making a decision between what was put forward by the Deputy Premier and what was put forward by the member for Florey—two different options, of course.

So that was pretty underwhelming, but the bigger body was not about fuel price monitoring but about procurement. We had a voluminous report provided. We had the government rushing out in response to that report and abolishing the State Procurement Board and abolishing all the policies of the State Procurement Board and the policies governing procurement as it related to public sector agencies—and then silence. There was no movement for month after month after month.

We are told that the repeal act getting rid of the State Procurement Act was finally commenced last month, but I have to say that there has been radio silence from this government on its new procurement policies. We heard a tiny bit from the Treasurer about needing to provide further and better particulars of government tenders on the tenders website.

Well, really! If the government has a tin ear to the plight of the small business community through COVID, do they honestly expect a small business operator, who would like to expand their operations and do so by accessing some opportunities to provide goods or services to the government, after doing a 12 or a 14-hour day, to go home, log on to the tenders website and scroll through reams and reams of information trying to find upcoming tender opportunities that might suit them?

Why is it that this government takes the view that the community must run to it in seeking support or in finding out information about its operations? Why can this government not do something

to assist the community with regard to its procurement policies, get out on the front foot and engage with the business community about those opportunities going forward?

It was the former Labor government that established the Office of the Industry Advocate, Ian Nightingale. You will perhaps recall, sir, that in the lead-up to the 2014 election the Premier was quoted in an *Adelaidenow* article questioning Mr Nightingale's position and whether it would continue under a Marshall Liberal government. Fortunately, that veiled threat from the Premier has not been carried out, and Mr Nightingale continues. I will be the first to admit that there were significant improvements to be made in government procurement, certainly in my time as a minister. He certainly did make improvements, but further improvements since then have largely languished and there have not been further opportunities for South Australian businesses.

That was something we were hoping to hear more about when it came to questioning about procurement and also the Productivity Commission, both of which are superintended by the Treasurer. I think 26 FTEs in the Department of Treasury and Finance oversee procurement functions, if I am remembering accurately the evidence that the Treasurer gave to the committee. That was of course of great interest to me after seeing example after example of procurements heading interstate.

If I just jump back to talking about the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, the commissioner now has a new capacity, which did not exist previously, and that is to undertake investigations of public servants. Previously, there had been a government investigations unit within Crown law. If there was something to be investigated—for example, the conduct of a public servant—then the government investigations unit would carry out that investigation and it would usually be one of the senior law officers of Crown law that would conduct the investigation and provide a written report to either the chief executive or, if warranted, the minister relevant to that particular complaint, and then any action could be considered. That was certainly the case under the former Labor government.

Now what we see is that this government has outsourced that function to non-government staff to undertake those investigations. The question has to be asked: on what basis? On what basis can this government agree to conduct an investigation into the behaviour of a public servant, an investigation, mind you, that does not warrant an examination by the Independent Commission Against Corruption or the Office for Public Integrity? On what basis can an investigation now be undertaken by somebody who is not only external to law enforcement agencies but external to the government themselves?

If someone came to you, sir, and put to you that you were to be the subject of an investigation and it was to be carried out by somebody who was not in the employ of the Office for Public Integrity, not of the employ of the Independent Commission Against Corruption, not a police officer or an authorised officer under the Police Act, and not even an authorised person within the public sector—for example, in Crown law—why on earth would you be answering those questions that might be put to you in the course of that investigation? How will that information, to be gathered by this private investigator, be managed? In fact, what protocols exist, for example, governing the access of a private third-party entity to government information, to government documents and government systems? How is that to be done?

So we asked these questions during the estimates committee, and the Treasurer blithely said, 'Well, there's been no change here. This is all the same.' He pointed back to, or tried to point back to, a previous government investigation by public servants into the conduct of other people employed under the Public Sector Act and tried to say that, because that investigation had required the use of an IT expert in order to interrogate IT systems, then that is exactly the same as what has been proposed now under the current Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

Well, that is frankly wrong and deliberately misleading—that is not the same. I would not be surprised if the Public Service Association or other employee representatives take it upon themselves, when representing their members or representing a public servant who might find themselves the basis or the subject of such investigations, to consider their rights very carefully in participating in that investigation. It seems very clear to me and very obvious to me that the legal basis for the conduct of that investigation has significantly shifted now that it has been privatised under this government.

We do not have authorised senior public servants like senior lawyers in Crown law conducting these investigations; it is now being done by an unnamed panel of private contractors. That should send a shiver up the spine of public servants. What is there to stop the misuse of the existence of this sort of investigation by people making unreasonable or vexatious or onerous claims against others?

We know, of course, that unlike a senior member of Crown law who was previously responsible for these sorts of investigations, who has an inherent interest in getting to the bottom of the matter as quickly as possible so that they can return to their other duties, now we have a process where it is in the interests of a private contractor, getting paid presumably on a dollar per day or an hourly rate basis, to investigate as fulsomely and as lengthily as possible. That is a very poor outcome whatsoever.

The government, of course, despite repeated media articles about this and about these sorts of concerns, refuses to countenance any criticism of this or answer any claims that people's basic rights as employees at work are not being maintained through this new regime. This is something that we are watching very closely because our parliament's experience with these sorts of private investigations has not been good to date.

When the Leader of the Opposition was questioning the Premier about the operations of the parliament, for example, it has been the parliament over the last 18 months which has had to deal with a significant report about misbehaviour within parliament, including by members of parliament, including two very serious uninvestigated allegations of sexual assault and sexual harassment.

When a separate allegation was made, in fact, by a member of parliament, the previous Speaker's response was to hire what was initially an anonymous gumshoe private detective to come in and investigate this, raising all manner of legal issues around the appropriateness of someone like that being brought in to do this, let alone whether there were any issues of legality or privilege and so on. I note to date that report or its progress has never seen the light of day. So if the parliament cannot set the right example in these sorts of investigations, how on earth do we expect the public sector to set the appropriate example as well?

Jumping back to the GST issue, the federal Productivity Commission played a part in this. For those members who perhaps have not followed it with as great an interest, this all came about because Western Australia complained that they were receiving a diminishing share of the GST revenues, ignoring the fact that they were receiving billions of dollars a year in additional royalties from the resources that just happen to be located on their side of their state border. They were complaining that they were receiving less than their fair share of GST revenues.

Over time, the pre-existing GST distribution model would compensate for that. There may be a time lag, which of course is problematic and of course did warrant some investigation, but these sorts of things should balance themselves out over time. However, in an effort to try to push this issue down the road, initially the federal government asked the federal Productivity Commission to do a review into the distribution of GST to the states.

It recommended two outcomes, if a change was to be made. It recommended either an equal per capita share of GST revenues—for South Australia, that would mean losing about \$2 billion a year, every year, in our GST share—or moving to an average relativity across the states, which at that point in time was estimated by the state's Treasury, the Department of Treasury and Finance, to be risking about \$500 million a year of GST revenues.

In the estimates committee, we asked the Treasurer why he told Paul Starick of *The Advertiser*, in an interview, that it was now the task of the next government, Labor or Liberal, to renegotiate that deal, when of course it had been so enthusiastically embraced by the Premier as a 'massive win' for South Australia. It seems that the Treasurer, heading towards the final days of his political career—and perhaps having a mind to thinking about his legacy, as some politicians reaching that time in their career do—thought perhaps it was time to place on record some concerns about the GST arrangements that had been struck in the recent past, while he was the state Treasurer.

He now is saying that this is not only a bad deal for South Australia but that it needs to be revisited. In fact, not only does his view now differ substantially from the Premier's in believing that it is no longer a massive win for South Australia but he thinks that what should happen at the end of

the 2026-27 financial year, when the temporary guarantee of no state being worse off from this runs out, is that the Productivity Commission review promised by the federal government at that point in time should be brought forward.

If the federal government does not agree to bring forward the Productivity Commission review to right now, then the South Australian Treasurer and the South Australian government will conduct their own review as soon, he said, as he can find somebody eminently qualified. I cannot imagine why Rob Lucas would be asking the federal Productivity Commission to hasten their review into the GST distribution arrangements.

This is the same body, with largely the same commissioners, that recommended we lose either \$2 billion a year or \$500 million a year. Why would we want to bring that forward? That is a turkey voting for Christmas, is it not? The worst possible outcome we could have for the state's finances is the federal Productivity Commission being put in charge of this review and doing it as quickly as possible. Why would we want that sort of formal recommendation floating around the country in the current context? It just beggars belief.

The Treasurer says that if they do not accede to that review, and I am sure they will not, then we will have our own independent review, based here in South Australia. To be fair on the Treasurer, it is hard to find somebody who is eminently qualified in this. In fact, there was a national leader in providing advice to governments, federal and state, who was South Australian and who passed away only in the last 18 months. He was a former Treasury official. In fact, in this place, both the member for West Torrens as a former Treasurer and I as a former staffer to former treasurers, as well as the Treasurer in the other place, Rob Lucas, all put on record our condolences on his passing to this individual's family.

He was Robert Schwartz. He was the national expert in GST distributions and horizontal fiscal equalisation. He provided his expertise not just to South Australian governments but also to federal governments of different political persuasions. I am sympathetic to the Treasurer for not being able to hasten his own inquiry, but really, asking for the Productivity Commission to do it—nothing could be more contrary to the state's interests than the federal Productivity Commission getting on and doing this inquiry.

The government basically has made its own bed and now must lie in it. This is a deal that was contrary to the state's interests and other governments, the Victorian Treasury and Saul Eslake, the respected national economist, have said that it would cost South Australia north of \$250 million a year and there is no easy way out. What on earth do we expect a federal government to say in the lead-up to a federal election when the Liberal Party has been given an absolute electoral hiding in Western Australia?

Do we honestly expect, as a South Australian community, that Scott Morrison and Josh Frydenberg are going to risk putting Western Australia offside when their political stocks are already so low in Western Australia and in Perth by risking the current regime that has been installed to Western Australia's very significant financial advantage?

Bear in mind what Western Australia is getting at the moment. Not only are they getting a subsidy in the order of \$1 billion to \$2 billion plus per year in GST top-up payments from the federal government but they are also experiencing an extraordinary demand for their iron ore exports to the point where I think I am correct in saying that the price hit \$200 a tonne, something I do not think we have ever seen in Australia before, delivering a windfall of billions of dollars of additional royalty revenue into Western Australia.

In the course of three years, we have had Western Australia convincing the federal government to overturn the GST distribution system, which has served our country well for 20 years, and what do they get out of it? Despite a pandemic, despite the restrictions on economic activity and business operations, they are billions of dollars better off in GST top-up payments from the federal government and, even more, many billions of dollars better off each year from royalty payments. It just goes to show you how badly handled this has been by the federal government and at the same time actively supported by this Premier and his Treasurer.

One thing we were expecting to come before the parliament before now was a commitment from this government to introduce a new tax on South Australians, yet another impost on South

Australian motorists, and that was an electric vehicle tax. During the course of the estimates committee considerations, we asked several questions about electric vehicles in South Australia.

The government said that they were going to impose a new tax on electric vehicles because electric vehicle owners do not pay their fair share for the upkeep of roads. I could say that that is not quite right or I could say that that is slightly wrong or misleading, but I will say it for what it is: it is a lie. It is a deliberate lie in an effort to tell people that something is happening that is patently false and untrue.

Regardless of what they drive, the only money collected from motorists that goes into the maintenance of the roads is collected from three things: motor vehicle registration fees, driver's licence fees and fees a motorist might pay from time to time in expiation fees, road traffic offences. Electric vehicles pay registration fees and they pay driver's licence fees, so the claim that electric vehicle owners do not pay their fair share of the upkeep of roads is blatantly wrong, and a treasurer, a transport minister or a member of cabinet who would be considering this would have considered what the current legislative framework is and how our roads are currently funded.

So there is that basic, most egregious of lies, but there is an additional one placed on top of it, which claims that the fuel excises collected by the federal government are for spending on roads. That is just wrong as well, absolutely wrong. There is not one part of that, not one vowel or consonant, let alone syllable, which is correct. Yes, the federal government does collect fuel excise, but it is not hypothecated into the roads or even into transport spending. It goes straight back to Treasury, into general revenue, and the government may or may not make an allocation from time to time, from state to state, on transport-related spending, whether it is infrastructure or otherwise.

We have this preposterous idea that a state like South Australia should be stepping into the federal policy breach and coming up with a new regime of motor vehicle taxation, which has a mind to the fact that fewer motorists will be paying a federal tax to the federal government when they fill up their cars at the bowser in the form of fuel excise. Spare me! It was yet another excuse for this government to impose an additional tax on motorists and to ratchet up, once again, the tax burden on motorists.

The additional impost imposed by this government on motorists is extraordinary, absolutely extraordinary. The last Labor government brought legislative changes before the parliament to change the compulsory third-party insurance scheme. Those changes, Labor Party changes, have dropped compulsory third-party costs by more than \$100 per year per vehicle.

This government has done the exact opposite thing with motorists. They have massively increased registration costs; they have massively increased administration fees, which all South Australians are obliged to pay when they register their vehicles; they have massively increased traffic fines; and now they are looking at introducing a new tax on electric vehicles.

This government think that electric vehicles are so important they apparently have an electric vehicle action plan. We are told by the Minister for Energy that the \$80 million this government claims is spent on procurement of government fleet vehicles is going to be dedicated to electric vehicles. There are 6,712 vehicles in the government fleet, according to what we learnt during estimates. Have a guess how many of them are electric vehicles: 11, 11 out of 6,712. A further 35 are plug-in hybrid vehicles. So, if you are most generous, 46 out of 6,712 could be considered to be electric vehicles—not even 1 per cent.

Here we are, more than two years on from the government telling us they are going to introduce an electric vehicle tax, and where is the legislation? 'Well, we haven't got the legislation, because we've got to wait to see what Victoria does first.' Well, we have the legislation from Victoria, so what is the hold-up? The hold-up is that the government have been humiliated into not bringing this forward because once again they are punishing motorists. The Labor Party has dropped motor vehicle costs for motorists and the Liberal Party is massively jacking them up.

If you want to know by how much, you only need to look at Budget Paper 3, motor vehicle taxes on motorists. Motorists pay more than \$100 million a year extra in tax compared to what they did at the time of the last election—and \$100 million is no small beer. It is absolutely extraordinary how this government have come after motorists, and they have been caught out.

Not even the Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries supports this tax. Not even the biggest group speaking on behalf of the motor vehicle industry supports this tax, because, of course,

the last thing electric vehicles need is a disincentive. What other states are doing is providing them incentives. Yes, you might argue that rolling out charging stations is terrific, depending on where they are, but that alone is not enough. I seek leave to continue my remarks after the resumption.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### **UNEXPLAINED WEALTH (COMMONWEALTH POWERS) BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DRIVING AT EXTREME SPEED) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

#### **VOLUNTARY ASSISTED DYING BILL**

*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Condolence*

#### **MCKEE, HON. C.D.T.**

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03):** By leave, I move:

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

Colin McKee was the Labor member for Gilles between 1989 and 1993. He was born on 8 August 1949, the son of Dave and Rhonda McKee. Ten years later, his father was elected to this house to represent the city of Port Pirie and the surrounding areas. This meant Colin spent much of his upbringing in the Iron Triangle city.

His father was a member of this house for 16 years, culminating in ministerial service under Premier Dunstan between 1970 and 1975. Before his election to this house in 1959, Dave McKee had been renowned as a boxer. By contrast, 30 years later, in his maiden speech to this house his son spoke about his interest in the arts as an organiser for the Musicians' Union and later for Actors and Announcers Equity.

Before his election as the member for Gilles, Colin had also served for almost 10 years at the Labor Party office as party organiser. During that time, he worked on two state election campaigns and three federal campaigns, as well as a number of by-elections. During his service to this parliament he was a member of the Joint Committee for Subordinate Legislation and, subsequently, the Legislative Review Committee.

His parliamentary service coincided with the nadir of his party's political fortunes following the collapse of the State Bank, and one of the consequences was that Colin was unable to secure his party's preselection for the seat of his choice in the 1993 election. As a result, he did not seek to continue his parliamentary career.

On behalf of the house, I express our appreciation to Colin for his service to this parliament and to the people of South Australia. I also extend our deep sympathy to his wife, Cyndy; son, Todd; sister, Laneene; and other members of the McKee family. Vale, Colin McKee.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** I second the motion from the Premier. I rise today to honour the contribution to public life of the late Colin McKee. A parliamentarian, a unionist, a Labor man and a friend of many current and former members of the South Australian party, Colin David Thomas McKee passed away last month on 6 July aged 71.

Colin will be remembered as a hardworking and devoted member of parliament who represented the interests of the people of Gilles with diligence and integrity. Colin was elected in the

1989 state election and replaced Jack Slater, a former minister in the Bannon government who held the seat of Gilles from 1970 to 1989. At the age of 40, he joined six other new parliamentary colleagues who also entered the parliament in the 1989 election. They included Vic Heron, Colin Hutchinson, John Quirke, Paul Holloway and Michael Atkinson.

Back in 1989, the seat to which Colin was elected was similar to the current seat of Torrens. It bordered on Walkerville and took in the suburbs of Vale Park, Manningham, Windsor Gardens, Hillcrest and Gilles Plains. Colin followed in the footsteps of his father, David, who was also an MP for Port Pirie, between 1959 and 1970, and for the seat of Pirie, between 1970 and 1975. He was also the Minister for Labour and Industry in the Dunstan government between 1970 and 1975.

In his maiden speech, Colin said that he was never pushed into politics but, growing up in a working-class family, being surrounded by unionism and Labor politics, the Vietnam War and conscription were enough to mould his opinion. Colin believed that participation in Labor politics and the labour movement was the only way he could make a substantial contribution to his fellow human beings, even if only in a small way, to improve the community—and he did make a contribution.

He spent 17 years as a union official and a Labor Party organiser before entering parliament. His early career saw him become an organiser of the Musicians' Union of South Australia and, like former premiers Don Dunstan and John Bannon, he later became involved in the union for performers in radio, television, theatre and dance, becoming the founding secretary of Actors Equity.

In 1979, after the loss of the Corcoran government, Colin was elected to the position of state organiser of the Labor Party, which could be a highly sought-after position. His first electoral bleeding happened just five weeks after he took on the position, when he was sent out to work on the Norwood by-election.

Some may recall that Greg Crafter was elected in the March 1979 by-election triggered by the abrupt resignation of Premier Don Dunstan. Only six months later, he was defeated by Liberal Frank Webster at the September 1979 state election; however, when a court overturned Webster's win another by-election was held in February 1980, which Colin worked on and which ultimately saw Greg Crafter re-elected as the member for Norwood. Colin's work is well credited amongst those familiar with that by-election.

Colin spent nearly 10 years at the party office and worked with the then secretary of the party and now former Senator Chris Schacht. They worked together on four state by-elections, three federal elections and two state election campaigns, culminating in success in all but three by-elections—an outstanding record. In his maiden speech, Colin spoke passionately about the music industry, the Labor Party and the environment.

In the lead-up to the 1993 state election, the seat of Gilles was abolished and the new seat of Torrens was created. I cannot imagine that the last couple of years of the Bannon-Arnold government were enjoyable for anyone, especially not for those who were seeking preselection in incredibly difficult circumstances.

While Colin could have quit politics in 1992, which would have resulted in a by-election that more than likely would have brought down the then Labor government, it was something that Colin did not elect to do. Like many others, in Labor-held seats in the 1993 state election—even with a high-profile minister contesting the seat—there was a massive swing against the Labor Party and the seat of Torrens was picked up by the Liberal Party.

Would it have made a difference if Colin had been preselected for Torrens? No-one really knows, one can only speculate, but there is no doubt it was a tumultuous period in the Labor Party and, like many MPs who were elected at the 1989 election, it was difficult to contest the 1993 one.

Interestingly, not all media coverage in 1992 was about Colin's preselection battle. In preparing this speech, I read a rather lengthy story that appeared in the *Adelaide Advertiser* speculating about what Colin would do after his preselection battle for Torrens. It was clear that Colin was very much committed to his family. Colin's family can feel very proud of the many decades of work he helped carry out on behalf of others.

Colin was committed to serving the labour movement and was passionate about the issues that were important to South Australians. He was a man who stood firm to his beliefs and his

conscience. He pursued whatever he believed was best for our state and his community throughout his entire working life within the labour movement.

On behalf of the Opposition and the parliamentary Labor Party, I express my sincere condolences to Colin's wife, Cyndy, who has joined us in the gallery today; his son, Todd; his much-loved sister, Laneene; and his extended family, friends and former colleagues. My thoughts are with them at this difficult time. May he rest in peace.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

*Sitting suspended from 14:11 to 14:23.*

#### *Petitions*

### **PIED CORMORANTS**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga):** Presented a petition signed by 458 residents of Stansbury, Port Vincent and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to formulate and implement a multifaceted strategy to manage the impact of an excessive population of pied cormorants on the environment, infrastructure, tourism industry and wider commercial activity in Stansbury and Port Vincent.

### **ROAD UPGRADES**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga):** Presented a petition signed by 905 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to allocate appropriate funding in the 2021-22 budget and work with the Copper Coast Council to fully upgrade 5.74 km of the Copper Coast Highway between Irwine Street-Owen Terrace and Kadina Road-Bowman Road in Wallaroo.

### **ROAD SAFETY**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Presented a petition signed by 237 residents of Adelaide and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to install appropriate safety measures at the intersection of Reid Avenue and St Bernards Road in Hectorville.

### **RESIDENTIAL PARKS**

**Mr GEE (Taylor):** Presented a petition signed by 658 residents of residential parks and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to introduce a standard site lease agreement for all residential parks in South Australia based on the Consumer and Business Services template, and that all lease agreements be registered.

### **CLIMATE CHANGE**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition):** Presented a petition signed by 10,366 residents of Adelaide and greater South Australia requesting the house to declare that we are facing a climate emergency and commit to immediate measures to achieve net zero carbon emissions in South Australia as quickly as possible and to draw down excess carbon from the atmosphere.

### **HAPPY VALLEY RESERVOIR**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale):** Presented a petition signed by 355 residents of the electorates of Hurtle Vale, Davenport and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to reconsider opening the Happy Valley Reservoir to the public in order to protect the unique ecosystem which supports a range of wildlife, including kangaroos, koalas and black cockatoos.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:



By the Deputy Speaker—

Auditor-General Report—Examination of the Community Wastewater Management Systems Program—Report 11 of 2021 [Ordered to be published]  
Minutes of the Assembly of Members of the two Houses of a Member to fill a vacancy in the Legislative Council rendered by the resignation of the Hon. David Ridgway  
Reports received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991—  
Public Works Committee—  
153<sup>rd</sup> Report entitled Happy Valley Reservoir Stage One Project  
154<sup>th</sup> Report entitled Augusta Highway Duplication (Port Wakefield to Lochiel) Project  
155<sup>th</sup> Report entitled Mitcham Primary School Redevelopment Project  
156<sup>th</sup> Report entitled Stradbroke School Redevelopment Project  
157<sup>th</sup> Report entitled Morgan Whyalla Pipeline No.1 Replacement Project  
158<sup>th</sup> Report entitled Golden Grove Park 'n' Ride Project

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Acts Interpretation—Audiovisual Meetings  
COVID-19 Emergency Response—  
Savings and Transitional Matters  
Section 16 Real Property Act  
Criminal Law Consolidation—General  
Justices of the Peace—General  
Professional Standards—General  
Subordinate Legislation—Postponement of Expiry (No. 2)

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

Local Government Act 1999—Review of the operation of Section 302B  
Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Planning, Development and Infrastructure—  
General—Application of Act  
General—Electricity Infrastructure  
Local Council By-Laws—  
District Council of Grant—  
No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
No. 2—Local Government Land  
No. 3—Roads  
No. 4—Moveable Signs  
No. 5—Dogs

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Electricity—Principles of Vegetation Clearance

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

Flinders University—Annual Report 2020  
Torrens University—Annual Report 2020  
University of Adelaide—Annual Report 2020  
University of South Australia—Annual Report 2020

By the Minister for Innovation and Skills (Hon. D.G. Pisoni)—

Training Advocate, South Australian—Annual Report 2021  
Training and Skills Commission—Annual Report 2021

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Construction Industry Training Fund—General

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan) on behalf of the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—  
Wilderness Protection—General

*Ministerial Statement*

**AFGHANISTAN**

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33):** I rise to make a statement, on indulgence, on the conflict in Afghanistan. I rise today to speak about the unfolding humanitarian crisis in Afghanistan. Many have watched in horror the images of despair and desperation coming out of Kabul and right across Afghanistan. I know fears remain for those in that country, especially the women and children. This is truly a heartbreaking and distressing situation. It goes without saying that the current situation is having a profound impact on the 8,000-strong Afghani community here in South Australia.

Last week, I met with a number of Afghan community leaders to give my assurance that the government stands shoulder to shoulder with them and is ready to offer all possible assistance. There will be ongoing conversations with community leaders in the weeks ahead as we get more clarity on what is currently a dynamic and volatile situation. In the meantime, I want to commend the Afghan community for coming together to raise awareness of the conflict and funds for the response. To see so many South Australians attend the vigil on Saturday night was truly moving.

As we watch events unfold, it is essential to remember that throughout Australia's 20-year mission in Afghanistan members of our Australian Defence Force made an immeasurable difference to the lives of the Afghan people. Anyone who has not served or lost a loved one in the line of service cannot imagine the pain and grief being felt across the veterans community at the moment. These bonds forged through military service are unbreakable and I urge you all to lean on each other for support at this very difficult time.

Australia's mission in Afghanistan will forever be part of the tapestry that makes up Australia's military history. My message to our veterans is this: you fought with distinction and honour for a worthy cause. Be proud of your service and of what you have achieved and the difference that you have made. Thank you for your service.

Finally, the government is working with the federal government and monitoring the situation in Afghanistan closely, while every effort is being made to evacuate Australians and Afghan visa holders. South Australia will likely receive repatriation flights, and our government stands ready to support the federal government's humanitarian program for the safe settlement of any Afghan refugees here in South Australia.

During this heartbreaking time, I call on all South Australians to show compassion, reach out with their hearts and support those in our community who have been impacted by this conflict. I know that we all hope that peace will again be on Afghanistan.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** I thank the Premier and the parliament for the opportunity to address this matter on indulgence. Like most of us in the chamber, I was born here. My parents were born here. I think people in our incredibly privileged position on an almost daily basis take for granted that we truly do live in probably the most special country anywhere in the world. We take for granted our liberty and that we live in a civil society with the rule of law and democratic values almost universally shared.

My grandparents were not born here. They were born overseas, in Hungary and Lithuania, and they came to Australia in 1948 and 1949 as displaced people. We would call them refugees today: they came by boat. Throughout every moment I can recall of my childhood, almost without fail both those grandparents would remind me just how lucky I was, that I was incredibly privileged to

live in Australia and that I should never take it for granted. Inevitably, as we get into our day-to-day lives and routine, we do take it for granted. We do not reflect enough on just how lucky we are.

I can tell you what, over the course of the last week, with the events that have been unfolding in Afghanistan, when all of us have been witnessing that human tragedy unfold, live in technicolour before our eyes, it is impossible not to appreciate just how lucky we are. I can think of a few interactions that I have had over the course of the last week that particularly remind me of that.

I was lucky enough to go to the Fatima Zahra Mosque last Wednesday evening. I was invited by the Afghan community to go along, and I was there with a number of my colleagues—and it was absolutely packed. As soon as we rolled up to the car park, it was hard not to be overwhelmed by the collective sense of anxiety permeating amongst that community throughout the event. After a relatively informal ceremony, I hung around and community leaders were bringing individuals to share their stories with me and it was gut wrenching.

I was speaking to a middle-aged mother of children she has been separated from; I was speaking to a sister of a brother who had helped Australian forces, who she had not heard from for days; and I was speaking to another father, recalling stories he had heard of family members back home, his female family members who were shaving their heads in the desperate hope that the Taliban would not recognise them as being female.

On Saturday night, the Premier and I were able to attend the vigil in Victoria Square, and we were both inundated with people wanting to share their stories about the tragedy that was unfolding back home and desperately pleading for something to be done to be able to bring family members out to Australia. While it is true that many of the decisions that relate to those people's future freedom are not necessarily a function of this house, it is our collective responsibility to put pressure on those decision-makers in Canberra who can aid those people's cause.

There are 4,200 people in Australia right now who have been deemed to be legitimate refugees who are stuck on temporary protection visas—some of them for five, six, seven years—who have hanging over their heads a permanent threat of being sent back to Afghanistan. I welcome the remarks of the Prime Minister. I welcome the remarks of the Prime Minister and the foreign minister that no-one will be sent back at this time.

But those people deserve more than just a reassurance about what is occurring at this time. Those people deserve a permanent path to residency and ultimately Australian citizenship. Why? Because that is Australia at its best—welcoming other people from other parts of the world with an open heart and a compassion that we want to provide people hope in their moment of peril, that there are other parts of the world that hold those ideals of freedom and democracy more than just words on a piece of paper but things we are willing to share. We did it after Tiananmen Square, we did it after Vietnam, we did it after World War II and we can do it again.

I take this opportunity to advocate yet again that those people who are already here—already deemed to be safe and appropriately residing in Australia—get permanent residency and citizenship. I join the Premier in his calls for doing everything we reasonably can for other members of the Afghan community, particularly those who would love to see family members enjoy this country and truly be able to call it home.

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: TEACHERS REGISTRATION BOARD PETITION**

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:47):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** On Thursday 24 June, I spoke in this place in response to the Legislative Review Committee's report on petition No. 13 of 2020, entitled 'Maintenance of the current composition of the Teachers Registration Board'.

I delivered my response to the report within 30 days of it being tabled as I felt it would be prudent to address the matter before the legislation commenced and there was a discussion in this house. However, section 19(3)(a) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 requires me to formally address the house following the provision of my written response to the committee, which I sent on 7 July.

Given I have previously addressed this matter in detail in my speech of 24 June, I would therefore like to take this opportunity to say I am pleased with reforms of the Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004 and I believe they are working well.

*Question Time*

**MEMBER FOR WAITE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:49):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier maintain his position that the behaviour of the member for Waite at a Parliament House Christmas party in December 2019 was completely unacceptable? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** On 14 February last year, the Premier released a statement in which he said:

The type of behaviour that has been publicly canvassed is completely unacceptable and falls well short of the standards expected of all members of parliament, accordingly, I have advised Mr Duluk that he is no longer to participate in any meetings of the Liberal Parliamentary Party.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:49):** I stand by all statements I have made on this, but I make the point that Mr Duluk has already made his own statement accepting that the behaviour was unacceptable and has made a full apology.

**MEMBER FOR WAITE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier continue to believe that the member for Waite's position in the Liberal Party is untenable? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** In the Premier's statement of 14 February last year, he also said:

...new information, combined with reports of a police investigation into Mr Duluk's behaviour, renders his position in the Liberal...Party untenable.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50):** I stand by my previous statements on this matter.

**MEMBER FOR WAITE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50):** A supplementary question: does that mean the Premier believes that any position Mr Duluk could have in a future Liberal Party is untenable?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50):** You are taking statements from a long time ago and trying to extrapolate on them at the moment. The reality was that there was a police investigation which resulted in court proceedings, and it was completely untenable for Mr Duluk to sit in the Liberal parliamentary room at that time.

There has been a case. It has been before the court, and the court has made its decision. There is also a parliamentary inquiry that was underway that was paused. I presume that will resume, but that is ultimately a matter for the Speaker, not the Liberal Party. However, I do make the point that there is a court decision that has been made today and that there has been a full apology for the behaviour from the member for Waite. Ultimately, I expect that the parliamentary inquiry will resume.

**MEMBER FOR WAITE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:51):** My question is to the Premier. What was the new information about the member for Waite's behaviour that forced you to bar him from the Liberal Party? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** In a statement on 14 February last year, the Premier stated that he 'became aware of further allegations regarding incidents involving the member for Waite, Mr Sam Duluk, and his behaviour at Parliament House on Friday 13 December 2019'.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:52):** I have nothing further to add to this matter.

### EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:52):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is creating more jobs for South Australians, and what this means for the future of our state?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:52):** I thank the member for Newland for his excellent question. He is focused on the big issues for our state, and that is dealing with the coronavirus and making sure we can maximise the largest number of people employed in the state of South Australia that we can.

We all know that the coronavirus has had a devastating effect on so many businesses, families and individuals right across this state, but the very good news is that South Australians have been working together and they have been abiding by the restrictions. We have been listening to science, to evidence, to the experts to guide us through this situation, and I think many people had the reward when the ABS released its statistics last week, showing that South Australia had a massive fall in its unemployment rate to 4.7 per cent, the lowest level we have had for more than a decade. In fact, it is two full percentage points lower than the Labor Party averaged over its last term in government, 6.7. It is 4.7 at the moment, and every South Australian can share in this fantastic news.

We saw a plummeting of the unemployment rate, we saw a massive increase in the participation rate in South Australia, and more than 10,600 South Australians got employment last week. For that we must be very grateful, but we also can't be complacent. There is still plenty more work to be done here in South Australia to make sure we can continue to navigate through this very difficult situation we have with the coronavirus and border restrictions being put in place, to make sure we can get even more South Australians into employment.

We know that as the employment rate increases in South Australia it means that more South Australians, especially younger South Australians, are able to have much greater hope that their future—their future employment and their future lives—is right here in South Australia. That has also been reflected in the very happy statistic that shows that we now have a net migration back to South Australia.

What we had under the previous government was a mass exodus of young people and capital out of this state. What we now have is a net migration back to South Australia for the first time in decades and decades and decades, and that is something that we should all celebrate.

What we know is that the most recent state budget handed down provided \$17.9 billion worth of economic stimulus here in South Australia, support for businesses in South Australia, especially around infrastructure. The member for Newland will be very pleased because the TTP park-and-ride is being built in his electorate. I was out there recently to see it. The good news is that 215 jobs—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** They bark, they whinge, they carp and they complain. They hate good news in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** They hate good news in South Australia, but the news is overwhelmingly good. Take, for example, the BankSA State Monitor—24 years this has been running. The state confidence, the business confidence in South Australia, at the moment is at the highest level in 24 years, but still Captain Negativity and the Labor Party over there want to talk down the state. Well, enough is enough. The people of South Australia are feeling positive—very positive

about their response to the coronavirus and most optimistic about the future when we can create future jobs in fantastic areas.

One of the areas we want to really focus on here in South Australia of course is new apprentices and trainees in South Australia. I want to congratulate my good friend the Minister for Innovation and Skills in South Australia, who has been doing a mighty job. When I look at the statistics to the end of last year there was a more than 20 per cent increase—a more than 20 per cent increase—in the number of apprentices and trainees in South Australia through last year, which is absolutely fantastic.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** They whinge, they whine, they carp, they complain. They presided over an absolute disaster in terms of vocational education and training and they don't even have the decency to congratulate the minister on the great work that he's doing. But the good news is that the statistics speak for themselves. The statistics speak for themselves.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Premier, your time has expired.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There are very happy days ahead for South Australia.

#### MEMBER FOR WAITE

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with his Liberal colleague the federal member for Barker that following today's court decision the member for Waite should immediately be readmitted to the Liberal Party? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Dr CLOSE:** The Liberal federal member for Barker, Mr Tony Pasin, today told *The Advertiser*:

With this matter finalised I encourage the leadership of the Liberal Party to immediately lift the suspension of the Member for Waite's membership.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57):** Firstly, I haven't seen those comments and, secondly, it's not up to me to determine who is a member of the Liberal Party—that is a matter for the Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division). That is a matter that they would consider, should there be an application that comes in.

#### MEMBER FOR WAITE

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57):** My question is to the Premier. As a member of the Liberal Party's state executive, will you personally support the member for Waite's readmission to the Liberal Party?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57):** I refer to my previous answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

#### ENERGY AND MINING SECTOR

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is creating job opportunities for our community through the Growth State plan for the energy and mining sector?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:58):** Thank you to the member for Colton, a very capable, very hardworking member who knows how our whole state benefits from our mining industry. The mining sector is growing fantastically at the moment, supported by the updated Mining Act and regulations, strategic investments and explorations, strong commodity prices and the excellent management of COVID to minimise disruptions.

More than 300 mineral and petroleum operators achieved the second highest production sales on record, reaching \$7.1 billion in 2020, including a record high of \$5.7 billion in mineral sales and \$1.3 billion in petroleum sales. This is on the back of the record high royalties of \$312 million in financial year 2020 to benefit all South Australians. The resource sector continues to grow and attract record high private new capital expenditure of \$2 billion for mining in South Australia for the 12 months to March 2021.

Just last week, the OZ Minerals Board approved a \$600 million expansion of Prominent Hill. This expansion will extend the mine's life to 2036 and increase copper production by 23 per cent on current levels. The expansion provides longevity for the 1,200-strong workforce and will increase royalties, which help fund roads, schools, hospitals, police stations, disability services, etc. It also provides opportunity for suppliers during construction and ongoing operations to benefit from the expansion.

The Department for Energy and Mining is working with OZ Minerals on the regulatory framework to authorise new activities. OZ Minerals' decision to expand Prominent Hill and promising results of investigations of two other copper targets nearby have the potential to open up further expansions over time.

The energy and mining sector directly employs over 13,900 people in South Australia, and no doubt some of them in the electorate of Colton. It generates over \$300 million in royalties per annum and provides over \$6.9 billion in production value. South Australia's copper strategy aims to boost production to one million tonnes over the next two decades. The Marshall Liberal government is delivering on our Growth State plan for the energy and mining sector by creating and sustaining jobs in the city and in the regions and in the outback.

It was a pleasure to be at the Global Maintenance Upper Spencer Gulf conference on Thursday and Friday last week. On Friday morning, the Premier gave an outstanding speech to that group. The mining sector, the resources sector, is alive and well. It's very buoyant at the moment. There are enormous opportunities for economic growth in our state, and that growth includes massive employment opportunities. Agriculture and mining are our two largest industries in South Australia, and they are both incredibly important.

One of the things about the Global Maintenance Upper Spencer Gulf conference that is fantastic to be able to share with members of this chamber is that that organisation was put together about 17 or 18 years ago to support the service companies in the Upper Spencer Gulf and outback which support the mining sector.

As I mentioned, there are over 13,900 jobs directly employed in the energy and mining sectors in our state, but there are approximately 41,000 people in South Australia employed directly and indirectly in the resources and energy sector. It is a massive contributor to our economy. It is done incredibly responsibly in South Australia with regard to the environment. It has a very bright future. It is working incredibly hard to fit in with all other sectors in our state—and long may it continue to contribute to our economy and our society.

#### **MEMBER FOR WAITE**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02):** My question is to the Premier. As the leader of the parliamentary Liberal Party, will you support the member for Waite's readmission into the Liberal party room?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:02):** There has been no application, and I am not going to be speaking about hypotheticals. I refer the honourable member to all of my previous discussions regarding this matter.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** What's the fee?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is called to order.

#### **MEMBER FOR WAITE**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe that a 'drunken pest' deserves a place in your party room? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Dr CLOSE:** In his judgement today, Magistrate Jonathan Wells described the member for Waite as 'rude, unpleasant, insensitive and disrespectful' and clearly a 'drunken pest'.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:03):** I just refer the member to my previous answers. On this, I will not be lectured by the Labor Party. One of her own shadow cabinet colleagues was castigated by the ICAC for incredibly unfortunate language.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I think the member for West Torrens at the time might have referred to it as 'conversational swearing', but we all know the language that was used to bully and intimidate people within his own department, found very, very, very unacceptable by the ICAC. I take advice from a lot of people, a lot of different groups across the state. One group I won't be taking any lectures from whatsoever is the Australian Labor Party.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the deputy leader, the member for West Torrens is warned for the first time, the member for Playford is called to order and the member for Lee is called to order.

#### MEMBER FOR WAITE

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:04):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier support the reopening of a parliamentary inquiry into the member for Waite's behaviour at a Christmas party in December 2019?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:04):** If only the deputy leader had been listening to the answers she would have maybe heard that that is a matter for the Speaker, and the Speaker will make that consideration. I expect that it will continue.

#### GIGCITY NETWORK

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:04):** My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister advise how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting growth of the digital economy and creating jobs in South Australia through the GigCity program?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (15:04):** I thank the member for King for focusing on the big issues—and the big issue in South Australia is the future. That's what this is all about: jobs for young people that we are delivering here in South Australia by making sure we futureproof the state. Of course, the GigCity network supports the growth of all startups, entrepreneurs and small business through the provision of additional ultrafast internet connectivity to over 390 businesses at 23 innovation precincts across metropolitan Adelaide, including Lot Fourteen, the Tonsley innovation district and Technology Park.

I am also pleased to announce that two new precincts will be joining the GigCity network shortly: the Welland Healthy Living Precinct and the Unley Civic Precinct. The Welland Healthy Living Precinct is a social enterprise hub in the inner western suburbs that supports primary healthcare providers and focuses on the shared care and disability sector. The Unley Civic Precinct is a managed co-working and business incubation space located in heritage cottages being refurbished.

This is the outcome of an expression of interest process conducted in April this year in which 19 councils in metropolitan Adelaide were invited to submit applications for new GigCity precincts. Applications were received from five councils: the City of Charles Sturt, the City of Burnside, the Campbelltown City Council, the City of Prospect and the City of Unley. The two new precincts are expected to be connected in late 2021 or 2022 once all agreements have been signed and the capital works completed.

The GigCity network is helping eligible small businesses thrive in a digital economy, with a 2019 survey showing that more than two-thirds, or 67 per cent, of GigCity users found the GigCity service was important and critical for the success of their business. A further survey of all GigCity users is currently being undertaken, and I look forward to the updated results from this consultation.

In addition to the high-speed connectivity, GigCity users are also experiencing improved efficiency through access to cloud-based software, offsite data backup and videoconferencing



capabilities. In 2020, the government approved \$2.5 million to continue the GigCity program until June 2024, providing certainty for over 390 businesses that are currently using the GigCity connectivity. This includes a recently completed review of the cybersecurity and resiliency of the GigCity network.

The government is considering the recommendations of this review and will adopt measures that further strengthen the network to meet the demanding needs of the defence, space and creative industries. The government is also extending GigCity to Mount Gambier and Whyalla, with 35 businesses already using GigCity services. The network is still under construction, which is expected to be completed by January next year.

#### MEMBER FOR WAITE

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:07):** My question is to the Premier. Is there anything a parliamentary investigation could find that would outweigh a magistrate's description of the member for Waite as 'rude, unpleasant, insensitive, disrespectful', 'a drunken pest', in your consideration that might allow him back into the Liberal party room?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir: that question is entirely hypothetical.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Well, 'Is there anything,' it is hypothetical. Premier, did you want to have a go at it? No?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:08):** I don't have—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —anything further to add to the answers that I have already provided to the house.

#### MEMBER FOR WAITE

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:08):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier ask the Speaker to provide the investigation access to all documents and access to all members of staff, including Parliament House staff?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:08):** As the member would be more than aware, there is a parliamentary inquiry, which is already underway. Certainly, the former Speaker didn't make any requests of me as the Premier—and it's a parliamentary inquiry; it's not a government inquiry. But if the Speaker does (1) choose to resume the inquiry and (2) require any further information, I'm sure that he will make me aware of that, and I would be very happy to support that. He may make further requests from the entire parliament.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:09):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house why the GST deal his government negotiated in 2018 must now be renegotiated? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The Treasurer, Rob Lucas, told *The Advertiser* in an interview on 18 June 2021, and I quote:

The battle for a re-elected government, or a new government, is to convince the commonwealth government of the day, whoever it is, to renegotiate the deal...

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:09):** I thank the member for his question; it's an important question. Certainly, the Board of Treasurers—most of them, anyway—have looked at the deal, several years ago of course, in light of the current projected GST distribution and sought to make some changes. At this stage, the federal Treasurer, Josh Frydenberg, and the Prime Minister have ruled that out. Nevertheless, certainly that deal hasn't gone as expected and there are some very significant GST distributions to the west at the moment. If you think about what horizontal fiscal—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Talk about maladministration! What's wrong with you? Why don't you sign up to it?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens!

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Premier, I will speak. The member for West Torrens is warned for a second time.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He clearly has a few issues there at the moment. I'm not quite sure—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Yes, a quarter of a billion dollars a year lost to the state because of you.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens!

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Quarter of a billion a year.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, you have been warned twice. I am in the Speaker's chair for the first time in question time. I don't want to be throwing people out, but you have been warned twice.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The basis of horizontal fiscal equalisation, of course, is making sure that the GST, one of the pieces of legislation which was opposed by the Labor Party—violently opposed by the Labor Party. They hated the concept. They fought it for years and years and years. Ultimately, the Australian parliament decided it was in the best interests; now they are the experts of GST, the very—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —legislation that they—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —vehemently opposed, they are now warmly embracing. The basis of the GST is what we call horizontal fiscal equalisation. A change was made, which all jurisdictions of course supported—Labor and Liberal—right across the country. Again, those opposite completely ruled out the position that their own colleagues interstate took with regard to this situation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Of course—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It's—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Sir, there's something going on over there.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Premier, take your seat for a moment. The leader, I am reluctant to warn the leader but I am calling the leader to order and warning him for the first time. In this place, we ask questions and the minister responsible answers and will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you, sir. Thank you for your protection. It was quite extraordinary—but I know why they are upset. I know exactly and precisely why they are upset. They were in for 16 years—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Playford is warned for the first time. The member for Lee is warned for the first time.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I know why they are upset. They were in government for 16—  
*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson is called to order. Member for West Torrens, you're on thin ice.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** When they were in government for 16 years they left with a report card from the independent umpire, the ratings agencies. The ratings agencies look at all jurisdictions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Leader, a question has been asked of the Premier. I am interested in his answer. I am warning the leader for the second time, and I would be very reluctant to throw the leader out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned for the second time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I was saying, those opposite are very touchy on this subject. They were in government for 16 years. The independent umpire gave them a report card; in fact, they gave every single jurisdiction a report card, and the fiscal situation in South Australia was ranked by those three independent ratings agencies, and we were ranked bottom in the country, below Tasmania. Since coming to government and—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —applying fiscal discipline, we have again been rated by those independent agencies. Standard & Poor's, Moody's, and Fitch have all upgraded South Australia. In fact, we are at the highest point we have been for a very long period of time. Whilst those opposite want to throw stones with regard to our performance in government, with regard to the budget, we actually prefer to listen to the experts and the experts have given a glowing report to South Australia. In fact, we have got one more year of the situation with putting forward a deficit, but then we will be returning to the black.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Point of order: standing order 98, debate. The question was not about the Marshall Liberal government quadrupling debt: the question was about GST revenues that are now \$250 million a year worse off as a result of the deal that this government has supported.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The leader is correct. The question was about GST. The Premier has been doing his best to answer it with numerous interruptions. There are three members of the opposition on two warnings. Premier, can you wrap up your answer in the last 20 seconds.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Yes, certainly the Treasurer, working through the Board of Treasurers, which he is the chair of, has a different position from the federal government with regard to the distribution of GST going forward. This is an issue that will continue to be prosecuted. It will be very interesting to see what the Australian Labor Party's position is at the federal level—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Time has expired.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —whether they will support changes to that GST distribution that many Labor treasurers signed up to at the time.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Time has expired, Premier.

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, I have not given you the call yet.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I thought his time had run out, sir. Sorry.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, his time had expired. I had not yet—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, but he was still talking.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Don't argue. I had not yet given you the call. That's how it works. I am going to say one more thing to the Leader of the Opposition. He is on two warnings and I am reluctant to throw the leader out, but continual interjections will finish that way. Member for Lee, you have the call.

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:16):** My question is again to the Premier. Does the Premier still believe the deal is 'a massive win for South Australia'? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** When the Premier was asked about the deal on 17 October 2018, he described the deal that had been reached between the states and the federal government as 'a massive win for the people of South Australia'.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:17):** As you are aware, sir, the Liberal Party in South Australia has always been a supporter of the GST in Australia, unlike those opposite, who fought against it over a long period of time. There was an opportunity to renegotiate that deal, but certainly the position that was being put by Western Australia, and of course also by the commonwealth, was one that was unacceptable. It was unacceptable to South Australia and it was unacceptable to other jurisdictions at the time and we fought hard to make sure that there was an equalisation over this period of time as we transitioned to the new arrangement—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens can leave for half an hour.

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I didn't quite catch what he was saying, but I think he was just congratulating us on the position we have taken to return the budget to surplus over the forward estimates, because there are still many jurisdictions that can't return their budget to a surplus situation or at least to a balanced situation and that has been our focus. Yes, we have gone into additional debt. Those opposite shake their head at going into additional debt, but our primary focus over here is to make sure that we can support and stimulate economic activity and jobs during this very difficult period. The alternative is one that they haven't actually articulated—

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Point of order: standing order 98, debate. Again, the question is not about debt or the government's fiscal settings but entirely about the deal that you supported, as Premier of South Australia, about GST revenues. The question is not about debt: the question is about the GST deal that has left South Australia's revenue \$250 million a year worse off, which you said was a win for South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Can I just rule on that point of order; it was in relation to debate. I think in this place the questions are asked and the ministers and the Premier can answer however they see fit. They have four minutes to do that, to build their answer, and I am happy that the Premier is doing that. Minister for Energy and Mining, did you have a point of order?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** I do have a point of order, sir, which is that raising a point of order from the opposition is not an opportunity to make a speech.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I am not going to uphold that, minister. To the opposition, it's your question time. Is the Premier finished?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** No, I was just warming up, sir. I thought I was being very pertinent to the topic that we were considering before. As the minister pointed out, we had the loquacious phrasing of a point of order by the Leader of the Opposition. No, I think that everything that I have said has been pertinent to this issue. GST is important because it's a major contributor to our state budget. It's a major form of income and it's particularly volatile at the moment. It may interest this house—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The leader can leave. I am serious. You have been on two warnings for a while and I indicated to you that you were on thin ice with two warnings.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** For how long?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Half an hour.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I was saying, GST is particularly volatile at the moment. We are seeing wild fluctuations in the forecasts for GST into the commonwealth coffers for ultimate distribution using that methodology to each of the individual jurisdictions. When we actually look at the causes for that, we obviously are very concerned about the situation in New South Wales, in Victoria, in the ACT, and of course today we heard about two cases in the community up in Queensland.

Every time a state is locked down, it does have an effect on spending in that state which ultimately has the effect on the GST receipts that the commonwealth take and the distribution that comes out via that methodology. So we are very concerned about—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order! Premier, before you go on, the member for Playford is warned for the second time, the deputy leader is called to order and the member for Kaurna is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I was saying, there was a very strong push from Western Australia, supported by the commonwealth government, for a very significant rewrite of the GST distribution via—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I conclude my answer, sir.

## PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:22):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister please update the house on the how the Marshall Liberal government is making public transport more accessible and creating jobs by building what matters in the north-east?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:22):** I thank the member for Newland for his question and note firsthand the great work that he is doing and that the Marshall Liberal government is doing with him to make public transport more accessible for residents, especially those in the north-eastern suburbs. I acknowledge the strong advocacy of the member for Newland and the member for King in their local areas and the work that they do in trying to improve public transport in their area, in particular along the O-Bahn and the great impact that the O-Bahn has on the local residents out there in their community to get them where they need to go.

Of course, the O-Bahn, a great Liberal innovation, which was initiated by the Tonkin government back in the early 1980s, has now grown to be one of the most popular pieces of public transport and the most popular public transport corridor, with tens of thousands of Adelaidean commuters using that service every day. The Marshall government is continuing to contribute better

services through the record investment of \$17.9 billion to improve our state's infrastructure and we are very proud of that.

I did hear the member for Lee over there and I am sure he is blushing because he wishes he had the \$8.8 billion that we are spending on public transport and road infrastructure projects over the next four years, but unfortunately he doesn't and he can't deliver that. Instead, those opposite provided a failing public transport system where patronage decreased in their last couple of terms that they were there. In their time, I should say, in government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, a moment please. The member for Playford can leave for half an hour.

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** As I was explaining before I was rudely interrupted there, public transport patronage data—and we know that more people used public transport 10 years ago than when the former Labor government left office. That is a real shame.

I note the member asked about how we are making public transport more accessible for the people of the north-east, and I have plenty to talk about there. I was fortunate to recently visit the north-east and meet the member for Newland, and we travelled around his wonderful electorate. I caught the O-Bahn out there and was there in a flash. It was a really great trip and making the journey from the city to Tea Tree Plaza was wonderful. Along the way, of course, we saw the Paradise park-and-ride that has already been built and the site for the new Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride as well that the Marshall government is building, and we are excited by that.

The new park-and-ride will provide 400 spaces for O-Bahn commuters, bringing the total number of spaces available for commuters to more than 1,100. While those opposite are making a lot of hot air about parking at TTP, we are just getting on with the job of building more car parks there and helping the cars get off the neighbouring side streets. They are happy for them to be in the side streets; we are building more car parks. It would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the member for King and the advocacy she has for her community.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Your time has expired, minister. Thank you.

#### **TEA TREE PLAZA CAR PARKING**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:25):** Supplementary question to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport: does the minister know how many Datacom employees' car parks will be lost during the construction process of the long overdue O-Bahn park-and-ride at Tea Tree Plaza?

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, before I call you, I must apologise. We had lost the clock on your previous answer so continue now.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:25):** No problems. Thank you for that, sir. I can perhaps wrap both up into the next answer because I was pointing out the park-and-rides we are building at Golden Grove and we are very happy about that. Of course, we are improving the road there as well with stage 3 of the Golden Grove Road upgrade project—just doing the things that we need to do for the people of the north-east, the really important projects.

I have mentioned the Golden Grove park-and-ride and the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride, which goes with the Paradise park-and-ride. You can see the journey we are going on there with the people of the north-east and we are really excited to be building what matters for the people of that region. As for the Datacom people, that is the forecast site for the new Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride. Again, the parks that we are putting in are on top of the parks that are already there for the Datacom people who use that space.

I will get the detail for the member for Florey and get back to her with the exact number of car parks that will be impacted during the build and how that will go forward. But, again, at the end of the day, having those extra car parks with the growth of the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride and the

Golden Grove park-and-ride will be a massive win, and I do congratulate the members for King and Newland on their great advocacy for these two wonderful projects for the people of South Australia.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** A further supplementary, member for Florey.

#### TEA TREE PLAZA CAR PARKING

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:27):** Again to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport: can you confirm that you will still be actually charging the people at Modbury Tea Tree Plaza to park in that park-and-ride while you are not charging the people of Paradise and Golden Grove?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:27):** For 16 years there was a process put in place for the parking at Tea Tree Plaza. We will be continuing that same process that was in place under the Labor government.

#### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:27):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of GST modelling undertaken which shows every state and territory other than Western Australia and the Northern Territory worse off under the GST deal negotiated in 2018? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The Victorian Department of Treasury and Finance, responsible for modelling GST revenues for the commonwealth government, has modelled scenarios for GST revenues to the states and territories which show South Australia up to \$258 million a year worse off than under the original GST arrangements.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:28):** I am not particularly aware of the model that the member mentions but, of course, there are many models and many forecasts and, as I said in one of my previous answers, it is particularly volatile at the moment. Of course, GST is one of the major streams of income that we get from the federal government, but we also negotiate a range of national partnership agreements and specific purpose payments.

As the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport said before, we are very fortunate at the moment to have an excellent working relationship with the federal government, which has delivered a massive record \$17.9 billion worth of infrastructure projects across the state. We couldn't do that without the federal government. So, yes, we get money from the federal government from GST; we also get money from the federal government in terms of the national partnership agreement, and also the specific purpose payments.

We are very pleased with the excellent support that we have from the federal government with the fifty-fifty funding for a range of metropolitan projects, and 80:20 per cent for a range of country projects which were left on the backburner by the previous government. That \$17.9 billion that is currently being spent, of course, is creating thousands and thousands of new jobs in South Australia. It is one of the reasons why we now have record employment in South Australia.

There are very few places in the world that can say they have more people employed now than pre COVID. We are one of those places in South Australia—10,600 jobs in July. We can't be complacent, but I must say that I am buoyed by the statistic which came out today which showed that more than 50 per cent—

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order: standing order 98, debate. The Premier is talking about unrelated employment statistics. I asked him specifically about GST modelling from the Victorian Department of Treasury and Finance.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** And a study—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, but not debate.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** In the little green book at your feet.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It is interesting, somebody complaining about debate as they are debating the debate. Anyway, I will leave it alone. I wasn't debating: I was actually providing really important information for the house that I thought most people would be interested in. Maybe the 10 or 20 people who are watching it online are more interested, I'm not 100 per cent sure.

The reality is that today we went past a very important milestone, where 50 per cent of people aged 16 and over have now had at least one single shot of their vaccination, maybe even more. The reason this is important—

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** There is a point of order, and I am actually going to uphold it this time, member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you.

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** No, but I'm anticipating that it is to do with relevance.

### GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:30):** My next question is to the Premier. What modelling has the Premier been shown about the likely impacts on South Australia's GST share following the 2026-27 financial year?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:30):** I am surprised, absolutely shocked and surprised, that the member for Lee, the shadow treasurer in South Australia, someone who actually worked in Treasury for such a long period under the Hon. Kevin Foley, who was the Treasurer at the time, hasn't asked those questions to the person responsible for them—the Treasurer.

He has had estimates, and my understanding is that Mr Lucas answered every single question. He sat there very patiently and went through, in great detail, answering the questions the member for Lee asked. He is a very obliging member of the Legislative Council, and he is an excellent Treasurer. He has had two stints at the job. I'm not sure he has ever had quite the deficit we reached this year but, as I said, these are extraordinary times.

If the member would like to have detailed information regarding modelling that is undertaken in Treasury, it would probably be best to direct that question to the Treasurer, who is, of course, in the other place.

### EXPORT PROGRAMS

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:31):** My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is creating job opportunities to make an impact on the community and create jobs through programs that assist South Australian businesses to start their exporting journey?

**The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:32):** I thank the member for MacKillop for his continued focus on jobs and how businesses in his electorate can continue to grow. One of the ways, of course, is through exports.

The global pandemic and the headwinds that has created have made exporting challenging for all South Australian businesses. As a government, we have made sure that we are trying to get the health response right to ensure that South Australians are safe, while at the same time making sure we continue to grow the state's economy and take the opportunity offered by living in one of the safest places in the world to help our businesses here continue to grow.

Looking at the jobs that have been created, the most recent employment statistics show we have had more people employed here in South Australia than before the pandemic, so that focus is there. In fact a record number of people, South Australians, employed in the state's history, which is fantastic. One way we can continue that growth in jobs is to encourage South Australian businesses, whether in the electorate of MacKillop or in wider South Australia, to grow through exports.



One of the ways we can do that, especially while international travel has been curtailed, is via our trade office network helping businesses link up to distributors and key markets. Most recently, the 12-month export statistics to June show that South Australian businesses exported \$12.8 billion of merchandise—again, a record in this state's history. It is proof positive that by growing your exports you can help grow your business as well.

In terms of supporting those businesses, we have a number of programs to help South Australians see that opportunity and how exports can help them grow their business, wherever they are in their export journey. If they are starting out, we have the Export Fundamentals Program, or if they are already exporting but want to diversify into another market we have the Export Accelerator program, and we help those that are exporting with the Global Expansion Program as well.

However, one thing we do hear is that for some companies, especially the smaller ones, the step of going from selling to South Australia to exporting is a big one. For us to say there is a path to exports, they say that we just need to take small steps. One of the ways we have just announced to be able to further assist companies is by a national trade program. It is a \$1.13 million program over four years and designed for those South Australian companies who haven't exported yet but have an ambition to export.

This national trade program will help them effectively export interstate as well, build up their capability and confidence so that they can learn about what can then be replicated to export overseas. That is logistics—whether that's their supply chains, their channel partners, even warehousing when their goods arrive, also receivables and invoices and especially their packaging as well to make sure their packaging can stand up to being sent through the supply chain.

All those measures are addressed by this program. It is a bespoke program, run in conjunction with the Export Council of Australia. Applications are open until 31 August, so any companies in your electorate, member for MacKillop, that are looking to take that next step I really encourage them because the opportunities, once they have done that, they will be able to then replicate it and then continue to grow. We know that companies that are growing expand their volumes and that means more jobs for South Australians.

#### **EVENTS ADVISORY GROUP**

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:36):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier axed his Events Advisory Group? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** In a press release last November, the Premier boasted that an Australian actor, an international food festival director, industry representatives and business leaders are among members of a new group that will help inform the Marshall Liberal government's exciting new era of events in South Australia.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:36):** Again, I am very surprised because we announced this about 10 or 12 days ago. When I was a shadow minister, I worked very hard to keep on top of my brief and find out what is happening in the portfolio. It seems quite extraordinary, you hold a press conference, you announce the winding up of the Events Advisory Group, you thank all the members for their excellent work and input and then a couple of weeks later the Labor Party wake up, come into question time and ask a question that has already been answered in the public domain.

I thanked very much Nikki Govan, the chair of the Events Advisory Group I think last week or probably possibly the week before, for the excellent work and the input that those people had given in a volunteer capacity, to take a lot of suggestions from a lot of different groups across South Australia and put them into a logical order and present them to SATC.

We have obviously announced the Bloom festival, which I think is something which is going to meet the needs of the people of South Australia, especially in terms of creating additional jobs in South Australia right throughout that calendar. That was one of our major focuses. It was a response, if you like, to the recommendation from the SATC board, the unanimous recommendation from the SATC recommendation which was to move away from the Adelaide 500 and move towards a suite of events right throughout the year which would support employment in South Australia.

We have had Illuminate Adelaide, and what a success that was. I know that a lot of people were very disappointed when Light Cycles in the Adelaide Botanic Gardens finished. I know that Van Gogh Alive is still going in North Adelaide, and it's going because of the support of the people of South Australia. They hate it over there, but the people of South Australia love getting out in the winter months.

But we also have to have people getting out in the spring months, so the Events Advisory Group of course provided that input into the types of events that could be held right throughout the calendar, which would maximise employment right throughout the year, not just concentrate it in one part of the year. I think that the former Labor Premier of South Australia used to refer to it as Mad March. In some ways it was mad—it was mad that we concentrated everything in one part of the year, rather than spreading it out right across the year.

There is still plenty on at the beginning of the year, sir, as you would be more than aware because we have events like the Adelaide International, which was introduced by our government on coming to power, or the TDU introduced by a former Liberal government here in South Australia. We have the Fringe and the Festival and, as it turns out, they were both also introduced by a former Liberal government, albeit many, many decades ago. But they are still the legacy of the Liberal Party looking at ways that we can actually employ South Australians. But we've got to have more, and that is why we are putting the Illuminate Adelaide set of festivals and experiences through the middle of the year—hugely, hugely successful. We want to do more throughout those spring months as well with the Bloom festival.

So we thank the members of the events advisory committee. I have spoken to the vast majority of them personally—I have certainly written to all of them—to thank them for their volunteer service. They didn't get a cent. They didn't get a cent for the work they did, but they did it because they knew that this was what we needed in South Australia.

We have already announced several events that have come together from that advice that we have received, but there is still plenty of work to do, and that is precisely what we will be doing in South Australia. We are putting the people of South Australia first. Forget about the politics, we are putting the people of South Australia first and getting on with getting people out and about right throughout the year.

It was the unanimous recommendation from the SATC board. They made that recommendation to the government to move away from the Adelaide 500 and to quarantine that money—I think it was \$14 million—and spread it throughout the year, maximising employment. We can see the response from that reflected in the most recent ABS statistics, where we have more people employed in South Australia than at any time before in the history of the state.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Ramsay, I am going to warn for the first time both the member for Kaurana and the member for Mawson.

#### EVENTS ADVISORY GROUP

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:40):** My question is for the Premier. Did the chair of the Events Advisory Group advise the Premier that they had proposals but they were not supported by the South Australian Tourism Commission?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:41):** Again, we have been through this in the public domain quite a lot, but there were a large number of events that were submitted. Off the top of my head, I think it was in the order of 60, 70 or 80 different proposals that were put in. In fact, if we funded all of them, there would be many hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of support, and that wasn't the intention whatsoever.

SATC worked with the events advisory committee and also their own events group, which sits within SATC and is headed up by Hitaf Rasheed, and they looked at each of the events and the likely job creation here within South Australia and the likely interstate and, ultimately, international visitation to South Australia and made the tough decision of prioritising those. Of course, you need to also look at those that are going to be able to operate sooner rather than later because we wanted to have impact as soon as possible, and that work was done.

Of course, there were many more submissions made than there were projects approved, but I think most people thinking about it for a nanosecond would appreciate that this is very logical. You ask for a whole range of ideas and people put them in, but not all of them are going to be selected. But what I am convinced of is that we have made careful decisions and carefully used taxpayer dollars to maximise those outcomes for our state.

As I said, those outcomes are very important for our state but were not being delivered under the regime that was set up by the previous administration. They weren't being delivered, but they will be delivered going forward, which is a focus on job creation and a focus on interstate visitation in South Australia. Also worthy of consideration is stopping the leakage of people going interstate for events because we haven't had a calendar in that part of the year.

We have to give reasons for South Australians to stay here during winter and spring and not go interstate or overseas, when borders will permit, to spend their money. One of the great things about what is happening in the state at the moment—and it would be great if the opposition would acknowledge it for once—is that we have had seven record months of regional visitation—seven months in a row.

It's absolutely fantastic and it doesn't happen by accident. It happens by the industry working together with the SATC, the statutory authority, funded by the taxpayers of South Australia, looking at innovative ways to support operators during a pretty tough time, when there are border restrictions in place. We absolutely know that the effects of the coronavirus are not being felt evenly. There are some businesses, sir—some in your electorate—that are doing extraordinarily well.

In fact, South Australians are not spending money interstate and overseas: they are spending money in their own backyard. There are businesses on Eyre Peninsula that are doing extraordinarily well. There are businesses right across South Australia that are doing well. We know that because business confidence is the highest it has been in the history of the State Monitor, and we have more people employed than at any time in the history of the state.

But it is not even. There are businesses which are still struggling. That is why we are working to smooth events right across the year, clearly opposed by those opposite. Secondly, we are trying to make interventions to create more stimulus for experiences and accommodation across our state. That's why we have just recently brought forward the Great State Voucher rounds 5 and 6, experiences and accommodation. They will be run in the coming months.

We already know that this is a great program. When people spend money in regional South Australia, perhaps on an experience, the multiplier for that region is quite extraordinary. It is the same with accommodation. Maybe the multiplier is not quite as large as it is for an experience, but it is still very, very significant. That's what gives us great, if you like, confidence to continue to invest in the Great State Voucher to support our wonderful tourism operators here in South Australia.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I call the next question, I am going to warn the member for Kaurua for the second time and remind the member for Lee that he is on two warnings.

#### **WATER INFRASTRUCTURE**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:46):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is working with the commonwealth government to create job opportunities that impact on our community through investment in water infrastructure projects?

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:46):** I thank the member for Hammond for his important question. Water infrastructure is a critical part of our regional communities and our ag sector, which the member for Hammond certainly knows. I remember working with him in my roles in the dairy industry through the droughts and the pressures that particularly his electorate faced during that time with issues around water.

To date, we have spent about \$13 million on projects locally during the on-farm water scheme, which is again another drought measure that has been put in place to assist farmers as they struggle with the vagaries of drought and making sure they are able to protect their livestock and have adequate water and also help some of the horticultural industries with their issues as well.

We have been working with the commonwealth more recently also to make sure we have great water projects coming forward to make sure we have jobs for our regional areas. Recently, the federal government announced \$90 million for 10 water projects in South Australia, jointly funded with us, where we are going to actually underpin these projects to make sure that we see some great projects being delivered.

Industries that are going to be supported are pork, olive, vegetable, horticulture and wine—industries which will all benefit from this funding. It is estimated that from these projects there could be as many as 800 jobs that will arise from this investment. Some of the projects that are being put into place are:

- \$2.8 million towards the stormwater re-use project at Waikerie;
- \$2½ million to increase the trunk line capacity and new pumps at Nildottie in the Riverland;
- \$1.29 million for a recycled water pipeline from Mount Barker to Nairne to support the farmers there;
- \$1.58 million for a recycled water storage facility to supply farmers at Callington;
- \$1.4 million to reduce main water use at Seven Point Pork at Port Wakefield, which I am sure the Minister for Skills was able to see when he was up there last week, talking about the jobs that have been put in place there through the training programs;
- \$8.8 million towards the pipeline extension for NAIS, which is going to help the olive industry at Two Wells;
- \$800,000 around security and reliability of water for farmers in the areas around Port MacDonnell;
- a big project of \$58 million for the construction of high-technology glasshouses at Virginia, which will improve the water efficiency in those glasshouses to deliver great savings there;
- \$9 million for water infrastructure to supply agriculture around Roseworthy; and
- \$3.187 million towards the improvement of water deliverability and accessibility in the Lower Murray reclaimed irrigation areas.

The important thing about a lot of these projects is that they are actually using recycled water. This is water that wasn't available, that has been re-used, that's able to actually deliver jobs as well as improve the ability for these regions to underpin their businesses going forward. We are also working with the commonwealth to fund the preliminary business cases in Clare Valley and Eden Valley water supplies.

#### **FROM ELECTORATE, COVID-19 VACCINATION**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:50):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Minister, can you please update the house on my question regarding the progress of the residents of aged-care facilities at Port Pirie, Clare and Crystal Brook having the COVID-19 vaccination, and also the number of aged-care residents who have been vaccinated and the number who have not received this vaccination? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain a bit further.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I asked this question on 23 June, and the minister stated he would take it on notice and get back to me. With the issue current at the moment, especially with New South Wales and things like that, I consider this to be a very high issue. I ask if the minister can give me an answer now or else I will need an answer fairly urgently because I have concerns and also residents' families are concerned about the vaccinations in those facilities.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:51):** I thank the member for the question. As the minister responsible to the House of Assembly for Health, I believe

I did take that question on notice. I will check what the status of the answer is now, but I make the point that obviously an extraordinary amount of work has taken place since June.

There has been an extraordinarily positive response from the people of South Australia to the vaccination rollout across South Australia. I think that more than 50 per cent of South Australians have now taken their first vaccine. For both people who are working in aged care and, indeed, residents in aged care they are, of course, a very high priority and have been since the very start of the rollout.

I think that the member for Frome is able to assist in his community, as are all members of parliament, by reiterating at every opportunity—as I do right now—the importance for all South Australians to get the vaccine. The fact is that all South Australians over the age of 16 are able to now make an appointment to get the vaccination.

However, still there remain, as I have expressed concern previously, people in our community who seek to undermine confidence in the vaccine process, undermine confidence in the medical science. That is our pathway out of this pandemic and it is indeed saving countless, hundreds of thousands, of lives around the world. What we are seeing, despite the significant case numbers in New South Wales—which is, of course, deeply concerning to us all—are vastly suppressed rates of transmission in New South Wales where people have been vaccinated and vastly reduced—

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** Point of order, sir: I asked the question, and I appreciate what the minister is saying, and I wholly agree on that, but my concern is: have all the residents—and I will go one further—and all the staff in those facilities been vaccinated? If that could come back to me as an answer, I would be quite happy. I promote the—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Frome; we have that.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** I need an answer.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The member for Frome asked a question and then followed it up with a lengthy explanation and I am responding directly to some of the points he made. That's how it works.

When we see in New South Wales that dramatic transmission taking place but yet very reduced transmission from people who have been vaccinated, as I was saying, and the impact on severe sickness, the requirement for the use of ventilators and death being dramatically suppressed when people have had vaccinations, then I go back to what I was saying.

I urge the member for Frome and indeed all members to take every opportunity to reiterate the importance of vaccinations in their community, to encourage people in their community if they have reservations about a vaccination to look at the evidence of those vaccines, whether it is Pfizer or the AstraZeneca, which is available right now in significant quantities for many people in the community, including more elderly residents in the community.

It is a safe vaccine. It is a vaccine with reduced risk of side-effects compared to just about any other medication that we use in our everyday lives. Indeed, it is an opportunity for those residents to increase their own safety and for all residents, particularly those who have elderly family members, such as those that the member for Frome refers to, to get vaccinated so that when they visit their family members they reduce the risk of transmission as well. In relation to the detail of the numbers, I expect they have increased between June and August, so I will take that question, as a fresh question, on notice.

### **MOUNT GAMBIER METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:55):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister inform the residents of Mount Gambier why the Seaford MFS and the Mount Barker MFS are receiving brand-new fire appliances, yet the Mount Gambier MFS, which attends more call-outs and whose nearest MFS support is Murray Bridge, are receiving second-hand appliances?

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:55):** I thank the member for Mount Gambier for the question. Obviously, in terms of emergency services and trucks, we are spending money in a way that hasn't been done for many, many decades—in fact, record amounts of expenditure in the emergency services space. I would like to take the opportunity to firstly thank the MFS in Mount Gambier for the great work they

do in protecting lives, livelihoods and also the environment. They do a magnificent job. Since coming into government, sir—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** —our government has obviously spent close to \$70 million in additional funding into the MFS since 2018, and that has certainly strengthened the appliance fleet right across the board. Of course, by investing in that across the board, that's obviously designed to reduce the age of appliances right across the state. In doing that, all stations in time will also benefit from those new appliances by entering the system with appliances that may need to be retired, or midlife appliances when they are refurbished as well.

We know that after the Keely review there has been a record amount of expenditure by this government. We have a number of appliances that we have been driving to make sure they arrive as soon as possible. We know that the first two, as the member alluded to, have arrived, one in Mount Barker—and I know that the member for Kavel was very happy to be out there with me recently—and one has gone to the member for Kaurna's electorate in the Seaford area. There are a number of other appliances, another eight in fact, and they are all on track to be delivered by March 2022.

As I said, our government continues to invest record amounts in this space, but, of course, I do appreciate and acknowledge the member for Mount Gambier coming into the house and raising this on behalf of his constituents. What I can advise in terms of the MFS in Mount Gambier is that they have had a capability boost—in fact, they had one recently, with a new combination aerial pumping appliance, in 2016—and they will soon be bolstered further by what will be a newly refurbished 3,000-litre pumper. With that pumper, I am advised that delivery is anticipated before the upcoming bushfire danger season.

Of course, the MFS and the deployment of appliances right throughout the MFS is an operational decision. MFS appliances are given a midlife refurb, rebuild, and that certainly extends their operational response life significantly and, therefore, the value to the SA community. The MFS will continually review its current appliance fleet. I will continue to work with the MFS, and I will continue to provide resources wherever we are able to do so as well. As I said, our investment is designed to reduce the age of appliances right across the state, and all stations will benefit from those new appliances that enter the system.

#### **PORT WAKEFIELD ROAD SPEED RESTRICTIONS**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:59):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister please advise the people of Narungga the status of the temporary speed restrictions along the Port Wakefield Road immediately south of Port Wakefield. With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain just a little bit further.

Leave granted.

**Mr ELLIS:** Temporary speed restrictions have been in place along the Port Wakefield Road for months and months despite the fact that the road has long finished being resealed. This is causing enormous frustration to many residents of my electorate who travel along a brand-new, perfectly sealed road at significantly less than the normal posted speed limit. Will the minister direct his department to lift those speed limit signs immediately? They have been in place for far too long.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:59):** I thank the member for his question and note the wonderful work that is happening at Port Wakefield. Actually, I was just there a handful of days ago, when we went up to Port Pirie and Port Augusta with the member for Stuart and had a look at what's happening there. As we went through Port Wakefield, it just looked fantastic to see the new bridge go up, and we did go through the bypass as well that is being built on either side of Port Wakefield, and it's all part of the roadworks that are going on.

I do note some of the speed restrictions in and around that area that are in place, and I know that we have actually moved some regulations to make sure that any speed limits on any roadworks

on any department or highways commissioner roads have to have the safest speed limit put in place. If those works are not happening or if the speed limit can be put up to a safer speed limit, then that is done if there are no works happening.

What we do understand and know with the number of roadworks we have going on right across South Australia and I have talked already about the \$17.9 billion infrastructure spend we have and the \$8.8 billion of that that is going into roads and public transport infrastructure—is that there is a lot of work going on right across South Australia and people will come across these speed limit restrictions. We want to keep that to a minimum because we want to keep traffic moving across South Australia.

What I can tell the member is that there are times when a new surface, for example, may be laid down and that surface may take some time to cure, if you like, or it has to have a certain number of kilometres run over it and it is retested and recalibrated before the speed limit goes back up. Likewise, line markings, audio tactile line markings, are other things that need to be considered as well. If there are entry and exit points of vehicles that are coming on and off that road as well around a site such as this, where such extensive roadworks are happening, sometimes then the speed limits are reduced to make sure it is a safe environment.

I do understand the member's point. In fact, I think we have had a conversation about this a number of times. I know that with the amount of work happening in the electorate of Narungga, on Yorke Peninsula in particular as well as this Port Wakefield project, people in his community would be feeling frustration when they see some speed restrictions. I know when I go out and speak to people in those communities and say to them, 'We can stop doing the roadworks and we can do some roadworks somewhere else if you don't like the slight speed restrictions,' they are very quick to say, no, they want to see their roads fixed because they know that for 16 years there was a lot of neglect, especially of our regional roads.

When we came into government we had road maintenance backlog of three-quarters of a billion dollars, and that is what we are going about fixing. The Port Wakefield intersection, Crash Corner as it has historically been known, has been a problem in our state for decades, but we have gone on and we are fixing it. The Premier talked about the jobs that are coming with that as well.

I say to the people of Narungga and right across South Australia—and I know a lot of metropolitan people are making their way out into the regions now to enjoy the tourism offerings and spend some time in our wonderful regional areas and enjoying what they have to offer—when you are out there and see these speed signs and see the speed restrictions and roadworks going on, you must understand that that is building infrastructure that matters to the people of South Australia.

It is making our regional roads safer as well. We know that our regional people are sadly too highly represented in our road crash and fatality statistics, so we are building the roads to make it safer. We are building roads to improve productivity in our regions and we are also generating jobs. When you drive past these projects and you see people wearing fluoro vests, hard hats and steelcapped boots, they are jobs for people in South Australia.

We are creating some 19,000 plus jobs with that \$17.9 billion we are investing in infrastructure across South Australia. I think collectively we should be very proud of that. I know that on this side of the house we are very proud of that spend and the jobs it's creating. Whilst there is some inconvenience, I am more than happy to have a look at any inconvenience that anyone has out there. Please let me know about it and we will look into it a little bit further, or you can contact the traffic information hotline. It's all on the DIT website. Put that in, let us know and we will have a look at it, but we will continue to build what matters for the people of South Australia.

Time expired.

#### FUEL PRICE MONITORING

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:03):** My question is to the Attorney-General. How has the process of data aggregation by the private third party selected to administer the government's 30-minute fuel pricing system been vertically separated from the commercial providers of fuel price information?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:04):** I thank the member for the question. As members know,

we introduced a mandatory reporting in relation to fuel pricing. All retailers in South Australia now have to do that and they are subject to a significant fine if they fail to do so within a 30-minute time line. That is being regulated and policed by the commissioner for consumer services. Regular updates have been given to this house as to the success of that trial that we have undertaken.

One of the aspects of that was the selection of and appointment of the data aggregator, which ultimately I have reported to the house was the same company that was used by the Queensland Labor government for an initiative that they had introduced before that time. I don't have with me the particulars of the detail of the contract of their employment, and I have just checked; I don't have any particulars of that. But I am happy to take on notice the particulars that the member seeks. But she raises the point, I think, that it's important that the information that is collated and retained for the purposes of compliance with this new law is one which is not to be confused with or accessed by others for any other commercial purpose.

These data aggregators do have a number of clients. If we, as a government, are one of them, then they have an obligation within the terms of those contracts to both comply with what they are to do for us, and that includes the retrieval and disposal of data, and not to overlap that or have access to other clients that other clients may be contracting for their purposes in the aggregation of data. So I will check the particulars of the contract and, if I am able to provide that to the member and to the house, I will do so.

#### FUEL PRICE MONITORING

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:06):** Supplementary, Deputy Speaker.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Supplementary, member for Florey. Are we allowing that? Time has expired. Perhaps we—

**Ms BEDFORD:** It's pertinent to this and, while the Attorney is seeking further information, it's part of it.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I will allow it, member for Florey.

**Ms BEDFORD:** Attorney, are you totally satisfied that you have given full regard to all the requirements of the Productivity Commission and the ACCC in this regard?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:06):** In relation to the aggregation of data and the protection of the information against other commercial interests, I have no reason to indicate the separation hasn't been complied with and is adequately covered. I regularly meet with Mr Soulio, who manages this. Of course, we regularly report on the investigation or prosecution in relation to these matters and in cases, too, in which notices have been followed through. At no time has he raised with me that there has been any breach of obligation in relation to our contract with the aggregate provider, but I will certainly make that inquiry.

#### *Grievance Debate*

#### STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:07):** Deputy Speaker, today's question time is yet another example of why you never have to look very far to find an example of how this government has sold out the people of South Australia. It is something that we have got used to over the last 3½ years. It was not long after this parliament first met after the last election that the revelations were revealed that the minister for environment and conservation had a finding against his conduct by a royal commission that he had sold out the interests of South Australia.

If selling out South Australia's interests on the River Murray was not bad enough, it was quickly followed by what persists today and that is the Premier's refusal to stand up for South Australian workers and ensure that we secure the full cycle maintenance of the Collins class submarines—something which has been under threat, without resistance from this Premier, for the better part of three years.

Even when it has come to funding in the federal budget, this government talks a big game but delivers something far less. It talks about how much money we are getting from the federal



government on infrastructure funding. We do not have to look too far in the federal budget papers to see that South Australia is receiving virtually nothing out of \$12 billion of national rail funding. Even when it comes to the education of our children, this government has sold out the families of South Australia, signing up to a weak watered-down Gonski funding deal which sees each South Australian public school receive hundreds of thousands of dollars less than what had previously been agreed between the former federal government and the state Labor government here in South Australia.

What does a few hundred thousand dollars mean to a local school? That is multiple teachers, support workers, staff who can identify children with particular needs and so on, sold out once again by this government. What is even worse than that funding arrangement is the humiliation that the City Deal negotiated by the Premier on behalf of this state receives less money than the City Deal negotiated with Townsville.

Townsville, the third largest city in Queensland, gets more money than the capital city of South Australia. It would be like the residents of Brisbane looking on in wonder that a City Deal had been struck with the residents of Port Pirie in which it received more than Brisbane had been awarded. That is the ignominy of this funding arrangement reached by the Premier.

But, more to the point, the state's financial future has been sold out by this Premier and his Treasurer signing up to a GST deal that means South Australia will lose somewhere in the order of up to a quarter of a billion dollars a year, each year. This is not my claim; this is the modelling done on behalf of all states and territories by the Victorian Department of Treasury and Finance, quoted by reputable national economist Saul Eslake about how bad this deal was. The Premier told this place, and I quote:

We made our position very clear: we would not support any single, solitary thing that diminished the GST take. That will be the same this year, next year, in 2027 and beyond.

What did he do? What did his government actually deliver? He said to the parliament back in October 2018:

I am pleased to report today and update the house that since coming to government the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, has worked extraordinarily effectively with the Coalition and with the Treasurer of Australia—both the Hon. Scott Morrison and the Hon. Josh Frydenberg—in recent days on this deal.

The Premier said, and I quote, that this negotiation was 'a massive win for the people of South Australia'.

I tell you what losing \$250 million a year means to the people of South Australia: that is, roughly speaking, 2½ thousand nurses in our public hospital system. That is what \$250 million is. It is a couple of thousand teachers each and every year. It is money sorely needed by our police force stretched to the limit not only trying to manage public safety here in South Australia but dealing with a COVID pandemic. It is money we sorely need to spread elsewhere into our health system.

This state has been sold out by this Premier, and it is only now and only because of questioning from *The Advertiser* and Paul Starick that finally we get an admission in the dying days of his political career that Rob Lucas says this deal needs to be renegotiated. Well, he personally negotiated it, he sold this state out and the Premier congratulated him on it.

### ANZAC SPIRIT SCHOOL PRIZE

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (16:12):** It gives me great pleasure to congratulate some outstanding young South Australians who have participated in and successfully awarded the Premier's Anzac Spirit School Prize for 2021. They join an alumni of significant work done by some outstanding South Australian students over a number of years now. Since 2007, 165 students have done this work as a project in year 10. They have engaged with an Australian or particularly South Australian hero, whether that be a serviceman or a nurse or someone who served Australia during the First World War or, in more recent years, the Second World War as well.

They have engaged in a new project that has contributed to Australia's historical record of that service. Indeed, thousands of these projects, having now been done as part of the Virtual War Memorial or as unique projects on their own, have been accessed by family members of deceased or returned service people—certainly all deceased now given the time we are talking about. It has brought them comfort and pride in their family members.

The 2021 Premier's Anzac Spirit School Prize awardees are Matthew Boyd from Investigator College, Lara Dawson and Olivia Turner from Adelaide Botanic High School, Nicholas Heinrich from Central Yorke School, Annabel Arbon and Gemma Mann from Endeavour College, Cynole Sony from Glenunga International High School, Jessica Grasser from Golden Grove High School, Ezra Lockwood from Horizon Christian School, Madeline Wirth from Kingston Community School, Jessica Inglis and Dakota Lloyd from Loxton High School, Jennifer Nguyen from Our Lady of the Sacred Heart College, Max Thomas from Prince Alfred College, Aidan Chong and Sadie Schultz from St Ignatius College, Bethany Yates from St Martin's Lutheran College, Saffron Chen and Eleanor Humphrey from St Peter's Collegiate Girls' School, and Abbey O'Donnell from Wirreanda Secondary School.

I would also like to commend their teachers, in particular Jodie O'Donnell, Jean Rogers, Raelene Stutley, David Thiele, Damon Smith, Rhys Wood, Rebecca Learey, Maddison Lawrie, Ilza Braddock, Maria Kambanaros, Ron Pippett, Stephen Uren, Romana Quintel, Gregor Dingwall and Lauren Smith.

The Premier's Anzac Spirit School Prize was developed to encourage young South Australians to understand, connect with and maintain the ANZAC spirit. It aims to make history come alive and engage our students at an empathetic level with the stories of individuals from individual and original primary sources, and years 9 and 10 students from around South Australia have been entering the competition. It is about storytelling, and if members are not yet familiar with the prize I encourage them to go onto the website of the Virtual War Memorial and look at some of the wonderful entries. They use letters, artefacts, photographs and oral history.

In the last couple of years we have seen dramatic increases; indeed, in 2021 more than a thousand students participated in the competition, a more than 40 per cent increase from previous years. Those students have previously been able to travel to places like France, Belgium, Singapore, South Korea, Gallipoli and Vietnam to connect with our ANZAC history. In 2021, it was to Darwin, and in 2022 it is again planned for the students to travel to Darwin and the Top End for the purposes of historical learning and commemoration.

We are really pleased that the 2020 winners were able to have a trip this year, which was successful. Students commemorated the 1942 bombing of Darwin; in particular, they laid wreaths as part of the ceremony on ANZAC Day at the Darwin Cenotaph and mixed with veterans and members of the history community in the Northern Territory government at Parliament House, and I thank the Northern Territory government for its support. Students also connected with community; media outlets and community groups have heard the stories of the projects from students since.

The teachers selected to accompany the students on this trip are Jodie O'Donnell from Investigator College and Janine Fedorchuk-Weeks from Birdwood High School. Dr Paula Dabovich has been selected to be the RSL SA delegate on the tour to conduct commemoration ceremonies, and I thank the RSL in particular for its strong engagement with this project over many years.

The 2022 prize will be launched on 11 November, Remembrance Day. With the continued support of the South Australian history community, RSLs and South Australian schools across the education sectors, the Marshall Liberal government looks forward to continuing to support the important work of this prize and see the significant contributions the successful students will make in the years ahead.

### **TOURISM INDUSTRY**

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (16:17):** Usually when there is a call to action it comes at the end of the speech. This is so important that I am going to say it at the start: Premier, our tourism operators need you to go to national cabinet and advocate and fight for them.

Who could ever have imagined that we would have a rally of tourism operators out the front of Parliament House? These are businesspeople who have invested their blood, sweat and tears and who are on their knees. They are out the front of parliament because they feel like they are not being heard. They want our Premier to make sure he is hearing how desperate they are. They are fighting for their survival, and they feel like they are being ignored and are falling through the cracks.

When New South Wales and Victoria go into lockdown our tourism operators, our hotels, go into shutdown. Even today some of them said to me, 'Do you know, we would be better supported if we were in lockdown.' That is the reality of what we are facing. There is no equality in Australia for businesses that need support.

We know that some businesses have done well during this time, but many businesses have taken the deepest cuts and had the deepest impacts of COVID, and they are saying to state and federal governments, 'Help us because when COVID ends—and it will end—and tourism comes back, if you don't support us, we will not be here.'

When I talk to tourism operators and I talk to people running hotels and owning hotels, it is their staff they talk to me about—staff who have trained and worked for them for a long time, staff who are committed and experienced and skilled, but they have to let them go. One hotelier told me that this week he was making 40 people redundant because they are seeing occupancy rates less than 30 per cent and it is unsustainable for their industry.

What they are calling for is targeted wage support and what they need is something similar to JobKeeper. In New South Wales, there is JobSaver, which supports companies and supports businesses to keep their employees on board. Because of the lockdown in New South Wales and Victoria, our tourism operators and our hotels are virtually shut down.

Let me give you some quotes from people who have been talking about this over the week. Some of them were there today and some have spoken on radio. The organiser of the rally and owner of Taste the Barossa, Dallas Coull, said:

It's pretty simple... when the borders are closed our businesses aren't viable and that's right throughout the whole industry and... all we're asking for is exactly what other places in Australia are getting.

If you're in New South Wales you're getting a weekly payment that gets your staff and your business through to the other side of this pandemic. We're not getting anything. That's just untenable. That's just outrageous really.

On radio, John Culshaw, who owns the Majestic Hotel, said:

We own quite a big hotel in the city. Our occupancy is 23 per cent... throughout South Australia with hotels, generally you need 63-65 per cent occupancy in normal times to break even.

Many other operators have echoed these sentiments: Steve from Cellar Door Tours, Innez from Adelaide's Top Food and Wine Tours, Chook from Chook's Little Winery Tours and Hassie from Australian Wildlife Adventures. These are small family businesses fighting for their survival. Premier, help them survive. We know how important this is to our economy. These are jobs for South Australians and these jobs are going unless you do something about it.

#### **TEA TREE PLAZA CAR PARKING**

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:22):** I rise today to put on record the fact that, on behalf of my King constituents, I do not support paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza. While Labor's Tea Tree Plaza petition stunt has been designed to grab attention and at the same time capture people's phone numbers and email addresses so they can send more Labor messages out to people in the future, I have been listening closely to my local community's views on the Westfield announcement, and because I take my role representing my constituents very seriously, I have proactively been asking local business owners from King if they support paid parking and the answer has been no.

I have asked my constituents who work at Tea Tree Plaza businesses whether they support paid parking and they have also said no. Firstly, they are concerned at the proposed extra cost of attending work and, secondly, they are concerned they will be required to move their cars during a shift at work to minimise the cost of the proposed parking.

There is a lack of general support for paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza and, as I said, I do not support it either. Tea Tree Plaza is a local shop. It is a meeting place. It is where we celebrate dinners with family and friends at Zitto, Bangkok Boulevard and The Bavarian and it is where we go to watch the movies. It is also where a huge, amazing Tea Tree Gully mall walking group meet twice a week to exercise and socialise. Tea Tree Plaza has been more than a shopping centre for many years since I was younger; it has been a community meeting spot for all ages. In fact, I had my first car accident on the first night of my Ps at the Tea Tree Plaza car park.

To be clear, the majority of my constituents have told me they do not support or want boom gates and paid parking, so we need to explore how we can most effectively influence the Westfield proposal so our local constituents' views are heard. There is then the question of whether this paid parking solution is even needed, given the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to building a new Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride at this same location.

We will be adding another 400 parking spaces at Modbury, and of course in King we are doubling the size of the Golden Grove park-and-ride. Therefore, I think we should see how much the pressure on car parking at Tea Tree Plaza is relieved when these Marshall Liberal government projects are delivered. On top of this, we are making the commute from Golden Grove to the plaza faster on buses with the Golden Grove stage 2 upgrades, which will encourage more people not even to drive but to jump on the bus.

I agree on one thing the leader said this morning, and that is it would be great for community members if their representatives from both sides of politics could work together to best advocate the community's wishes on this matter. I wish the leader was genuine about this because, if he was, then we would be collaborating on our public transport and car parking changes that will create more choices and capacity for people living in the north-east. Sadly, this is not the case. This grandstanding by the leader this morning was just another Labor stunt.

The Labor Party have socialised a proposed solution that they have been told is flawed. I sought advice from the Attorney-General on their plan, and she outlined the flaws to me. The Local Government Association has socialised a response to Labor's plan, outlining the flaws. The Local Government Association has stated it is unclear as to how it would work in practice. The Local Government Association has said there is a potential cost burden for councils, and that would flow on to ratepayers if the Labor Party's plans go ahead. My constituents, I can tell you quite clearly, do not want increased council rates.

Today, the Leader of the Opposition suggested to this house that if the member for Newland and I do not support their plan then we are not standing with constituents. This is rubbish. This is not true. We simply want a car parking solution that works for our constituents, and increasing parking spaces might be the answer. I have requested a meeting with Westfield to discuss their plans, how they will impact my community and how we can support staff working there. Unlike Labor, I have not gone to the media; I have just got on with the job of advocating, and I will continue to do so.

### AFGHANISTAN

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (16:27):** Today, I would like to make some comments about the tragedy that is unfolding in Afghanistan. I do so from an electorate point of view and the view of the people in my electorate. There is no doubt that the tragedy in Afghanistan is a symbol of the failure of Western foreign policy. Quite simply, we got it wrong. We have other examples like Syria and Iraq. There are now parallels with Vietnam in terms of the scenes we have seen at Kabul airport.

The visual images we see are reminiscent, as I said, of Vietnam and also paint a very powerful picture of a desperate nation that will now be under the control of the Taliban government. In terms of its impact on the local population, we have heard the stories and the fears of the women and girls in that community and how their democratic rights will be wound back. We have also heard the pleas of minority ethnic groups like the Hazara, who have been persecuted in that country for centuries and continue to be and, with the Taliban returning, will suffer even more. Obviously, this will lead to a displacement of people and a flow of refugees. As a world community, we need to do our bit.

When this was unfolding in Afghanistan, one area I did not realise it would impact on was the local scene in terms of the veterans. I recently received an email from a local veteran we were working on a project with apologising for not responding to my emails. He said, 'The Afghanistan thing has just been really tough on us. It really has been tough on us.' The veterans are questioning whether their sacrifice and the sacrifice of their colleagues was worthwhile, or was it in vain. The Vietnam veterans have relived what happened to them back in Vietnam at the end of the war—a similar situation.

Thankfully, though—unlike with the Vietnam veterans—we understand that our veterans have done their job as our nation has asked. The Vietnam veterans did not have that courtesy from

our nation and still today they remember that. For that reason, we have to ensure that the royal commission finally announced by the Prime Minister to look into the wellbeing of our veterans is well resourced and well run.

It is now more important than ever that this royal commission is not established to hide the truth but actually designed to open up the truth to make sure we support our veterans. The rate of suicide among our veterans is unacceptable. It is more than 10 times the average rate for people in the community. I see it with my local veterans who come to speak to me about how they are doing, and this whole Afghanistan matter, sadly, has made it a lot worse.

I have also received emails from other South Australians who have married Afghani men and women and whose partners are now stuck in Afghanistan. They are obviously very concerned about the wellbeing of their loved ones. Also, for the first time in terms of an overseas conflict, I have received emails from those you might call Anglo-Australians—people who were born here of Anglo background—who are very much concerned about people in Afghanistan.

They have seen the horrors and that has moved them. A lot of South Australians have friends and family in Afghanistan. I have also heard of the impact on South Australians who have an Afghani heritage and who have family and friends in Afghanistan. They are asking what are we going to do to assist their family and friends to make sure they are not persecuted and do not become victims of the Taliban.

We have the moral obligation to support these people who worked alongside the so-called coalition of the willing, which includes Australia. The Hazara community would like the commonwealth government to take the following steps: grant immediate permanent protection to Afghans in Australia on temporary visas, particularly Hazara Afghans; increase particularly Afghani citizenship; and prioritise family reunions to make sure that we support our Afghani community. This is time for real leadership, and that is doing what is morally right for humanity.

#### **DAVENPORT ELECTORATE SPORTING FACILITIES**

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (16:33):** There is something strange and deeply concerning occurring in the City of Onkaparinga. It involves grassroots sporting organisations being actively prevented by council from applying for state government facilities funding grants. Let's just read that back: council does not want clubs applying for funding from the state and is using its position as the landowner to prevent it from occurring.

Curiously, this appears to be a unique problem for the clubs and facilities in my seat of Davenport. Elsewhere in the council, clubs are encouraged to apply. They are just being denied the opportunity in my area. We even have a situation where previous written support and permission from council for a funding application for unisex change rooms at the Happy Valley Sports Park have now been reneged upon. Council has then sought to claim that there is no evidence of that support and, when copies of that written support have been pointed to, the council has described that as 'unfortunate'.

In a completely separate situation, the Hub Gymnastics Club had proposed an application for a 50 per cent contribution for a KinderGym extension to a council facility, the other 50 per cent of which the club would fund itself—the club. Despite being asked for no money, the council did not want to support the proposal and eventually constructed a series of conditions designed to achieve just that.

I have hundreds of women and children denied an opportunity to use safe, compliant change room facilities at the Happy Valley Sports Park. I have hundreds at the Valley Vikings Netball Club, who are forced to play their home games at Meadows because their council will not just not support an application for funding a few courts: they will not permit an application. I have 600 members of the Hub Gymnastics Club who are prepared to put their hand in their own pocket to enhance the facility they leased from the council so as to provide child care, and thereby enhance and grow the club, effectively prevented from doing so. I am hearing the term 'immoral' used to describe the council's action in this case.

Council takes three years to approve a drop-in change room facility at the Flagstaff Hill Community Centre and one year to approve building a coaches' box at that ground, whilst around the corner Telstra can get approval to build a mobile phone tower in nine months despite residents in the area objecting. Frustration with this council is not new. In my newsletter of winter 2010, I

pointed out how we need reform, how from 1997 to 2019 my rates for my home in Onkaparinga increased 152 per cent versus an inflation rate across the same period of 69 per cent.

Rates increases of over double the rate of inflation have been a hallmark of the council since it was formed by a merger of the Happy Valley, Willunga and Noarlunga councils in 1997. In 1998, a DPTI report provided a justification for that merger on the basis that staff numbers had dropped in three councils, from 550 staff in 1997 to 515 in June 1998. As at 30 June 2020, Onkaparinga employs 803 people, which is a 60 per cent increase on the 500 staff council started with just over 20 years ago.

The tale of the take continues with rates comparisons against the Marion city council, where a \$540,000 home will cost \$322 more in rates in Onkaparinga every year than the same home in Marion. Another example is the assessment by the final inquiry report into the Hallett Cove Joint Venture, prepared by the South Australian local government boundaries commission. It detailed how the same block of vacant land would generate \$4,000 in rates for Marion, whereas if that land were in the Onkaparinga council area the rates for that same piece of property would be \$9,000.

Easily, the most galling part is the fact that, of a recent \$9.4 million capital works funding contribution made by the federal government to council, only \$830,000 (9 per cent) was spent in the area, which will comprise my seat of Davenport, yet that area has, according to council, 19 per cent of the rateable homes in the council: 19 per cent of the ratepayers are getting 9 per cent of the funding. In rates, that equates to about a million dollars a month heading south from my community.

My community deserves better. The volunteers at my sporting clubs deserve better. The vast majority of the people on the council are great. That is why, notwithstanding that, it is time to replace the landlord. That is why I am pleased to announce the launch of the Glenthorne council. There will be plenty of details to come. It will be a community focused on parks and lifestyle, sweeping from the Hills down through to Hallett Cove. It will have 55,000 people, sensible rate structures and be responsibly locally accountable.

### ROAD SAFETY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (16:38):** I rise to speak on the petition I tabled in this house before question time today. There is a grave concern for pedestrian safety at the intersection of Reid Avenue and St Bernards Road at Hectorville. Two hundred and thirty seven petitioners urged this government to install appropriate safety measures, such as line marking and barriers, to ensure pedestrians are encouraged to use purpose-built crossings and refuges nearby

Pedestrians must wait at this spot for a sufficient break in the traffic before attempting to run across the road and quite often stop in the middle of the road, where it is unsafe. On a busy road, which has a residential population on one side and a supermarket on the other, it is important pedestrians have access to a safe crossing zone. This is a longstanding issue. I believe I am not the first person to have brought this to the house, but it has come to me because of the concerns I have raised on numerous occasions about planning and urban infill and the problems it is causing.

Many people who have signed the petition are also concerned about street parking in neighbourhoods undergoing small-scale urban redevelopment or otherwise laid out with narrow carriageways. The increased density of on-street parking further impacts upon driver safety by limiting the vision of motorists to see pedestrians trying to cross the road between parked cars. While management of on-street parking lines lies within the responsibility of councils, two issues have been raised which could be apt and lead to reform of transport regulations.

Firstly, it has come to my attention councils have no or few powers to limit garaging of heavy vehicles in their communities. In one case cited to me, a heavy vehicle driver was in the habit of parking his prime mover on a residential street, often in breach of parking time limits. It may be for certain types of highly congested residential streets council should have some ability to enforce off-street garaging of heavy vehicles, which would in turn limit on-street parking overflow.

Another example cited to me is increasing congestion on streets where subdivisions are occurring, leading to fewer off-street parking opportunities or where there are already limited off-street parking opportunities. It has been suggested to me a possible solution for some narrow

streets could be to allow residents to park in front of their own driveways on a permit basis. However, there appears to be no provision in the Road Rules to allow this.

Of course, these issues occur all over Adelaide and have caused issues for many, increasingly so in the electorate of Florey. As one example, Ingle Farm has one of the highest number of approved subdivisions in metropolitan Adelaide. Urban infill often sees two or three homes on the site where a single dwelling once stood. I have begun to see cases of four, five and even six on some blocks, which is a very worrying trend.

Why would people not want to move to Ingle Farm and other adjacent suburbs like Pooraka? They are great suburbs, places that have been long-term homes to great people and families who have lived there for generations. They have proud sporting clubs, with long-held traditions, and the local schools have nurtured many fine careers. A central focus of the Better North East project, Ingle Farm is centrally located for people working in the city or in the close by northern suburbs, where we find emerging defence industries.

The influx of new homes in Ingle Farm and surrounding suburbs has created the same traffic issues that have occurred in the City of Campbelltown: limited on-street parking, difficulty navigating tight streets and increased traffic on roads not designed to serve as the major thoroughfares they have become.

One particular example is Sullivan Road in Ingle Farm, a road with an intersection on Montague Road. It has become almost impossible to exit onto the main road at peak times, yet it is one of only two ways to access Montague Road from the northern residential area of Ingle Farm. It also has a bus route for the popular 229 service. I hear from residents of the perils of navigating the intersection and the lack of any positive intervention the intersection has received.

All levels of government are seemingly aware of the multitude of issues along Montague Road, yet it appears it is a low priority. Any proposal to infill the adjacent green space with medium to high-density housing would be a missed opportunity, and utilising this space is important, as it was set aside as part of the MATS plan many years ago. Control has since passed to the local government, something that I believe happened in 1980, where the future of the Walkleys Road corridor has sat waiting for attention.

The Better North East project has identified that potential and its uses, and it is supported by the residents action group, which is run by Alan Patching; with the help of the Southgate Institute at Flinders University and in-kind support from the South Australian government through Renewal SA all have looked at some really exciting ideas.

The corridor has potential as a public transport corridor to connect Ingle Farm to the north via the Gawler line and to the city and the north-east via the O-Bahn. Yes, it is only one suggestion, but in the absence of any others it has generated some excitement. It boldly looked at ways to get cars off the road and create a cross-suburban link for the dormitory residents who move substantial distances each day to work.

The Better North East project also looked at opportunities to reinvigorate the Ingle Farm precinct, a place where higher density housing would not be out of place. Better North East, with the assistance of Southgate, began to look at chances to regenerate renewal-ready neighbourhoods and identify where services and infrastructure could be targeted to shape their community of interest. I look forward to working with all parties in continuing to explore opportunities for this vibrant corner of the north-east.

#### **GAZZARD, MR K.H.**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:43):** Today, I rise to pay tribute to Kenneth Harold Gazzard, born 21 October 1929 and deceased 12 July 2021. He died peacefully surrounded by family and his wife of 63 years. He was the adored and deeply loved husband of Lorraine. He was the greatly loved father of Chris, Peter, Michael, Cathy, Paul and Matthew and respected father-in-law of Lyn, Carolyn, Marcia, Marijan, Jenni and Marika. He was adored by his grandchildren, Anthony, Sally, Daniel, Mitchell, Meg, Emily, Laura, Jack, James, Max, Noah, Lucy, Grace and Ned, and he was the special great grandfather of Anthony and Hayley's daughter, Matilda.

Ken Gazzard was a giant in the community of Mount Gambier. He was born in Casterton on 21 October 1929, the second child of Harold and Ann Gazzard. It was evident that Ken had ambition

and was not afraid of hard work. Borrowing £100, he purchased a truck and spread superphosphate. He then bought a milk round and soon after added a bread round as well. When these rounds finished, which was usually about 11am, he would then work as a printer after 5 o'clock.

Ken met his wife, Lorraine, in 1951 at a woolshed barbecue at Casterton and they were married six years later in 1957. It was in 1954 that Ken started selling cars in Casterton. Always on the lookout for opportunities, Ken purchased a car yard in Elizabeth Street, Mount Gambier, in 1958 and so began the dynasty of Carlin & Gazzard car yard. From such humble beginnings, C&G not only has a second-hand dealership but also has a number of new car franchises—Mercedes Benz, Subaru, Mitsubishi, Jeep, Honda, LDV and Ram Trucks.

I had the great pleasure of knowing Ken through his son Peter, who is a very good friend of mine. Ken was always liberal with his praise and often gave sage and thoughtful advice. Some of Ken's regular quotes are as follows, 'Won't matter one day,' 'Yesterday's gone forever,' 'We're only passing through,' 'Can't take it with you,' 'You know, I won't be here one day,' and, 'In any case, make sure peace at any price.'

It was Ken's love of family that really shone through. I will read a passage out of his story, called 'A condensed version of Ken's life' which is in the Reflection section and it echoed greatly with me. It was about if you face tough times or uncertain times, as follows:

In any case, if you count to 10 and go back to basics, with thought and concentration you can achieve anything you want to...On the personal side, I have been very fortunate. Lorraine is a wonderful wife and mother and we have had a great marriage of over 50 years. I am very proud of my six children and all the grandchildren. I would also like to acknowledge my daughters-in-law, Carolyn, Marcia, Jenni and Marika, son-in-law, Marijan, and former daughter-in-law, Leanne. They have been a great support over the years and are much loved members of our family.

I am very proud of the business we have created and, most importantly, our family, and I wish our children and grandchildren continued good health, happiness and success in the years to come.

I think that reflects very nicely on Ken and his love of his family. If you know the Gazzard family, it is a name that is synonymous with Mount Gambier and Tenison Woods College. I think most of them hold sporting records for that school. Family is a word that you would associate closely with the Gazzard family. It is not only a very successful business but a proud tradition in our area. Ken's legacy lives on through his family. I pay my respects to a great man and a great Mount Gambier resident, Kenneth Harold Gazzard.

### *Bills*

## **ELECTORAL (REGULATION OF CORFLUTES) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:49):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985 and to make a related amendment to the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:49):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Electoral (Regulation of Corflutes) Amendment Bill 2021. This bill amends the Electoral Act 1985 and makes a related amendment to the Local Government Act 1999 to regulate the use of corflutes on public roads. I can see the enthusiasm from the other side. As members are aware, 'corflute' is the name given to corrugated polypropylene, a fluted plastic which is lightweight yet rigid. Through election periods across the state we see corflutes posted on Stobie poles, advertising election candidates and being used as A-frames at shopping centres.

I will not go into too much detail as I have raised this in this house previously, but corflutes are detrimental to the environment as there are limited recycling options for them. Polypropylene is not widely recycled, with only two main recycling methods: either mechanical recycling, which is complicated due to concerns around food contact and separating types of plastic; and recycling



through chemical methods to break the corflute down. While all political parties encourage their candidates to re-use and recycle corflutes, or repurpose or donate, this is often difficult and sees a continual cycle of new corflutes being printed at each election—except for some, of course, who just recycle the same photograph.

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Not the Minister for Police, of course. He has such an attractive face on his posters.

Not only is the corflute detrimental to the environment but attaching corflutes to Stobie poles require cable ties and other fixings that often get cut and left for local wildlife to consume. Earlier this year, South Australia's most significant environment policy came into effect: the government introduced a single-use plastic ban. With the huge success of this policy, I would hope that this bill would receive the full support of the parliament.

Many of these corflutes quite often remain on Stobie poles much longer than anticipated, with candidates and their volunteers not removing them in the required time frame. Local councils have had to follow up to have them taken down. Councils also raised concerns about diminished roadside safety, distracting drivers and the preservation of roadside public amenity.

Corflutes are costly to parties and do little to educate voters about the candidate, their policy or their platform beyond name identification. With modern campaigning methods, corflutes are quickly becoming redundant.

The government appreciates that not all voters will have access to the internet, particularly social media, where much political communication occurs about candidates and policies of the political parties of the day. The government also appreciates that people may need to be reminded of election day and of polling place locations.

So, members, this bill permits a limited number of four corflutes to be exhibited by candidates or groups within 50 metres of an open polling booth. The clause also provides for an exemption to the ban of putting corflutes on roads when those roads are within the 50-metre zone.

Regulations will be made to set out requirements that must be followed in displaying these corflutes. If a candidate authorising the display of a corflute breaches the legislation, they commit an offence, and any person displaying unauthorised corflutes also commits an offence. The presiding officer of a polling booth has broad powers to direct or undertake the removal of corflutes that are exhibited in contravention of the legislation.

The bill also provides that other exceptions to the ban of corflutes on roads are permitted by regulation. It is shame that I am standing here once again debating the removal of corflutes. It is clear to me that the Labor opposition, to date at least, does not care about this issue—

**Mr Brown:** Why did you vote against it when we introduced it?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —however, there is always the chance for redemption, and I—

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Playford, I have already thrown you out once today. You are called to order.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —appreciate that the Labor opposition could see the clear light of day on this and recognise the impact of corflutes on our environment and the damage they cause. Kangaroo Island is already ahead of us.

In the 1980s, the community and the candidates agreed not to have corflutes at all. Banners continue to be displayed only at polling booths. I note that the member for Waite has also attempted to introduce his own bill—welcome back, member for Waite—to remove corflutes; however, this has not progressed. We all saw the shameful conduct of the opposition in more recent times, to fill up the time for private members and ensure that that bill did not see the light of day.

The community dislikes them, volunteers get caught up in the midnight rush of getting the perfect Stobie pole and plastering faces all over the main roads, and they are intimidating to voters on polling day. We are in the 21<sup>st</sup> century and it is time for a change. So I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. I hope the bill progresses through.

Leave granted.

#### EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

##### Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of *Electoral Act 1985*

4—Amendment of section 115—Limitations on display of electoral advertisements

An offence of exhibiting an electoral advertising poster on a public road (including any structure, fixture or vegetation on a public road) during an election period, except in circumstances prescribed by the regulations, is provided for. A definition of *electoral advertising poster* is inserted—being a poster displaying electoral advertising made of corflute or plastic. The limitations under the section would also apply to posters made of other materials or kinds of materials prescribed by regulation (if any).

5—Amendment of section 125—Prohibition of canvassing near polling booths

Limitations on the number of electoral advertising posters that may be exhibited within 50 metres of an entrance to a polling booth open for polling are provided for. The presiding officer at a polling booth is authorised to remove posters that are not exhibited in accordance with the limitations.

##### Schedule 1—Related amendment to *Local Government Act 1999*

1—Amendment of section 226—Moveable signs

Currently, a sign related to a State election may be placed and maintained on a road during an election period without an authorisation or permit under Chapter 11 Part 2 of the *Local Government Act 1999*. That general exemption in relation to State elections is deleted as a consequence of the insertion of the offence into section 115 of the *Electoral Act 1985* by the measure.

An exemption is provided for in relation to a sign that relates to a State election and is an electoral advertising poster that is authorised to be exhibited under section 115(2a) of the *Electoral Act 1985* or section 125(1a) and (1b) of that Act (during an election period under that Act) (so that such a sign may be placed and maintained on a road during an election period without an authorisation or permit under Chapter 11 Part 2).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

#### *Personal Explanation*

#### **MEMBER FOR WAITE**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (16:56):** I seek leave and the indulgence of the house to make a personal statement.

Leave granted.

**Mr DULUK:** This morning, I was found not guilty of the charge brought against me, and I am grateful for the opportunity to have cleared my name. I would like to express my gratitude to my family, friends and the many people in my community of Waite for their support and encouragement. In reflecting on the magistrate's remarks today, I once again reiterate the personal apology I conveyed to Ms Bonaros after the event in December 2019.

Through a lot of reflection and plenty of love and support of my family and friends, as well as the commitment and support of my staff at my electorate office, I know that I stand here today a stronger, happier and better person, having addressed the causes of my behaviour that night. I remain committed to continuing to serve the people of Waite. I remain committed to working and ensuring that this place is a better place. I will continue to work closely with my community and colleagues from across the chamber and the parliament to champion the issues that matter to the people I represent.

*Ministerial Statement***IMPAIRMENT ASSESSMENT GUIDELINES**

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:58):** I table a ministerial statement in this house on behalf of the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas.

*Bills***LIQUOR LICENSING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:58):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 and to make related amendments to the Gambling Administration Act 2019, the Gaming Machines Act 1992, the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016 and the South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:59):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Liquor Licensing (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2021. This bill seeks to make a number of necessary amendments to the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 to continue to support the hospitality sector while ensuring that the interests and safety of the community are protected. It is essential that the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, which regulates the sale and supply of liquor, keeps up with industry trends and modern practices. However, an appropriate balance must be struck between reflecting emerging business models and ensuring that there are adequate safeguards in place to protect the community.

The COVID-19 pandemic has posed significant challenges for all of us, and we appreciate that the hospitality sector has been under remarkable strain as a result of the measures imposed to protect the community. From March last year, when the pandemic hit, the government acted swiftly and allowed liquor licence holders operating a community club, on premises licence, restaurant or residential licence to apply for a free, short-term temporary licence enabling them to sell a small amount of liquor along with a takeaway meal.

This has continued and has been a lifesaver for businesses that have had to shut down during lockdown. Purchases are currently limited to two bottles of wine or a bottle of wine and a six-pack of beer, cider or premixed spirits, and can be taken away only by the purchaser or delivered between the hours of 8am and 10pm. The bill seeks to make this temporary measure of limited quantities of takeaway alcohol with a meal permanent to ensure that the support for licensees and the hospitality industry under this model is maintained. This is in line with the approach being taken in other states.

A much-needed, enhanced regulatory framework for same-day alcohol deliveries is being introduced to ensure appropriate protections are in place in response to this emerging business model. Developments in technology, such as ordering alcohol via a phone app, and an increasing customer demand for fast and convenient online delivery services, have seen the continued growth of online alcohol sales and same-day delivery. This has been further exacerbated during the pandemic.

Amendments to this bill seek to address the heightened risk of minors or intoxicated people accessing same-day alcohol delivery and new requirements for training for same-day delivery providers and those delivering alcohol. The amendments capture the range of business models under which same-day alcohol deliveries are provided in South Australia and extend to employees and agents who undertake the deliveries. Importantly, the framework recognises that same-day delivery providers have certain obligations in relation to the people they engage to deliver alcohol as part of their business.

To protect the community from harms associated with liquor, the bill seeks to afford the commissioner the power to bar a person from a licensed premises or part of a licensed premises.

The provisions are designed to expand the commissioner's ability to deal with alcohol-related harm issues and are consistent with similar existing provisions under the Gambling Administration Act 2019.

The proposed provisions would allow the commissioner to simultaneously bar the individual from multiple licensed premises via a single barring order or be restricted to just part of a licensed premises. This will allow voluntary or third-party welfare barring orders to be tailored and flexible, and not necessarily impact on a person's ability to continue to socialise and enjoy a drink whilst in the controlled environment of a licensed premises. This is particularly important in country or remote areas, where a person's main social interaction and sense of community may come from the local pub.

Expanding on these provisions, an additional new power is proposed with the support of the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, South Australia Police, health agencies and community representatives to allow the commissioner to bar a person from purchasing takeaway alcohol from a licensed premises in specific regions. The intent of this provision is to help tackle issues such as are being experienced in and around areas such as Coober Pedy and Ceduna, where the purchase of takeaway alcohol is contributing to antisocial behaviour and significant alcohol-related harms in those communities.

An appropriate IT solution is being developed by the government to support these proposed new barring provisions, which will also significantly streamline the existing process for venues to record a barring order and notify the commissioner at the same time. It is also proposed to reinsert a previously deleted object of the act—that being, 'to encourage a competitive market for the supply of liquor'.

In the grant of an application for a liquor licence, the licensing authority is required to be satisfied that the grant would not be inconsistent with the objects of the Liquor Licensing Act. Prior to the 2019 amendments to the act, an application for a hotel licence or a retail liquor merchant licence was required to satisfy the licensing authority that the licence was necessary in order to provide for the needs of the public in that locality. This was known as the needs test.

This was removed in 2019, following a recommendation by former Supreme Court Justice Tim Anderson QC that its relevance had dissipated as a result of the abolition of the needs test on 19 November 2019. As a result of this recommendation, the needs test was replaced with a community impact assessment, which is applied to certain high-risk categories of licence applications. As part of this assessment, the applicant is required to demonstrate that the grant of a licence is in the community interest.

The ACCC has written to the commissioner and raised competition concerns in relation to the possibility of the new test making it easier for larger operators to expand further with the grant of new licences where they already have significant market presence. The ACCC has suggested that the assessment of an application should take into account the broader consumer interest of ensuring that consumers enjoy the benefits of a retail liquor market that is not dominated by a small number of large suppliers.

The reinsertion of the object of the act 'to encourage a competitive market for the supply of liquor' is intended to provide consumers greater freedom of choice, product and price for the purchase of alcohol, while ensuring that larger operators are not able to saturate the market driving out smaller independent competitors.

An amendment has also been included in the bill to allow South Australian liquor businesses to seek funding through crowd-sourced funding arrangements. Currently, the act is incompatible with the commonwealth crowd-sourced funding legislation, meaning that SA businesses cannot use this method of funding. Crowd-sourced funding is a form of fundraising that allows a company to access capital from a large number of investors. This amendment will provide greater funding opportunities for smaller independent businesses.

Currently, the act requires that a person must personally attend the office of Consumer and Business Services to inspect documents relating to an application for a liquor licence. The bill seeks to allow the commissioner the power to publish certain documents and material relevant to an application on the CBS website, such as a copy of the plan of the proposed premises. This is a

necessary amendment, particularly highlighted by the COVID environment, as it removes the requirement for a person to physically attend the office of Consumer and Business Services to inspect an application for a liquor licence.

These amendments will ensure the commissioner can still exclude information considered to be information of a personal nature or considered commercial-in-confidence. While strengthening the harm minimisation measures, the bill also seeks to support industry by reducing red tape. Measures are proposed to assist community clubs by allowing them to sell takeaway liquor to their members and also to provide clubs with the ability to trade from 5am on ANZAC Day without the need to apply for a short-term licence to extend their trading hours.

The bill also contains a number of other administrative and technical amendments, the need for which has become apparent since the commencement of the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Review) Amendment Act 2017.

Finally, as a result of the recent implementation of the government's gambling reform package, a consequential amendment to the act is proposed to ensure consistency in relation to restrictions on the use of facial recognition technology in areas of licensed premises outside the gaming room and to ensure that such technology cannot be used in a manner that encourages or provides incentives to a person to consume alcohol or gamble.

Mr Anderson QC has undertaken comprehensive work in liquor and gambling reform under contract from a previous government and we thank him for that work. Sometimes, though, when new laws come into place, we identify some weaknesses in the application, so this is a remedy, together with ensuring that we contemporise the need for 2021 business models. Within the envelope of COVID, we have learned some lessons about how we might accommodate the matters that have had to be pivoted to be able to ensure that our hospitality industry survives and that our people are protected. I commend this bill to the house and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses without 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 *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*

###### 4—Amendment of section 3—Objects

An object of encouraging a competitive market for the supply of liquor is included.

###### 5—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Various definitions are inserted and amended for the purposes of the measure.

###### 6—Amendment of section 5—Resident on licensed premises

Existing section 5(2)(b) is deleted.

###### 7—Amendment of section 6—Persons with authority in a trust or corporate entity

is removed from The list of situations in which a person will be considered to hold position of authority in a trust or corporate entity is amended so that only shareholders who own more than 5% of the shares in a proprietary body corporate are included.

###### 8—Amendment of section 11—Disclosure of information

The disclosure of information relating to barring orders to the Commissioner of Police, licensees, responsible persons and security personnel is authorised.

###### 9—Amendment of section 20—Representation

Certain technical amendments are made to this provision.

###### 10—Amendment of section 25—Representation

Reference to 'counsel' is amended to 'a legal practitioner'.

11—Amendment of section 28AA—Intervention by Commissioner of Police

This amendment is technical.

12—Amendment of section 28A—Criminal intelligence

This amendment is technical.

13—Amendment of section 32—General and hotel licence

Specific reference to the licensing authority's power to include a condition on a general and hotel licence allowing the sale of liquor from a bottle shop area between 8 am and 10 pm for consumption off licensed premises is provided for.

14—Amendment of section 33—On premises licence

Specific reference to the licensing authority's power to include a condition on an on premises licence allowing—

- the sale of liquor of the prescribed kind and not exceeding the prescribed quantities between 8 am and 10 pm for consumption off licensed premises with a meal is provided for; and
- the sale of liquor of the prescribed kind and not exceeding the prescribed quantities at any time through direct sales transactions provided that the liquor is delivered between 8 am and 10 pm and with a meal provided by the licensee.

15—Amendment of section 34—Residential licence

Similar amendments to the on premises licence provision are made to this provision.

16—Amendment of section 35—Restaurant and catering licence

Similar amendments to the on premises licence provision are made to this provision.

17—Amendment of section 36—Club licence

Similar amendments to the on premises licence provision are made to this provision.

In addition, specific reference is made to the licensing authority's power to include a condition authorising a licensee to sell liquor on the licensed premises to a member of the club on any day over a continuous period authorised by the licensing authority (which must not exceed 13 hours) between 8 am and 10 pm for consumption off the licensed premises.

Other amendments relate to trading from 5am on ANZAC day. Another amendment is technical relating to bottle shops.

Further amendments relate to procedural matters concerning notices and notifications given under existing section 36(4).

18—Amendment of section 37—Small venue licence

Similar amendments to the on premises licence provision are made to this provision.

19—Amendment of section 39—Liquor production and sales licence

This amendment is consequential.

20—Amendment of section 40—Short term licence

Section 40(2) is amended to include the words 'or on a temporary basis for another purpose considered appropriate by the Commissioner'.

Another express ground for refusing a short term licence is included. Other amendments are consequential.

21—Amendment of section 41—Interstate direct sales licence

The provision relating to interstate direct sales licences (inserted by *Liquor Licensing (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2019*) is amended to allow for a discretion to refuse a licence if the trade to be authorised under the interstate direct sales licence would be better authorised under a licence of a class set out in section 31(2) (instead of the rule in existing section 41(2)(c)).

22—Amendment of section 42—Mandatory conditions

A right of review is included in section 42. Another amendment relates to the use of facial recognition technology.

23—Amendment of section 50A—Annual fees

Provision is made in relation to the annual fee for a licence granted part way through an annual fee period.

24—Amendment of section 50B—Notification of certain variations to licences

This amendment is technical.

25—Amendment of section 51—Form of applications

This amendment is technical.

26—Amendment of section 51A—Applications to be given to Commissioner of Police

An application for the removal of a licence is added to the list of applications to be given to the Commissioner of Police.

Another amendment is technical.

27—Amendment of section 52—Certain applications to be advertised

Various amendments are made in relation to the advertising of applications.

28—Amendment of section 52A—Confidentiality of certain documents and material relevant to application

Certain amendments are made relating to confidentiality of documents and material relevant to applications.

29—Insertion of section 52B

New section 52B is inserted:

52B—Information relating to applications may be published on a website

Provision is made in relation to publication of information relating to applications.

30—Amendment of section 53—Discretionary powers of licensing authority

An amendment is made to the discretionary powers of licensing authority.

31—Amendment of section 53A—Licensing authority to be satisfied that designated application is in community interest

This amendment is technical.

32—Amendment of section 55—Provisions governing whether person is fit and proper

Certain mandatory considerations are made discretionary. Another amendment removes related bodies corporate from the list of close associates.

33—Amendment of section 57—Requirements for premises

This amendment is technical.

34—Repeal of section 59A

The provision relating to paying a licence fee on grant of a licence is deleted.

35—Amendment of section 66—Suspension of licence

These amendments are technical and consequential.

36—Insertion of section 66A

New section 66A is inserted:

66A—Revocation of licence

A power to revoke licences is inserted.

37—Amendment of section 67—Surrender of licence

This amendment is technical.

38—Insertion of Part 4 Division 6A

A new Division 6 is inserted into Part 4:

Division 6A—Jointly held licences—removal of licensee

67A—Jointly held licences—removal of licensee

Provision is made in relation to the removal of a joint licence holder from the licence.

39—Repeal of Part 4 Division 9

Part 4 Division 9, which is not necessary due to section 43, is repealed.

40—Amendment of section 73—Devolution of licensee's rights

These amendments are technical.

41—Amendment of section 76—Commissioner of Police may make written submissions

This amendment is technical.

42—Amendment of section 77—General right to make written submissions

One amendment provides that written submissions in respect of an application that relate to a matter that is, or should be, dealt with or addressed under the law relating to planning or carrying out building work may not be made under section 77.

The other amendments are technical.

43—Amendment of section 78—Further written submissions

This amendment is technical.

44—Amendment of section 82—Variation of written submissions

This amendment is technical.

45—Amendment of section 97—Supervision and management of licensee's business

Certain technical amendments are made in relation to the supervision and management of a licensee's business.

46—Amendment of section 97A—Direction to complete training—designated persons

A director of a licensee is added to the list of designated persons.

47—Amendment of section 98—Approval of assumption of positions of authority in corporate or trust structures

This amendment is technical.

48—Amendment of section 99—Prohibition of profit sharing

The words '(but this paragraph does not prevent the members of a licensed club from benefiting as members of the club from the proceeds of the business conducted under the licence)' are deleted from section 99(1)(b) and moved into new subsection (1a) (which extends to shareholders owning less than 5% of the shares in a body corporate).

49—Substitution of section 104

Section 104 is substituted:

104—Liquor may be brought onto, and removed from, licensed premises in certain cases

The scope of section 104 is extended to all premises where consumption of liquor on the premises is authorised (currently, it applies to premises where consumption of liquor is authorised with or ancillary to a meal provided by the licensee. The section is also amended to provide for consumption of liquor brought onto public conveyances.

50—Amendment of heading to Part 6 Division 5

This amendment is consequential.

51—Amendment of section 105—Adult entertainment on licensed premises

The references to prescribed entertainment are amended to refer to adult entertainment.

52—Amendment of section 106—Complaint about noise or behaviour emanating from licensed premises

The basis on which a complaint may be made is amended to cover noise or behaviour emanating from persons at licensed premises, or persons making their way to or from licensed premises or entertainment at licensed premises.

Another amendment deletes requirements relating to a 14 day period after service during which conciliation or hearing of a complaint cannot occur.

Other amendment delete certain mandatory considerations from section 106(6).

Another amendment includes a power to refer a complaint to another person or body. Other amendments are consequential.

53—Amendment of section 107—Minors not to be employed to serve liquor in licensed premises

Amendments are made to the limited exceptions relating to certain minors permitted on licensed premises.



54—Insertion of heading to Part 6 Division 7A Subdivision 1

This amendment is consequential.

55—Amendment of section 107A—Sale of liquor through direct sales transaction—general

These amendments are related to the insertion of Part 6 Division 7A Subdivision 2 (same day deliveries).

56—Insertion of Part 6 Division 7A Subdivision 2

New Part 6 Division 7A Subdivision 2 is inserted. The Subdivision regulates same day liquor deliveries (which are a type of direct sales transaction). The Subdivision imposes requirements relating to records, training and other matters relating to same day liquor deliveries.

Subdivision 2—Same day liquor deliveries

107B—Preliminary

107C—Liquor not to be supplied in certain areas

107D—Training relating to same day deliveries

107E—Self-exclusion agreements

107F—Same day delivery providers liable for acts of employees and agents

57—Amendment of section 109—Copy of licence etc to be available at licensed premises

Electronic display of licences is provided for.

58—Amendment of section 109A—Records of liquor transactions

A requirement relating to form of records is removed.

59—Amendment of section 111—Areas of licensed premises may be declared out of bounds to minors

Certain amendments are technical. Another amendment relates to the power for an authorised officer to require a minor to leave a part of licensed premises declared out of bounds.

60—Amendment of section 112—Minors not to enter or remain in certain licensed premises

These amendments are consequential and technical.

61—Repeal of section 113

Section 113 is repealed.

62—Amendment of section 113A—Requirements relating to notices

The offence from section 113 is relocated into this provision.

63—Amendment of section 115—Evidence of age may be required

This amendment is consequential.

64—Amendment of section 115A—Seizure of evidence of age document

This amendment is consequential.

65—Amendment of section 119A—Commissioner's power to deal with disciplinary matter by consent

Publication of an undertakings by the Commissioner is provided for.

66—Insertion of section 121A

New section 121A is inserted:

121A—Commissioner of Police to make available relevant information

Information held by the Commissioner of Police relevant to disciplinary action may be made available to the Commissioner.

67—Amendment of section 124A—Interpretation

These amendments are consequential on other amendments to Part 9 Division 3.

68—Insertion of Part 9 Division 3 Subdivision 1A

New Subdivision 1A is inserted. The Subdivision provides for the Commissioner to make barring orders on certain grounds.

Subdivision 1A—Commissioner barring orders

124B—Commissioner may make barring order on request

124C—Commissioner barring orders relating to consumption off premises

124C—Offences

124D—Evidence

69—Amendment of section 125—Licensee barring orders

A power for prescribed persons to require certain information is included. Another amendment changes '6 months' to '1 month' in section 125(6). Another amendment is technical.

70—Amendment of section 125A—Commissioner of Police barring orders

These amendments are consequential.

71—Amendment of section 125B—Police officer barring orders

These amendments are consequential.

72—Amendment of section 125C—Offences

These amendments are consequential.

73—Amendment of section 125D—Evidence

This amendment is consequential.

74—Insertion of section 125DA

New section 125DA is inserted:

125DA—Disclosure of information—police barring orders

The Commissioner of Police is authorised to disclose information relating to orders under the Subdivision to the Commissioner.

75—Amendment of section 126—Orders

These amendments are technical and consequential.

76—Amendment of section 127—Power to remove person who is barred

These amendments are technical and consequential.

77—Amendment of section 128—Review of orders

These amendments are consequential.

78—Amendment of section 128A—Reports on barring orders

One amendment changes '6 months' to '1 month' in section 128A(1)(a). Other amendments are consequential.

79—Amendment of section 136—Service

Section 136(2)(e) is amended to allow for licensee barring orders to be served by SMS.

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Amendment of *Gambling Administration Act 2019*

This Part provides for amendments to the *Gambling Administration Act 2019* related to the amendments to the *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*.

Part 2—Amendment of *Gaming Machines Act 1992*

This Part provides for amendments to the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* related to the amendments to the *Liquor Licensing Act 1997* (including amendments that make provisions of the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* consistent with equivalent provisions in the *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*).

Part 3—Amendment of *Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016*

This Part makes amendments to the *Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016* related to the amendments to section 106 of the *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*.

Part 4—Amendment of *South Australian Motor Sport Act 1984*

Section 27B is repealed.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Piccolo.

**ASSOCIATIONS INCORPORATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:09):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Associations Incorporations Act 1985. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:10):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Associations Incorporation (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2021. This bill proposes to amend the Associations Incorporation Act 1985 to improve the regulatory framework for the support, oversight and management of associations operating in South Australia.

Currently, the act provides for the incorporation, administration and control of not-for-profit associations in South Australia and only applies to associations that choose to incorporate and are legal entities with rights and obligations under law. I note that the bill contains a number of provisions that defer to the regulations to provide for further detail and compliance criteria. However, I would like to reassure members that the drafting of the regulations following passage of this bill will be an open and consultative process.

These reforms seek to renew, revitalise and modernise the not-for-profit sector in South Australia to provide greater consistency with other jurisdictions, educate and inform members of associations of their rights, responsibilities and liabilities and require minimum touchpoints with the regulator to ensure that appropriate oversight and support can be provided to the sector.

The not-for-profit sector is large and diverse. In the 2019 reporting year, the Australian Charities and Not-for-profits Commission (ACNC) estimated revenue across the sector of \$166 billion, with \$354 billion in assets and government funding accounted for \$78.1 billion. These significant figures are concerning when considered in light of the findings of the Productivity Commission's 2010 Research Report into the Contribution of the Not-for-Profit Sector, which found that the regulatory framework of the sector is complex, costly and lacks coherence and sufficient transparency.

In recent years, several other jurisdictions have completed reviews or introduced new legislation affecting not-for-profit associations. As the South Australian act has not been subject to a comprehensive review since 1997, it is currently deficient in provisions to appropriately support, oversee and regulate associations operating in the state.

These areas of required reform have been reinforced by recent evidence presented at the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee's inquiry into governance standards in South Australian Aboriginal Community-Controlled Organisations (the ACCO inquiry). Whilst not being issues restricted to Aboriginal-controlled organisations, the ACCO inquiry has heard evidence that affirms the need for reform of the sector to ensure that appropriate regulatory structures are in place to support accountability and transparency in the decision-making of associations and to ensure that the commission is appropriately empowered to address misconduct and investigate potential breaches of the act.

There are three key themes to this reform package: support, oversight and regulation. Paramount to this reform package is improving mechanisms to better support associations and the volunteers that establish and sustain them. The bill introduces a framework around the provision of model rules and governance principles, similar to the ACNC, which will be supported.

Incorporated associations will be able to benefit from adopting model rules, should they wish; however, that is not mandatory. Adopting model rules seeks to minimise the cost and risk to associations and provide greater consistency and structure in the management of associations across the state. The content of the model rules will be prescribed by regulation.

The reforms also seek to provide increased transparency for members of associations through introducing requirements around the recording of minutes, such as requiring minutes from

meetings to be recorded within one month, where there is currently no time requirement associated with this.

Importantly, the amendments also seek to ensure that associations have clear dispute resolution processes established and that these are clear and transparent to members. It is proposed that the model rules may clarify who may rule on a dispute, what the jurisdictional body is and guidance around disputes between the association and a member. Better oversight of the sector is also proposed through amendments to provide clarity around the disclosure of a committee member's conflict of interest and the need to establish and maintain a membership register.

The bill seeks to streamline the process for members to seek an authorised inspection of records, allowing members to apply to the commission rather than the court for approval to have the association's financial records and minutes inspected on their behalf. Amendments also seek to provide greater flexibility for associations by allowing members to participate, and for voting to occur via electronic means, therefore removing the requirement to have a common seal.

The second key theme of this reform package is the provision of improved oversight of the sector. The bill seeks to require a simple regular touchpoint with the commission by incorporated associations to verify their details on the register and confirm that they are still operating and provide updated contact details. Currently, only prescribed associations—being those with gross receipts in excess of \$500,000 in the last financial year—are required to lodge a periodic return with the commission, with 100 to 200 lodged each year.

With around 22,000 incorporated associations on the register, this represents more than 99 per cent that purportedly fall below the reporting threshold, and are only required to notify the commission when their details change. These changes are infrequent, and many associations fail to notify the commission when they occur.

As a result of this, the commission cannot be sure how many incorporated associations are no longer operating, including associations that may hold assets that should otherwise be used for the benefit of the members. The proposal included in the bill is to introduce a simple requirement for the incorporated association to verify their details to the commission through the completion of an annual information statement, which will ensure that the register of incorporated associations operating in the state is more accurate.

The reporting model has also been reviewed, with a proposal to replace financial audits with financial reviews, which are less burdensome and more closely aligned with the approach taken by the ACNC with respect to reporting requirements. However, it is proposed to empower the commission to still require an audit of council, where appropriate. Changes have also been proposed to membership requirements, including requiring an association to have a minimum of five members with full voting rights and committees to have a minimum of three, each of whom ordinarily reside in Australia and are aged 18 years or over.

The final theme of this reform package—regulation—is encapsulated in amendments designed to empower the commission to better address misconduct and investigate potential breaches of the act. Amendments have been included in the bill to support the commission to assist incorporated associations in resolving governance and financial issues, and appropriately address any wrongdoing.

The reforms also seek to introduce amendments to how the commission manages associations suspected of being defunct by allowing details of these associations to be published, to assist the commission with correcting the register and winding up associations that are no longer operating. The community will benefit from an accurate register of incorporated associations, with the commission being better equipped to take appropriate action in a timely manner to protect the community where necessary.

Incorporated associations will benefit from more streamlined provisions to end an association or transfer it to a registerable Australian body with the Australian Securities Investment Commission. Currently, the ending of an incorporated association relating to external administration, winding up or deregistration is burdensome and onerous on incorporated associations and the commission. This proposal aims to provide greater consistency with other jurisdictions and will assist with correcting the incorporated associations register.

Lastly, the bill also seeks to empower the commission to call general meetings in certain circumstances and issue a notice requiring action to be taken to ensure compliance with the act. The association's rules will address an irregularity in the affairs of the association. It is also proposed to empower the commission to disqualify or suspend a committee member in certain circumstances, including for existing eligibility requirements relating to certain convictions.

In supporting this vital package of reforms, parliament will be providing a clear commitment to the improved provision of appropriate support, oversight and regulation of the local not-for-profit sector. I would be surprised if there is anyone who is a member of this parliament who has not had an issue in relation to the Associations Act raised by their constituency at some stage. It might be a local sporting club, it might be a local residents' association, it may be in the not-for-profit sector or even our multicultural communities.

The whole mechanism under this act is used 22,000 times; that is the number we have now in this state. From time to time, as local members of parliament, we are asked to answer queries: have we complied with the act? How do we change some of the terms of our arrangements? Are we compliant? If there is a dispute amongst those who are in the association, attempts are sometimes made to have a breakaway group, and another association is established. This can cause a lot of hurt and frustration in our constituency.

I certainly hope that these reforms will assist members to also advise their constituents on these matters. 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 *Associations Incorporation Act 1985*

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

This clause amends and inserts various relevant definitions.

###### 5—Amendment of section 6—Access to information

This clause amends section 6 to remove the ability for a person to inspect a register held by the Commission and replace it with a power for the Commission to make information from a register, and other prescribed information, publicly available in any way it deems fit.

###### 6—Insertion of section 8

This clause inserts a new section 8 as follows:

###### 8—Annual verification statements

This section requires incorporated associations to give the Commission annual verification statements in accordance with regulations, and gives the Commission powers regarding such statements.

###### 7—Substitution of Part 2 Division 2

This clause substitutes a new Part 2 Division 2 as follows:

###### Division 2—Enforcement and compliance powers

###### 10—Powers of authorised persons

This section details the powers of authorised persons under the principal Act to require people to answer questions and produce documents.

###### 11—Entry and inspection

This section gives authorised persons various powers of entry and inspection.

###### 12—Use and inspection of books or documents produced or seized

This section establishes how the Commission may deal with books or documents produced to or taken by an authorised person.

13—Commission may require compliance with Act etc

This section gives the Commission the power to issue a notice requiring an incorporated association to take action in order to comply with the requirements of the Act or to remedy an irregularity.

8—Amendment of section 18—Eligibility for incorporation

This clause amends section 18 in order to require associations to have at least 5 members with voting rights in order to be eligible for incorporation under the principal Act.

9—Amendment of section 20—Incorporation of association

This clause amends section 20 such that associations will no longer automatically obtain a common seal on incorporation under the section.

10—Amendment of section 22—Amalgamation

This clause amends section 22 such that associations will no longer automatically obtain a common seal on incorporation under the section.

11—Amendment of section 23—Rules binding on association and its members

This clause amends section 23 to make clear that provisions of association rules do not apply where they are contrary to the principal Act or any other law.

12—Amendment of section 23A—Contents of rules of incorporated association

This clause amends section 23A in order to remove the requirement of a rule prescribing an auditor for prescribed associations, as well as requiring the rules to cover internal dispute resolution mechanisms. It also contemplates regulations prescribing minimum internal governance principles, and implies a requirement to comply with such principles into incorporated association's rules.

13—Insertion of sections 23B and 23C

This clause inserts sections 23B and 23C.

23B—Application of model rules

This section allows for model rules to be prescribed through regulations, either generally or for specific classes of incorporated associations. These rules may be either mandatory, replaceable or recommended. The section outlines the interaction between an incorporated association's rules and the model rules.

23C—Commission may change an incorporated association's rules on application

This section allows the Commission to make changes to an incorporated association's rules, on application by the committee, where the Commission is satisfied that the change is in the best interests of the association and is not such that a special resolution should be required.

14—Amendment of section 24—Alteration of rules

This clause amends section 24 to make it clear that a change in an incorporated association's name will not impact the identity of the association, the association's rights or obligations, or legal proceedings by or against the association.

15—Amendment of section 25—Powers of incorporated association

Section 25 is amended to clarify that the rules of an incorporated association may impose limitations on any powers specified in section 25(1) but may not further extend those powers.

16—Amendment of section 29—Management of incorporated associations

This clause amends section 29 to require that the committee of an incorporated association consist of a minimum of 3 members who are ordinarily resident in Australia, and that all committee members be over 18 years old. The Commission may however exempt an association from compliance with the new requirement.

17—Amendment of section 30—Certain persons not to be members of committee

This clause amends section 30 to prohibit a person who has been disqualified from being concerned with or taking part in the management of a body corporate in another Australian jurisdiction from being a member of the committee of an incorporated association, or from taking part or being concerned with the management of an incorporated association without the leave of the Commission.

18—Substitution of sections 31 and 32

This clause repeals section 31 and 32 and inserts new sections 30A, 31, 32 and 32A.

30A—Disqualified person declaration

This section gives the Commission power to declare, in writing that a person is disqualified from being a member of the committee of an incorporated association in certain circumstances, as well as setting out the requirements for such a declaration and allowing the Commission to temporarily suspend a person (for up to 4 months) while they are determining whether a disqualification should be imposed.

31—Disclosure of material personal interest

This section requires committee members of an incorporated association to disclose material personal interests they have in matters under consideration at committee meetings, the circumstances where declarations are not necessary, and the consequences of making such declarations.

32—Matter on which committee member has material personal interest

This section precludes committee members from voting on or being present while the committee is considering a matter in which they have a material personal interest, circumstances where this does and provides alternatives where this leads to the lack of a quorum.

32A—Duty to deliver up documents

This section imposes a duty on committee members to ensure they give the public officer any and all documents in their possession that belong to the association, for delivery to their successor.

19—Heading to Part 4 Division 2

This clause amends the heading of Part 4 Division 2 to remove the reference to audit (consequential to the changes proposed in clause 20).

20—Amendment of section 35—Accounts to be kept

This clause amends section 35 to require prescribed associations to keep accounting records in accordance with the applicable accounting standards. It requires prescribed associations, incorporated associations of a class prescribed by the regulations and incorporated associations given written notice by the Commission under the section to cause accounts to be reviewed or audited in accordance with regulations. The requirement for a prescribed association to present audited accounts at the annual general meeting is replaced by a requirement to present the documents prescribed by regulations relating to the accounts to members in accordance with requirements prescribed by the regulations.

21—Repeal of sections 37 and 37A

This clause repeals sections 37 and 37A consequentially to the amendments in clause 20.

22—Substitution of heading to Part 4 Division 3

This clause changes the heading of Part 4 Division 3 from 'Annual general meeting' to 'Meetings' to reflect changes in the content of the Division.

23—Insertion of section 39AA

This clause inserts new section 39AA as follows:

39AA—Commission may call general meeting or annual general meeting

This section gives the Commission power to convene a meeting in certain circumstances.

24—Amendment of section 39A—Duties of officers etc

This clause is consequential to the amendments in clause 20 and amends section 39A by removing subsection (4).

25—Substitution of section 39B

This clause replaces section 39B to require an incorporated association to indemnify its officers against a liability incurred in good faith in the course of performing their duties and to change references to 'auditors' to 'auditors, or other reviewers' (reflecting the amendments in clause 20).

26—Amendment of section 39D—Inspection of records

This clause amends section 39D by shifting the body responsible for authorising inspection of an incorporated association's books from the District Court to the Commission. A person may apply to the Commission (on payment of a prescribed fee) to have a person inspect an association's books on their behalf. It requires associations to take all necessary actions to facilitate the inspection and makes it an offence to fail to do so or to otherwise hinder the inspection.

27—Insertion of section 39E

This clause inserts new section 39E as follows:

**39E—Membership register**

This section requires incorporated associations to maintain a register of members in accordance with the regulations, which they may be required to present to an authorised person.

**28—Insertion of section 40C**

This clause inserts new section 40C as follows:

**40C—Appointment of administrator by Commission**

This section allows the Commission to appoint an administrator to an incorporated association in certain circumstances.

**29—Amendment of section 41—Winding up of incorporated associations**

This clause amends section 41 by allowing any interested individual to apply to the Supreme Court for the winding up of an incorporated association, as well as allowing the Commission to do so without the consent of the Minister. It allows the Supreme Court to wind up an association where an association has not performed any activity or function for more than a year. It allows the Commission to wind up an incorporated association where the association is no longer eligible to be incorporated under the Act or has not complied with a direction under section 42(3a)(b).

**30—Amendment of section 42—Transfer of activities or registration**

This clause amends section 42 so that notice may be given where the Commission is of the opinion that the undertakings of an incorporated association would be more appropriately be carried on by, or are being performed by another incorporated association (in addition to the existing provision about other bodies corporate). It also allows an incorporated association to apply for a transfer of registration for proposed registration as a prescribed body corporate (which is defined in the clause) if authorised by a special resolution or at the direction of the Commission.

**31—Substitution of section 43**

This clause substitutes a new section 43 and inserts a new section 43AA as follows:

**43—Distribution of assets**

This section establishes the regime by which incorporated associations may distribute their surplus assets upon winding up.

**43AA—Distribution plans**

This section allows certain incorporated associations to apply to the Commission for approval of a plan for the distribution of their surplus assets.

**32—Amendment of section 43A—Application for deregistration**

This clause amends section 43A to remove the ability to prescribe a fee for an application for deregistration, to correct a minor error in the wording of subsection (5), to require the Commission to publish notices under the section within 3 months of an application (instead of the existing 1 month) on a website of their choosing and to change the prescribed amount for the section from \$5,000 to \$20,000.

**33—Insertion of section 43B**

This clause inserts new section 43B into the principal Act.

**43B—Deregistration by Commission**

This section gives the Commission the power to require an incorporated association it considers to no longer be eligible for incorporation under the Act to show good cause as to why it should not be deregistered, and the power to deregister, and hence dissolve, those that do not.

**34—Amendment of section 44—Defunct associations**

This clause amends section 44 such that the Commission is required to publish notice requiring an incorporated association to show good cause as to why it should not be dissolved on a website, as well as repealing subsection (3) which is now dealt with by new section 44AB.

**35—Insertion of sections 44AA and 44AB**

This clause inserts new sections 44AA and 44AB as follows:

**44AA—Possible defunct associations**

This section allows the Commission to publish a website listing incorporated associations they suspect may be defunct, alongside information describing how to prove to the Commission that is not the case. Should no such information be provided to the Commission, they may, by notice in the Gazette, cancel the incorporation of the incorporated association (whereupon the association is dissolved).



#### 44AB—Reinstatement where association dissolved or deregistered in error

This section allows the Commission to restore incorporated associations that have been deregistered or dissolved in error and to return to them any property divested under section 45.

#### 36—Substitution of section 46

This clause repeals the current section 46 and substitutes:

##### 46—Disposal of outstanding property

This section gives the Commission the power to deal with property obtained through the action of section 45. Surplus outstanding property may be distributed to certain kinds of body corporate with similar or identical aims and objects or, if the Commission is not aware of any such bodies, may be applied by the Commission for the benefit of incorporated associations generally.

#### 37—Insertion of sections 49B and 49C

This clause inserts new sections 49B and 49C as follows:

##### 49B—Commission may require statutory declaration

This section allows the Commission to require a statutory declaration verifying any information or document provided to it.

##### 49C—Secrecy

This section has been relocated from Part 2 Division 2 (which now just deals with enforcement and compliance powers) but adds an additional power for the Commission to permit an authorised person to make a record of, or divulge or make use of information where the Commission thinks this is appropriate.

#### 38—Insertion of section 50A

This clause inserts new section 50A as follows:

##### 50A—Meetings etc may occur remotely

This section allows for meetings to be conducted remotely through the use of audio or audio-visual communication.

#### 39—Amendment of section 51—Minutes

This clause amends section 51 by requiring provision of minutes within 4 weeks of a meeting. It makes it an offence for any associations to fail to comply with the requirements of subsection (1) instead of just prescribed associations. It also makes a minor amendment to subsection (4)(c) that is consequential to the amendments in clause 20 and requires that minutes of general meetings be made available to members in accordance with the regulations.

#### 40—Amendment of section 53A—Reservation of name

This clause amends section 53A by allowing for the reservation of a new name for an existing incorporated association.

#### 41—Amendment of section 56—Public officer

This clause amends section 56 by allowing the Commission to appoint a public officer for an incorporated association in certain circumstances, as well as establishing that a public officer does not need to be a member of the committee of the association.

#### 42—Insertion of sections 57A and 57B

This clause inserts new sections that are relocated from the current section 14 (but with an increased penalty).

#### 43—Amendment of section 58—Falsification of books

This clause amends section 58 to create a more serious offence for conduct apparently aimed at thwarting a direction under the Act.

#### 44—Amendment of section 67—Regulations and fee notices

This clause amends the regulation making power to make consequential amendments, to allow the regulations to refer to or incorporate, wholly or partially and with or without modification, rules, forms or any other document prepared or published by the Commission or a prescribed body, to increase the penalties that may be imposed by regulation, to make the regulation making power more consistent with recent drafting practice and to provide for fee notices (consistently with the *Legislation (Fees) Act 2019*).

#### Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

##### 1—Principal place of operations

This clause requires associations, should they primarily or solely operate in a single jurisdiction, to notify the Commission, in a form approved by the Commission, within 6 months of the beginning of the clause's operation.

2—Requirements relating to number of members

This clause provides that an association that was incorporated before the commencement of the amendments to section 18 of the *Associations Incorporation Act 1985* is not required to comply with section 18(4a) for a period of 12 months after the commencement of those amendments.

3—Requirements relating to Committee members

This clause provides that an association that was incorporated before the commencement of the amendments to section 29 of the *Associations Incorporation Act 1985* is not required to comply with section 29(1a) for a period of 12 months after the commencement of those amendments.

Schedule 2—Further amendments of *Associations Incorporation Act 1985*

1—Amendment of penalties

This clause amends the penalty provisions in the principal Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

## OPCAT IMPLEMENTATION BILL

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:21):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to implement the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in South Australia, and to make related amendments to the Mental Health Act 2009, the Police Act 1998 and the Youth Justice Administration Act 2016. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:21):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to finally introduce the OPCAT Implementation Bill 2021. The Australian government ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment in South Australia on 21 December 2017. The optional protocol is known as OPCAT.

The bill creates a new standalone act, the OPCAT Implementation Act, to give effect to South Australia's international obligations under OPCAT. In implementing OPCAT, state parties are required to establish one or more independent national preventative mechanisms (NPMs). Members can be well assured that I did not invent that description; it has come direct from Canberra. NPMs conduct regular and unannounced inspections of places of detention and closed environments where people are deprived of their liberty.

State parties are also obliged to facilitate international expert visits to domestic places of detention under the United Nations Subcommittee on Prevention of Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment. The Australian government is the state party for Australia. Australia is required to have implemented OPCAT, including the establishment of NPMs, by 20 January 2022.

The approach being taken to the implementation of the NPM obligation is a mixed model approach comprising a network of inspectorate bodies across the commonwealth, states and territories, which will be supported by national coordinating mechanism known as the NPM coordinator. The Australian government has nominated the Office of the Commonwealth Ombudsman as the NPM coordinator. In addition, the Commonwealth Ombudsman has also been designated as the NPM coordinator for inspecting commonwealth places of detention. This includes military detention facilities, immigration detention facilities and the Australian Federal Police cells.

The Australian government has taken the view that the implementation of OPCAT will initially focus on primary places of detention: adult prisons; juvenile detention facilities, excluding residential

secure facilities; police lock-ups or police station cells, where people are held for 24 hours or more; closed facilities or units, where people may be involuntarily detained by way of mental health assessment or treatment, where people are held for 24 hours or more; closed forensic disability facilities or units, where people are held for 24 hours or more; immigration detention centres; and military detention facilities. In accordance with this approach, the bill designates an NPM or NPMs for each of the primary places of detention.

The NPMs for correctional institutions will be the official visitors as provided for in the Correctional Services (Accountability and Other Measures) Amendment Bill 2021. There will also be an official visitor appointed as the NPM for prescribed custodial police stations. The NPM for training centres will be the training visitor, a centre visitor, under the Youth Justice Administration Act 2016 and the NPM for prescribed mental health facilities will be the Principal Community Visitor under the Mental Health Act 2009.

The government recognises that while the implementation of OPCAT will initially focus on primary places of detention, the implementation will be an iterative process. Additional places of detention will likely be included as the scheme evolves over time. This is similar to the approach taken by New Zealand when it implemented OPCAT in 2007.

In relation to both prescribed mental health facilities and custodial police facilities, the facilities that fall within scope are to be prescribed by regulation. It is the government's intention that prescribed facilities for police facilities will include lock-up or police station cells where a person is held for 24 hours or more. There are 19 facilities that are to be prescribed. The prescribed facilities for mental health facilities will include closed facilities or units where people may be involuntarily detained for 24 hours or more for mental health assessment or treatment. There are 18 facilities that are to be prescribed.

The primary function of the NPM under OPCAT is to undertake regular and unannounced inspections of places of detention, including their installations and facilities. The purpose of the inspections is to examine the conditions and treatment of persons deprived of their liberty. NPM functions are directed toward preventing ill-treatment and other human rights abuses from occurring. This is to be distinguished from other existing inspectorate bodies that exercise complaints and advocacy functions.

In recognition of this mandate, the bill makes related amendments to the Mental Health Act, the Youth Justice Administration Act and the Police Act to provide for the specific powers and functions of the NPMs, including to carry out regular unannounced inspections of places of detention, to conduct interviews with detainees and make inquiries about the detention of detainees, to require persons to answer relevant questions or produce relevant documents relevant to the NPM's function and to make reports and recommendations relating to the detention of people for those reports to be tabled in parliament. In addition, the bill provides for the independence of the NPMs and requires them to be provided with such resources that are reasonably required for the NPMs to exercise their functions effectively under OPCAT.

For the training centre visitor and the Principal Community Visitor, the bill sets out NPM powers and functions that are separate from the existing powers and functions of those inspectorate bodies. This has been done with a view to creating a clear legislative distinction between the existing powers and functions of these inspectorate bodies and their new NPM functions and powers. A similar approach has been taken with respect to the NPM for prescribed custodial police stations.

The bill takes a different approach in respect of the official visitor scheme in its role as the NPM for correctional institutions. For correctional institutions, the bill provides that the powers and functions of the NPM are as set out in the Correctional Services (Accountability and Measures Amendment) Act 2021. The government has taken this approach in recognition of the fact that the official visitor scheme is a new scheme, which has been specifically developed with the intention that it will be designated as an NPM under OPCAT.

Keeping our laws current and relevant is one of the Marshall Liberal government's key justice priorities. These reforms represent a unique opportunity to improve and strengthen independent oversight and monitoring of places of detention. The bill will support the establishment of robust methods of preventative inspection reporting to ensure that we have appropriate conditions and standards of care for people who are deprived of their liberty, and who are some of the most

vulnerable members of our community. With that, I commend the bill to members 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—Interpretation

These clauses are formal.

###### 4—Application of Act

This clause clarifies the relationships between this and certain other Acts.

##### Part 2—National Preventive Mechanisms

###### 5—National Preventive Mechanisms for specified places of detention

This clause sets out who the NPM is for the various categories of places of detention.

###### 6—Independence of NPMs

This clause provides for NPMs to be independent of any direction or control of government.

###### 7—Functions and powers of NPMs

This clause sets out the functions and powers of NPMs under the measure (including those set out in Schedules to the various Acts by Schedule 1 of this Act).

###### 8—Delegation

This clause is a standard power of delegation.

###### 9—NPMs may disclose information to other NPMs and NPM Coordinator

This clause permits an NPM to disclose information obtained in the course of performing their functions or exercising their powers to another NPM or to the NPM Coordinator (or both).

###### 10—Referral of matters to inquiry agencies etc not affected

This clause clarifies that the ability of an NPM to refer a matter to certain investigative and other agencies is not affected by this measure.

##### Part 3—Reporting

###### 11—Annual reporting by NPMs

This clause is a standard annual reporting requirement for NPMs.

###### 12—NPMs may prepare additional reports

This clause allows an NPM to prepare additional reports for the Minister responsible for the NPM.

##### Part 4—Miscellaneous

###### 13—Confidentiality

This clause is a standard confidentiality provision preventing disclosure of personal information except in the circumstances specified in the clause.

###### 14—Victimisation

This clause is a standard victimisation clause protecting people who provide information to an NPM.

###### 15—Obstruction etc

This clause creates an offence for a person to obstruct, hinder, resist or improperly influence an NPM in the performance of a function, or exercise of a power, or to attempt to do so.

###### 16—False or misleading statements

This clause creates an offence for a person to knowingly make a false or misleading statement in information provided to an NPM.

## 17—Protections, privileges and immunities

This clause confers protections from liability on people who answer questions, produce information or otherwise do things in accordance with the Act.

## 18—Review of Act

This clause requires the Minister to cause a review of the Act to be undertaken before the fifth anniversary of its commencement.

## 19—Regulations

This clause is a standard regulation making power.

## Schedule 1—Related amendments

## Part 1—Preliminary

## 1—Amendment provisions

This clause is formal.

## Part 2—Amendment of Mental Health Act 2009

## 2—Amendment of section 106—Confidentiality and disclosure of information

This clause amends section 106 of the principal Act consequent upon this measure.

## 3—Insertion of Schedule 1A

This clause inserts new Schedule 1A into the principal Act, setting out measures (including the functions and powers of the NPM) relating to the role of the NPM under the principal Act.

Part 3—Amendment of *Police Act 1998*

## 4—Insertion of Schedule 1A

This clause inserts new Schedule 1A into the principal Act, setting out measures (including the functions and powers of the NPM) relating to the role of the NPM under the principal Act.

Part 4—Amendment of *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016*

## 5—Amendment of section 49—Confidentiality

This clause amends section 49 of the principal Act consequent upon this measure.

## 6—Insertion of Schedule 1

This clause inserts new Schedule 1 into the principal Act, setting out measures (including the functions and powers of the NPM) relating to the role of the NPM under the principal Act.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

**LIQUOR LICENSING (COVID-19 AND OTHER MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 25 November 2020.)

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (17:30):** I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

**APPROPRIATION BILL 2021***Estimates Committees*

Debate resumed.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:30):** Before we broke, I started with some introductory remarks on the committee stage of the Appropriation Bill and you will be greatly relieved to hear they will not go on too much longer. The last thing I wanted to make mention of that came out during the estimates committees was some questioning around Lot Fourteen.

Unusually, when the Liberal Party came into government, the Lot Fourteen precinct was not only renamed in order to ensure that people who had an instinctive understanding of where the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site was could now be confused, having no idea where Lot Fourteen possibly was. Aside from that change in nomenclature, remarkably the most junior minister of the cabinet, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, the member for Schubert, delegated his responsibilities for that site to the most senior minister in the cabinet, the Premier.

On the face of it, you would think, other than that unusual aspect of a junior minister delegating to the most senior minister, maybe it was just to ensure that someone more senior and who had a greater number of staff at their disposal could ensure that things would proceed apace at Lot Fourteen.

Of course, the two signature projects, which the government took to the last election, to be delivered on that site were the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre, as it is now known, and also the new international culinary school which was to be an amalgamation of the Regency Park TAFE facility, which has served this state extremely well for decades and a private entity, Le Cordon Bleu, and \$60 million would be allocated to this project—\$30 million from the state government and \$30 million from the federal government in the City Deal, which I earlier referred to as receiving less funding than the Townsville City Deal, such is the close working relationship our Premier has with the Prime Minister.

Money was provided in the first budget of this government, the 2018-19 budget, to commence work on the culinary school. There were a couple of press releases put out, firstly by the Premier and then by the Minister for Innovation and Skills, the member for Unley, about the culinary school in the first half of 2019 and then it has been radio silence ever since. So I asked the Treasurer, 'As minister responsible for Renewal SA, whose responsibility it is to superintend the land itself down there, how is the culinary school going?' He said, 'We are reconsidering our plans about that.'

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** Half-baked.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, parbaked, as the member for Mawson says. Of course, very quickly after that revelation made its way into the media, a document was furnished from a source in the government, which was actually a cabinet document, an excerpt from a cabinet document, showing a list of cabinet decisions including one specifically relating to the international culinary school and that that school be scrapped and instead replaced with a new—and if I get the description of it right—cyber industries centre which presumably will give final breath to the Premier's commitments around Blockchain. So we are waiting for the new Blockchain facility to replace the now defunct international culinary school.

**An honourable member:** They will build the blocks there.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, that's right, they will build the blocks there, presumably in some sort of chain-like arrangement. That, of course, is not the only part of those two commitments that have stalled. Of course, the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Gallery is now approaching three years late and more than \$50 million over budget. It seems that the, at first, strange decision by the member for Schubert to upwardly delegate his responsibilities for the Lot Fourteen precinct to the Premier has resulted in two of the Liberal Party signature election commitments either stalling, in the case of the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre, and blowing over budget or just being scrapped altogether.

The City Deal was a National Partnership Arrangement entered into between the state and the federal government. The City Deal required the state government to undertake certain specific actions. Those actions were that by April of this year business cases for all the major elements to be funded from the City Deal, including the culinary school and the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre be finished, submitted and accepted by the federal government by April 2021, and that would trigger the first release of payments to the state government.

*The Advertiser* has asked the Premier's office: have those business cases been completed, have they been approved by the federal government and has money been provided by the federal government to the state? Of course, as we saw in question time today, the Premier's office is like the Premier—that is, evasive and not willing to answer those legitimate questions. So projects directly managed by the Premier himself and his team are either cancelled or have blown over budget.

I will conclude my remarks by speaking briefly about a couple of issues that are close to the heart of constituents in my electorate. Acting Speaker, I know you will be interested in these because you are a neighbour, on the other side of Grange Road now, and soon to be a little closer to Trimmer Parade after the next election with the change in the boundaries. You will be interested to know—in fact, you might have even been there I think a few Sundays ago—that the Deputy Premier finally announced that work would commence on the first stage of the Coast Park project between Semaphore Park and Grange.

Members may be aware that the Coast Park project, which was initiated nearly 25 years ago by former transport minister Diana Laidlaw and largely funded by councils, has been almost completely delivered, other than a couple of sections in the southern coastal suburbs and also this stretch in my electorate. It has been extremely difficult to get this project delivered in my electorate because there has been a small clutch of residents whose houses are built in these sand dunes who strongly oppose the building of this Coast Park project.

A former council, the City of Charles Sturt council, put together a reference group to examine how the Coast Park could be developed and that reference group reported not too long after the 2014 election. Unfortunately, in hindsight, the chair of the reference group and other members were property owners along that stretch of absolute coast.

I cannot help but feel that some members of that reference group who had those residences influenced the recommended option for the Coast Park; that is, it was not to be a Coast Park but a road park with the shared walking and cycling trail not to be along the coast, as it is for the remainder of the nearly 50 or so kilometres along Adelaide's coastline, but instead be along Military Road, taking it away from houses.

That is not acceptable to the community. I thought I would do what I could as a newly elected local MP and sit down with the residents who were in favour of it, sit down with the residents who were opposed to it and sit down with the interested community groups. Those are groups like the Tennyson Dunes Group, the Western Adelaide Coastal Residents Association (WACRA), even those residents who have formed their own environmental group to oppose things like the Coast Park, notwithstanding that they will be built immediately adjacent to the hundreds of tons of concrete, steel, glass and wood that comprise their own homes in the middle of the sand dunes. Nonetheless, they oppose further development next to their houses.

I tried—I tried for 18 months to negotiate an outcome that would see the Coast Park delivered—and failed. To give the City of Charles Sturt their due, they proceeded and tried to get this project underway. That same group of residents who have opposed this Coast Park took the council to the Supreme Court and tried to haul them over the coals for not meeting the letter of their own consultation policies. Unfortunately, the Supreme Court found in those residents favour.

When the former Labor government allocated nearly \$4 million, in addition to the nearly \$4 million the council had allocated to deliver the Coast Park in its entirety between Semaphore Park and Grange, it was thwarted by this legal action. I am pleased to say that the former Minister for Planning and the former Attorney-General, the former minister for Enfield the Hon. John Rau SC—

**An honourable member:** Of blessed memory.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —of blessed memory—brought a change to the Linear Parks Act into the house to enable a linear park to be declared in an area such as the area I am talking about, which would then enable the Coast Park to be built without the sort of legal action deliberately construed in order to frustrate a community project that the vast majority of residents in the western suburbs would like to see finished.

We had a change of government in the course of this Linear Parks Act passed by the former Labor government, laying the path (pardon the pun) for this project to be built. Unfortunately, the current government, sniffing the wind from some of those residents—not all—particularly in Tennyson and Grange along Seaview Road and in similar areas, and knowing they would oppose it, go out to consultation to declare this area a linear park but seek to declare a linear park only for the first part of the Coast Park project, the easy part, the Semaphore Park to Tennyson Park. That is what was announced a few Saturdays ago.

What the government is now saying about stage 2, the tricky part, the part that goes past the most vocal and wealthy opponents of this project, is that that this is now only 'possible', that we have

to have another round of consultation about whether we get on with this Coast Park or not. Well, enough is enough. The Liberal government is not committed to delivering the Coast Park in its entirety. That cannot be argued: they are not committed to it.

It is only 'possible,' according to the Deputy Premier and according to their candidates in the coming election. From the Labor perspective, we make the same commitment to the people of the western suburbs that we made at the last election: we are committed to delivering it, and we will deliver it between the houses and the beach, where the rest of the Coast Park has been delivered throughout metropolitan Adelaide.

Yes, there are, in an obscurity of lands titling, six properties that go down to the high-water mark on one portion of Seaview Road, which prevents the path from going in front of those houses. Notwithstanding those six properties, we will be delivering the Coast Park where we said it should be delivered at the 2018 election. That is a stark difference between the Labor Party's approach to the next election on this issue and the Liberal government's approach on this issue.

The Deputy Premier can stand up in here and make all sorts of claims about how she is committed to delivering the Coast Park, but the simple fact is that she is not. She has the power to do it. She had the power to go out and consult on the entire stretch, but she deliberately chose not to. She deliberately chose to avoid the hardest part of it, and now she has set in train a process, where this will deliberately not be resolved before the next election.

I say shame on this government. The former Labor government put in place the legislative changes and the funding to get this delivered, and in the last 3½ years it has been deliberately stalled by the Deputy Premier and other ministers in order to avoid what they think is going to be a backlash amongst a tiny proportion of residents. I have surveyed my electorate and 600 responses came back to that survey. All but six of them were in favour—all but six of them. They want this project delivered and they will not brook any further delay or obfuscation by this government.

*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. S.J.R. Patterson.*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:45):** I would like to make a brief contribution to the Appropriation Bill. The reason I need to do so is that there were some announcements during the estimates process that really upset my community, and I would like to focus perhaps on just one announcement.

In a media statement issued by the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, under the heading 'Hard work means fewer project delays despite COVID-19 pandemic', the minister tried to spin how he is going to sort these delays to the community. What has really angered my community about that is the delay in the electrification of the Gawler rail project and also his lack of commitment to improving the substitute bus services. Those two issues really did anger my community.

First of all, he played down the delay; in other words, it meant nothing and it was just a minor glitch in the system. But for the people who have had to put up with this delay for over 12 months—not a few weeks of the lockdown we have had—it really does grate on them.

Secondly, they have to put up with a substitute bus service, which has improved a bit after heavy lobbying by the community, but it is still not free and the reality is that for a lot of people it is still a lesser service in the sense that it can take up to 1½ to two hours to get to work. For those people who can catch the express services, it is not too bad, but there are those who cannot.

There are a lot of people who do not travel in peak times. Because of their work arrangements, they work different hours. A lot of people work outside of peak times. A lot of people do not have the advantage of a second vehicle. Often people who work as cleaners and other people are doubly punished by having to take a slow service to work early in the morning or late at night or even during the daytime.

In this three-page media statement, the Gawler project has one small mention. It is an insignificant little mention. I can assure you that the outrage of the community was palpable. The Facebook page put out by the local newspaper was inundated with complaints about the minister's refusal to even consider modifying substitute bus services to improve the quality of life of those people who live in that electorate, particularly a lot of students who try to balance study and work



commitments in part-time jobs to get ahead. The minister's treatment of this project, in the sense that he has not come clean and explained these delays, is really sad.

Another thing that needs to be mentioned is that there was no clarification about the future of Curtis Road—another hot-button issue in my community. People are now starting to believe very strongly that this government does not care about people in the northern suburbs. Certainly, the impression I get from all the survey work I am doing is that this government really does not care about Gawler and the northern suburbs and that is shown by the lack of investment in infrastructure in a whole range of areas.

For example, people are concerned about ambulance ramping in local hospitals, which continues despite the Premier giving a commitment that would be resolved. People are concerned not only about ambulance ramping but the lack of ambulances in our community too. We only have one unit in Gawler. If that is either ramped somewhere or taken somewhere else, our town is not covered by an ambulance service. We have an increasing number of stories about people waiting for an ambulance, causing quite a bit of stress and impacting on people's health and also their lives.

Throughout the whole process of estimates, what was really sad was that government ministers spent all their time trying to justify things which could not be supported. It also showed a certain disdain to make themselves accountable and the government accountable as well. That is certainly true about the issue of the electrification project. The minister was asked about when this was due, and we got the normal glib answer from the minister, 'Well, it's actually in the media statement. Look at page 24 or 25 of *The Advertiser*. It's in there'. It was a little story in there. The fact that he was not even prepared to be open and honest with the community shows the calibre of this minister.

Health, as I said, is an ongoing issue. There is also the issue that it is clear we need a major investment in infrastructure for what is a huge growth area. In Gawler and the northern suburbs, and also in my colleague's electorate of Taylor, we have some of the strongest growth areas in the state, and yet the social infrastructure is not keeping pace. Certainly, investment in our schools is not keeping pace. The investments in schools that are going on at the moment were investment commitments made by the prior government. There has been no new investment made by this government. All that is being done at the moment is the commitment which the previous government had made.

On the one hand, we have tens of million dollars being spent on new eastern suburbs schools, yet I have a school in my area which is literally boarded up because the buildings cannot be used because of a lack of investment in the school. With those few comments, the message certainly from my community about this government's Appropriation Bill is that the government certainly does not care about Gawler and the northern suburbs.

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:51):** I would like to speak briefly on the Appropriation Bill to make some reflections on what I learned in estimates when inquiring about some detail about the way in which money has been spent and plans to be spent. One of the issues that I was concerned about in terms of the local area for Port Adelaide is the treatment of the Australian Maritime and Fisheries Academy, which has been in Port Adelaide in the TAFE building—it is now a TAFE building in name only; the TAFE has been closed by this government—for some 20-odd years, offering a course, training people who are absolutely at risk if they are not well trained.

People who work in the maritime field are absolutely in danger if they are not properly trained in how to operate those vessels, yet the treatment of this government of that institution has been quite remarkable. It has been very dismissive and very high-handed. They are suddenly told, 'By the way, we won't be extending the lease. We've given this bit of the building away.' They have given it away to what they thought was Naval Group, although I believe it is possible that it is a subsidiary or a related company to Naval Group, perhaps a supplier. I do not have the detail unfortunately because the government has not been explicit.

In estimates, it turns out that in fact the Australian Maritime and Fisheries Academy still has a lease and subsequently has been offered an extension of that lease, but that had not been at all clear to Maritime Fisheries Academy, nor is their security of tenure, which enables them to invest in building up the number of students that they are able to train. I know that they wrote to the Premier

very concerned about this. They wrote several weeks ago and are yet to have any kind of reply to that letter that emerged in the media yesterday.

Another area that has been pretty badly treated by the training side of this government is Tauondi Aboriginal College. It is an institution that is a couple of years away from being 50, which is a very fine age to be.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Dr CLOSE:** Welcome. It is now on the verge of having to work out if it is going to be closing its doors. This is an institution that has trained many really significant Aboriginal leaders in South Australia. In fact, it has trained many significant Aboriginal people who have gone on to turn their lives around.

I met a woman who said that she had been working as a cleaner and was struggling to make ends meet. She had been taken into Tauondi College, gained a qualification and was now working her way through university in order to become a lawyer. The very significant role that it plays has been cut off by this government, just severed by this government. When I asked the Premier, as the Aboriginal affairs minister, there was absolutely no quarter given. There was no sense that this was a great tragedy to lose an institution like that, and I am sure that the Aboriginal people who heard those comments have taken that very much to heart.

A complete absence in the budget is the Port rail spur that had been committed to by the previous government. The contract signed was suddenly cancelled. The businesses in Port Adelaide who felt that they were able to invest on the basis that the government had committed to investing, that a contract had been signed, were devastated by the termination of that contract; the inexplicable and sudden severance.

Of course, sand carting came up as an issue. The local community were concerned that people involved in the community group, the reference group, were concerned to hear that the department does not consider it has any kind of written understanding with that reference group about how much sand is to be taken and under what conditions. I had some feedback about that, raising those concerns.

Mangroves are also in my electorate around St Kilda; that will be leaving my electorate at the election. We have lost some 10 hectares of mangroves at St Kilda. Some 35 hectares of samphire and saltbush area have died off as a result of what is clearly a transfer of highly saline brine from one area out into the mangroves. I cannot say exactly what has caused that, I can speculate, and I have heard the opinion and extremely well-respected views of local scientists, but I cannot say exactly what caused that, nor can I say that the action that caused it was approved by the government or consistent with the plan that the company has with the government, because the investigation is not yet complete.

It has been more than a year since locals started to notice the die-off, yet the minister was quite happy to say that the investigation would not be completed until at least the end of the year, which is disturbingly long, because not only do we need to know what happened but we need to be able to make sure that it does not happen again. There is a lot of brine that is within these salt fields and there is a lot sitting north of St Kilda that people are raising very serious concerns about.

I also raised some issues that stray outside my immediate electorate but of course are in my area of responsibility as the shadow minister. One is the question of the way in which Flinders Chase National Park has been treated. The government, as people will recall, approved a development that sits on clifftops, and the local friends of the national park group as well as environmentalists were appalled by this. They went on strike. It must have broken their hearts because they love that national park and want to do good work to support it. They also organised a legal campaign and were in court trying to say that this approval went counter to the management plan and, on my reading of it, it does.

I am not a lawyer, and I do not want to offer legal expertise or advice, but on a simple reading of the management plan of the park it was not consistent. They were in court about that when the government decided they would bring in a regulation that waived the normal planning process for approving and also waived the native vegetation clearance approval process that any other development would have to go through, so any private development over a million dollars in Flinders

Chase National Park would not have to go through those processes. I asked the minister if he was concerned that the approval was asked for and granted within a day, as I understand it, and he said no. The Minister for Environment did not find that surprising or disturbing at all.

Also, the marine parks were of concern to me. We have been waiting and waiting to see if this government is going to accept that there has been an accommodation reached between environmentalists and the commercial fishers over what the government wants to do to slash the sanctuary zones in the marine parks and to turn them over to commercial fishing. The two sides of this—the commercial fishers and the environmentalists—have done an incredible job working on an accommodation. They have reached one, as I understand it, and are sitting waiting for this government to determine whether or not it will adjust its management plan for the marine parks to reflect it. I did not get from the minister any sense of when that will be. What is the timing? When will we finally be able to put this to bed?

There is a question on Belair National Park. We know that the local community rose up and with almost one voice said, 'We do not want seven soccer pitches in the national park.' The minister in the press release had been spruiking this as part of his master plan—and the most significant change in the master plan—that this would be going in, saying that this would be using community infrastructure and be fantastic for the community.

Suddenly, he announced that he was not going ahead with that, that this was an idea that came up and was clearly not compatible and will not be moved forward after receiving all this feedback. When I asked him whether it was the case, perhaps, that the minister's office had put that into the management plan and had been the one to say that was a good idea rather than the department, the minister suggested that it was again a community reference group that had done that.

I have spoken to a couple of people in the community reference group, and it is not at all clear to me that that was what they thought was going on. They were not being asked to decide which ones were appropriate. They were being asked to give feedback, and they said, 'If you go ahead with this one, there will be trouble,' and trouble there was. It is very easy to try to make good announcements that you think everyone likes. It is owning them when they do not and admitting that you are changing your mind that shows true leadership.

Finally, the waste levy was jacked up a couple of years ago in the budget to a 40 per cent increase. The argument at that time was that this would help continue to drive down the amount of waste that goes to landfill. The anticipation for last year was that it would drop by 4,000 fewer tonnes going into landfill as a result of this increase in the levy. In fact, what we saw was a 37,000-tonne increase in a blowout in the amount of waste going into landfill.

In the budget papers, there was an explanation that was about construction. In the minister's answer, he did not think that construction was much of a problem and that it was more that people were cleaning out their sock drawers and eating more at home and not putting that into the green recycling. It is bad enough that it happened; it is even worse that we do not seem to know why.

My real question is: in noticing that this was happening, at what point did the government realise that there was a clear problem, that what ought to be resources, ought to be recycled as resources, was being tipped into landfill, where they are not only a complete waste but very, very expensive and collected by local government? Why did they not say, 'Perhaps we should be getting some information out. We should be doing something about this to make sure that those resources are captured'?

They seem to have just sat back and allowed it all to happen, and then we saw this 37,000-tonne blowout in the target. Whether I call them the highlights of the lowlights, they were the estimates experience, with that I conclude my remarks on the third reading.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (18:03):** I would like to make a contribution to this debate and acknowledge the work done in relation to the necessary passage of the Appropriation Bill and the matters that are before us. I have been listening with interest to a number of member contributions, and I see that the member for Lee just cannot help himself again. He gets it wrong again. I do not know why he does not check the record on these things.

In relation to the development of our coastal linear park along the northern part of the metropolitan coast, which traverses his electorate, the irony is that he does not appreciate that in this instance we are actually on the same side and that he and the people in his constituency might be well served to work with me and Mayor Angela Evans, who has been so supportive in her praise of the work we have done in this regard.

About 12 months ago, when I took over the role for planning, I found that we were getting this money back—of course, for the reasons the member has pointed out. There was litigation, the council lost and it all got too hard, and they said, 'Can you just take it over and deal with this matter?' I said, 'Of course. That's part of the deal. It's state money to come back. We will receive that money back and we will progress this matter as we can.' Consistent with the linear parks legislation, which the member also identified—

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Again, he interjects, 'When is it to continue?' and so forth. He just does not get it, does he? Let me just say, though, that I have actually put out a press release on this, it has been in the paper and it has actually been advertised. We are now at the stage where we are looking at the area, as he says, from the southern edge of the Tennyson Dunes Conservation Reserve to Terminus Street in Grange as the part of the next coastal linear park for consideration. As he would know, if he has even read the Linear Parks Act—I do not know—but he mentioned it in his contribution about the importance of my predecessor, the Hon. John Rau, who had progressed that.

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I am very happy to make it QC. As you know, we have passed legislation that allows me, in fact requires me, to present that. I think I have sent that message very clearly. If Mr Rau is listening intently to this debate, I am more than happy to present here—I do not think he will. I think he is in that locked-in set for the SC group, but I am always open to consider his application and progress it if he would like to come up in the world. In any event, let me get back to the coastal linear park and the importance of it.

When this legislation was passed, if members would like to have a look at this legislation, it set out a process by which a linear park is to be approved. Part of that requires that whatever the park parameters are have to go through a process, including public consultation, and the consultation—

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

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Lee, I felt I was very considerate of you during question time.

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** You threw me out.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Yes, I know, member for West Torrens. You were my first, in fact. Anyway, I will come back to this, Attorney. Member for Lee, you made a lengthy and considered contribution without any interjection, so I would appreciate—

*Members interjecting:*

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That's not the point. I would appreciate it if you gave the Attorney the same courtesy.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Congratulations on your contribution to the management of the house today too. It has been very good.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It is not over yet.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, I am on my best behaviour. The member for Lee did this back on 8 June and he throws this out there as though this is some major problem. We have had a process. Indeed, I have had all the same groups he has referred to in my office with the Department of Transport when we were dealing with the area that has been opened up by me and the mayor.

Recently, we were down there to officially announce the conclusion of that exercise. Mayor Evans came down to be part of that important part of the project.

Since that time—in fact, last week—I made a further announcement that the public consultation in relation to the area from Grange to Tennyson is now open. It closes on 17 September. There is a required period available. That has to be done, and the statute actually requires it. I cannot just skip over it, but I do not want to anyway. I think it is important that we invite all those people, including the member for Lee's constituency, firstly to go online to our new PlanSA portal and the information is all available there, with lovely maps and areas to have a look at, including the special park area that is protected. The member refers to some of his residents—I think they are in his electorate—who traverse the sand. The boardwalk cannot come around the front, but there is a proposed detour behind those houses.

All of that is available on the website. I would encourage his constituency, together with, I think, half a dozen people who apparently in his survey did not like this idea of having it, to all go online and have a say about it. We need to have a contribution here as to the proposed area and layout of the linear park, areas they want me to particularly take into account in considering the approval of any linear park and what protections they might look to for dune coverage, vegetation, habitat, etc. These are all matters that are critical to the residents who live there and also to those who would visit.

These parks have been so popular that they attract people from all over the state. When people come to visit our coastal parts of metropolitan Adelaide, they rejoice in being able to have access to these areas. They have been a huge success in other areas, all the way down to Aldinga, and we would like to ensure that we go through the proper legal process. We are doing that right now. Submissions close on 17 September.

I urge the member for Lee to hop online and send me a note about whatever he would like me to consider—what colour cement, what colour boardwalk, what trees. I am not big on Manchurian pear trees, as I have often said in this house, but I am happy to look at any other seaside vegetation that you might want to make a contribution on.

In this instance, notwithstanding now two bites of concern in a contribution to this house by the member for Lee, we are actually on the same side. I look forward to the day when there is further and new infrastructure that is being completed. The member for Lee might even like to come down to have a walk along the boardwalk at some stage and certainly bring his children and family. We would be very happy to show him what work is being done.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (18:10):** Estimates was an interesting process I thought this year, sir, ably chaired in committee A by you. Can I say, sir, in your final year in parliament, I think you have shown the entire chamber and all those who observe the parliament what a capable chair you are and you will be missed.

*Mr McBride interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** No, he did not kick me out. He would have liked to but he did not. But he is, despite the hard time that I give him, very good at his job and I want to thank him for his service. Hopefully, we will get some time at the end of the year to talk about members who are not recontesting but, if we do not, I want to put on the record my admiration for your service in a very dignified way. I think you are a good example to all members in this house about the true meaning of public service, so thank you very much.

Having said that, sir, I do not think the same could be said about the minister I was examining in committee A, the honourable Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. I think it is fair to say that that day we saw a minister who was not on top of his brief, unable to give direct answers to direct questions, probably someone who had not read the budget papers, probably someone who did not understand how to read the budget papers and probably someone who did not really understand the government's program.

More or less, in my opinion, from the way he conducted himself, he needed advice on every single answer. The reason he needed advice on every single answer was not that he just did not know the answer to those questions but that he wanted to waste time. You can tell who the confident ministers are. They are the ones who instinctively know the answer to the question, who have read

their briefing papers in advance, who understand what they were able to achieve through the budget process and what is in the budget papers and who are the masters of their own destiny.

I do not see that in the member for Gibson. I do not see that in the way he conducts himself as minister. The reason that is shown out is by the accusations against him, which are growing day by day. The accusations against him, I think, show a minister who is frustrated and angry when he is questioned because he does not understand his role.

The minister made a policy decision in this budget to take away about \$2.1 million or \$2.3 million that is allocated each and every year to sporting organisations that operate on a basis of being not for profit. He has reallocated that money or a portion of that money, a large portion, to other organisations for the first time. It is fair to say that that decision has sent shock waves through volunteer sporting organisations across South Australia. Now, \$2.1 million is a large amount of money, but in the consideration of the overall budget it is relatively small, which shows you the impact it has had, that the minister has decided that he would intervene in this small amount of money from a policy perspective to reallocate that money to organisations that are for profit.

When he did that, and that overarching organisation that represents those bodies complained—because, let's face it, if your funding model to provide volunteer services to volunteer sports is based on getting your money from the government and that government makes that cut, it is very difficult to then face that power and criticise it, which is why community groups go to their member of parliament or organisations go to a governing body. There are industry bodies all across South Australia that are big enough and ugly enough to be able to take on governments. That is why they are there.

I know this because I saw it with some organisations that were unhappy about the former government's policy decisions. Rather than individual members standing up, they had their overarching industry bodies do it for them. This is no different. So, when Sport SA went to see the minister to discuss this radical change in funding that is going to volunteer organisations like Triathlon SA and small groups that do not get large advertising revenue or membership fees from people who participate in those sports, they were met with a barrage of abuse, so much so that they complained. When they complained, that complaint became public and now the minister is suing them. He is suing the CE of a volunteer sporting organisation.

That legal action that the minister is taking—sorry, I should say concerns about this issue. He is beginning the process of taking defamation proceedings against Ms Leah Cassidy. That process, in my opinion, is designed to silence and intimidate other people from speaking out, 'You get cut in the budget and you criticise us, you will get sued. So do not criticise us. Keep your mouth shut before the election. Do not speak up.'

There is something about the culture of the cabinet that does not like dissent. I have heard it from other industry associations. I have heard it from a number of them getting phone calls from prominent ministers, disappointed that that industry association or that industry group may have criticised a government decision. For all of us, that means very little because we are used to it. We work in an environment that is designed for conflict. Look at the way the seats are set out here—it is an adversarial system of politics. But if you are an industry group and you have a senior minister call you, who you rely on as a regulator, someone who sets your taxation rates, someone who sets the ability for you to operate, and you get one of these phone calls, it would be very intimidating.

That goes to what I saw at Hove. At Hove, there were a number of people who took up their legitimate democratic rights to protest about a piece of infrastructure they thought would adversely impact their local community, and the response from the government on that was, 'How dare they? Woe is me. Woe is the minister. The poor minister and the poor minister's family.' Using your family to defend yourself I think is unfair on the family and unbecoming. The idea of saying, 'Remember my family was subjected to such and such' as a political defence is not on. Our family members are civilians and should not be involved in any political defence or attack.

These community members I have spoken to, person after person after person, have told me about the processes of the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport in dealing with infrastructure programs. He refused to meet with them as a group. They had organised themselves, as is their right, into an action group. I think they were called the Hove residents' action group and they wanted

to meet with the minister, have a public meeting and invite other local residents in his constituency to attend. The minister refused to do it. He said, 'No, I won't meet with people in a group and I won't meet with people in a public meeting. I do all my consultations one on one.' You have to ask yourself why; why would someone want to do the consultations one on one rather than meet with a delegation?

I will give you a few reasons. One is that there are no witnesses other than your Chief of Staff or your own staff, and it can be quite intimidating to see a minister and their Chief of Staff or departmental officers when you are on your own. What we got out of these meetings, what I have heard, are accusations of bullying and intimidation—bullying and intimidation, in his own local community, of local constituents.

It is fair to say that I do not think that is the last we will be hearing about complaints about the member for Gibson and his conduct and the way he administers his portfolio. I think the man is out of his depth, and when you are out of your depth sometimes you lash out, sometimes you get angry—and I think we are seeing that play out. To be fair to the member for Gibson, it is not his fault. He was promoted above his abilities by the Premier, and the Premier should know better. He should not have appointed a man like the member for Gibson to that portfolio, because his portfolio is one of the most important in government.

The current shadow treasurer, as the former infrastructure and transport minister, delivered the Torrens to Torrens project under budget and on time; Darlington; the Northern Connector. He went about doing media conferences, went about dealing with issues that had legacy issues (members might remember the tram issue where the wind had knocked over the guard railing). He dealt with all those issues and never once lashed out; there were no accusations like those we have heard with this minister. He was able to conduct himself in a high-pressure portfolio. What we have seen with the Premier's appointments to this portfolio are two failures.

I go now to the member for Schubert, who is leaving us. He will go down in South Australian political history as the first minister to be found guilty of misconduct under the ICAC Act. Just for those who follows this, misconduct, in the ranking of offences, is higher than maladministration, and it is no small feat to be found guilty of misconduct.

Just think about what the member was found guilty of: he did not even read the act that governs his ability, or lack of ability, to appoint or dismiss members of the Adelaide Cemeteries Authority—basic governance. I agree with the Ombudsman in that it is not that serious in terms of misappropriation of money, but my point is that in terms of governance it is staggering. When you are appropriating—how much are we appropriating today? What is the appropriation value?

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

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** So here we are appropriating \$16 billion, and in that appropriation we are seeing ministers who have governance over that appropriation. The estimates role is not only to examine the decisions of the government through a committee process but also to examine the people who have these commissions from the government. It is public scrutiny. That is what this room, these parliaments, are designed for: public scrutiny of the executive and the expenditure of the money.

I have to say that in the portfolio areas I had since we have been in opposition, of the two ministers who have held probably one of the most important portfolios one lost his job and I think the other one is in a lot of trouble. The front page of *The Advertiser* showed that the minister who is administering what he claims is the largest infrastructure spend in South Australia's history is suing a very small organisation and a CE for standing up for volunteers. I wonder if there are more. What happens if more come out?

The minister gave us a number of assurances in estimates about that investigation. One is that he said he would cooperate in full with that investigation, and the second is that he told us, in estimates, that he would answer all their questions. He said he would not claim privilege on any documents.

Importantly, the minister made it very clear that he did not instruct his department or his CE in his department to exclude Sport SA from an online meeting regarding the most recent COVID-19 lockdown. He made these statements unequivocally in the parliament and I would be very interested to see what happens over the next few days about Mr Wingard and his comments in the parliament

and whether Mr Wingard will be facing any more accusers, because I think this minister is hanging by a thread and that thread is under extreme pressure; one more cut, one more accusation, one more proved allegation, and I think it is time for this minister to go.

I also want to point out to the house what a farce the minister has made of Erma Ranieri's investigation, launched by the Premier, into the allegations against him. A complaint is made to the Premier about his minister's conduct. The Premier then somehow decides to choose the public sector commissioner to conduct this inquiry who has no legislative basis for investigating a minister. That is point one. Nevertheless, that is what he has chosen.

The public sector commissioner has no expertise in investigating accusations like this because it is a minister, so she has hired a private investigator. That is not a criticism of Ms Ranieri. She is a highly qualified public servant I have a great deal of regard for. I would just point that out. She is conducting that investigation and it is ongoing.

To pre-empt that investigation, the minister has now launched legal proceedings that go to the heart of the allegations because he claims the allegations are defamatory. It is the investigation that will decide whether or not these allegations are proven or otherwise, but the minister now is launching legal action.

The minister tells us he is not using any government money for this action and he has not received an indemnity. We do not know because every time we ask the Attorney-General whether any government ministers have received government indemnities, we do not get any answers. We do not know if the member for Schubert received an indemnity in his legal action defending himself against the ICAC referral to the Ombudsman in the inquiry that found him guilty of misconduct. We do not know. They will not tell us. This is public money and every time we ask these questions in estimates we get absolutely no answer.

Then of course we saw the Attorney-General in estimates answering questions and making statements, claiming them to be fact, and then we hear on radio those facts questioned. To be clear, I am not making an accusation that the Deputy Premier has misled the parliament—yet. However, if it is found that ministers during estimates made comments that were not accurate, this house has a responsibility to the people of South Australia to do something about it because when you are appropriating \$16 billion—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** It is \$17 billion.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** \$17 billion—and spending commonwealth money and state money raised through federal and state taxes, the very least we should expect from this parliament is that the ministers who answer those questions do so honestly. Sometimes they can make mistakes. Make no mistake—people can get answers wrong unintentionally. That is different. No-one would want a minister to resign because they have made an unintentional error. We are all human. We all make mistakes. It is the deliberate ones that we are interested in. It is the deliberate misleading.

I recently had the opportunity to debate the honourable Minister for Infrastructure and Transport at the Civil Contractors Federation. It was a good debate. It was in all the very best of spirits. The point I wanted to make there is the point I want to make to the house in the last minute and a half that I have.

The government has, I think, quadrupled South Australia's state debt. The budget papers in the risk statement show that a 1 per cent increase in interest rates will see our interest bill increase by a quarter of a billion dollars per year. At the end of the forward estimates, our interest bill under our current borrowings will reach nearly a billion dollars per year in interest on the debt we have with the current interest rates we have.

The question I posed to the people at that debate was: if the biggest infrastructure program this government has is the tunnels, who in that room thinks they are going to get the contract to build the tunnels? If you do not, do we have the capacity to continue borrowing more to keep on building more, to keep on building infrastructure, with the current debt burden this Premier, this Treasurer and this infrastructure minister are leaving us? If interest rates do ultimately go up—and in my



experience they ultimately always do—what will be this state's interest burden courtesy of the Marshall Liberal government in only three years?

We were on track in the last Labor budget at the end of the forward estimates to have the second lowest debt levels in Australia. Now we have some of the highest. I will be very interested to see how much of that money will be spent here in South Australia and how much will go to the interstate contractors building one massive tunnel.

**Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (18:31):** If the budget estimates process was to illuminate the plans of this government for health care in our west, my constituents and those of the member for Lee and the member for West Torrens should not have held their breath. We know when it comes to health in the western suburbs that this government have tapped the mat. They have tapped the mat and they are not interested anymore. They are not even pretending to try.

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Like the Repat that you closed.

**Mr SZAKACS:** The Attorney is showing her sense of geography once again. I might start with The QEH. It was funded in 2017 by the then Labor government. What do we have to show for it? We have delays, and we have a cost increase, which is the tax on the inaction of this government—a huge cost increase.

The one promise the government did say they would match, which Labor were very proud to commit to, was a revamped, renewed rebuild of the outpatients facility sitting in the oldest, most run-down building—in fact, noncompliant even from a disability perspective—in the entire SA Health capital assets, and that is the tower block. What have they done? It is gone. There we go: the outpatients facility, the one promise that the government announced, is gone.

Then there is the COVID testing clinic down in the west. What do we know about the COVID testing clinic in the west? It was closed without notice, without any explanation. In fact, the explanation we got was a lovely cute little emoji on a window that said 'COVID clinic closed'. Has there been a replacement? Absolutely not.

When it comes to the COVID vaccination hub, the west is nowhere to be seen, despite the fact that Labor have been calling for this continuously, despite the fact that there is a fitted out, lovely badged, pretty floor at The QEH, which was ready to go for a COVID vaccination hub. It is not to be seen in the west. That is incredibly disappointing because the vaccination rates in the west—in fact, in four of the suburbs that I represent in the electorate of Cheltenham—are amongst the 10 lowest vaccinated in the state.

This is not because we are stuck with a bunch of crazy conspiracy theorists who are anti-vax. Absolutely not. What we are faced with in the west is a wonderfully diverse community, 40 per cent of whom are born overseas, many of whom are not proficient in the English language and many of whom do not have the privilege of a car they can drive around in. Instead of making vaccinations easier for the western suburbs for those communities that are calling for assistance, we see nothing. They have to jump in the car or jump on four buses to get to Wayville. It is just not good enough.

It is the personal stories that I and many of us in this place, certainly on our side of the chamber, hear daily. These are the stories of our residents, our local constituents, who have been stuck in this roundabout within SA Health, cancellations of critical surgery and lack of ability to get in to see a specialist. The Premier might not care, the health minister might not care, but I think it is only fair that those stories, those people, are heard in this chamber—because I care. We care on this side of the chamber, and those people deserve to have their stories spoken of and heard in this chamber in a time and in a place where the government simply cannot walk away.

Those are the stories like that of Michael of Queenstown, who has lived with a bicuspid aortic valve for most of his life. In January 2021, his specialist advised that urgent surgery was required, classified as a category 1 procedure, and referred him to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. He had to wait until 1 April, some four months later, only to be told at that point what he already knew: that he needed urgent surgery.

After follow-up appointments on 9 April for an angiogram and on 15 April at the Royal Adelaide Hospital cardiothoracic clinic, his surgery was finally booked for 27 April. On 27 April, the day of surgery, after waiting six hours, Mr Lloyd was told he needed to go home because there was an emergency, and his surgery was rescheduled for 4 May. He was notified only five days prior to

the surgery that his procedure would again be pushed back, this time to 6 May. Remarkably, he was contacted the day before this surgery to cancel the procedure again because they did not have enough staff to undertake the surgery. Finally, Mr Lloyd had his surgery on 11 May, only after my intervention, 5½ months later for a category 1 cardiac surgery.

I have also met with Moira of Rosewater, who has suffered heavy and prolonged bleeding for many months now. On 13 April, an ultrasound identified a tennis ball size cyst and a polyp. Ms Victory was recommended to undertake, again, a category 1 medical procedure. Following this, she had an appointment on 20 April at the Women's Health Service in Port Adelaide. This was cancelled. On 21 April, Ms Victory was referred to North Adelaide Obstetrics and Gynaecology, but they refused to see her, even for a consultation, because she did not have private health insurance.

On 21 May, Ms Victory finally saw a specialist at, this time, the Women's and Children's Hospital, where it was determined, once again, what we all know, that she needed urgent surgery. She was phoned an hour later to be told that this surgery would not be performed. The Women's and Children's, unfortunately, she was notified, would not be able to undertake the surgery, or did not have capacity to undertake the surgery, because of her bariatric condition.

On 6 June, Ms Victory was referred to The QEH, only to be told on this day that this appointment would need to be cancelled. On 17 June, she was rescheduled for another appointment at The QEH, but again the appointment was cancelled on the day and she was referred to the emergency department. Imagine that: imagine turning up for what is now the fourth scheduled appointment and being pushed to an emergency department, wheeled over to the emergency department. There would have been ambulances ramped outside, beds full of patients seeking acute mental health assistance because they have nowhere else to go, and a woman, a local resident who is in desperate need of planned surgery, is told that she now needs to present as an emergency patient. It is just unacceptable.

On 29 June, Ms Victory was referred for further tests, but on 23 July, again just two hours before confirmation of her procedure, she was phoned to be advised that it was cancelled. I wrote to the minister back in June about these delays and cancellations, and neither I nor Ms Victory have heard anything since—nothing since.

There is also John of Alberton, who was diagnosed with mouth cancer in 2005. He was scheduled to undergo reconstructive surgery on 22 March 2021, but that was cancelled. His rescheduled appointment on 3 May was also cancelled. When I wrote to the minister, I was advised that his surgery had been rescheduled to 12 July. He was contacted on 9 July to discuss his pre-surgery requirements. He then presented to the RAH as advised on 12 July and completed his admission forms. After waiting for over an hour, he was advised that the surgery had been cancelled this time due to a shortage of beds. No date was rescheduled and no appointment was given to him. Once again, I wrote to the minister on 12 July and have yet to receive a response.

The same sort of story can be heard from Debra of Alberton. She had a fall in 2020 and was advised that she required knee replacement surgery. She was even told by her doctor to purchase private health insurance to avoid extremely long wait times, wait times that no doubt would be alleviated if you listened to the clinicians, if the Liberal government did not break their promise to rebuild the outpatients clinic at The QEH. Sadly, Debra, like many vulnerable South Australians, cannot afford private health cover, so she continues to struggle on crutches, and use a wheelchair to get around in the community, just to take a shower.

I heard from Mark of Woodville. He was advised by The QEH to contact me because of the extraordinarily poor experience his son had had at the hospital. His son was one of those many patients I spoke of who was admitted with acute mental health issues. On 12 April, Mark's son was directed to The QEH for a mental health assessment by his GP. He presented to the ED at 11.30am and was there until 6.30am the next day: he had waited for over 30 hours. During this time, he was visited twice; the rest of the time he was left alone in a bed in the ED. Disgusted, Mark took his son home and was advised by staff on the way out that some mental health patients on that very day had waited three days for a bed.

Sadly, I could go on and on, and it is stories like these that are becoming all too familiar in South Australia under the Marshall Liberal government's stewardship. Too many people are waiting

too long for recommended procedures. They are waiting too long for necessary procedures, only to have their appointments cancelled and rescheduled multiple times due to the lack of beds and lack of resources in our health system. It is shameful and it is simply unacceptable.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (18:42):** I am happy to conclude, and I thank all members for their contribution in relation to the Appropriation Bill.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (18:43):** I move:

That the remainder of the bill be agreed to.

Motion carried.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (18:43):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 18:45 the house adjourned until Wednesday 25 August 2021 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING**

**484 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (12 May 2021). How many residential buildings have been assessed by councils in South Australia as having aluminium composite panels that require replacement?

- (a) How many dwellings are there in these buildings?
- (b) Has there been any cost estimates provided to the government for the replacement of these panels?
- (c) Has the government investigated providing any support to the owners of these buildings for the replacement of these panels?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised by the Minister for Planning and Local government:

The state government called for a thorough and comprehensive cladding audit of high-rise residential and assembly buildings across South Australia.

The South Australian Building Cladding Audit focused on residential buildings more than two storeys in height, and motels, hotels, aged-care facilities, hospitals, schools and assembly buildings. The initial review identified 172 privately owned buildings as being of potential interest. Following further investigation, 161 buildings were confirmed as having aluminium composite panels (ACPs) attached to their facades; 79 of these are residential buildings.

Initially, 28 privately owned buildings were identified as high or extreme risk requiring remediation (21 high risk and seven extreme risk). These were mainly apartment (residential) buildings.

As at June 2021, the total number of privately owned buildings identified with ACP has reduced to 152. Three buildings remain rated extreme, four buildings rated high (due to a recently identified new building), and 54 rated moderate.

The confirmed buildings have been reviewed by Council Building Fire Safety Committees, in collaboration with the relevant fire authorities (the Metropolitan Fire Service or Country Fire Service), to determine acceptable options of remediation.

Many of the buildings have had their original level of risk lowered following the provision of additional information such as annual maintenance reports and information about the flammability of the cladding product itself.

Residential Buildings:

Seventy-nine residential buildings remain on the South Australian Building Cladding Audit Register. Three buildings are rated extreme risk; two are high risk; 25 are moderate risk; and 49 have achieved an acceptable risk rating of low and do not require any further action. Seven of these residential buildings have completed their remedial works; in some instances, this has included the removal of ACPs. Options for the remaining buildings are at various stages of investigation to determine the next steps in order to reduce the risk to an acceptable level.

**SPORTS VOUCHERS**

**494 Mr DULUK (Waite)** (13 May 2021). How many applications for the sports vouchers program were received from the electorate of Waite in the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):**

2018-19: 1,470.

2019-20: 1,649.

**SPORTS VOUCHERS**

**495 Mr DULUK (Waite)** (13 May 2021). How many sports vouchers were granted to applicants in the electorate of Waite in the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):**

2018-19: 1,470.

2019-20: 1,649.

**SCOUTS SA**

**496 Mr DULUK (Waite)** (13 May 2021). How many state government funding (across all agencies) did Scouts SA receive in the 2018-19 and 2019-20 financial years?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I am advised:

The Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing funded Scouts SA through the Active Club Program:

- 2018-19: \$35,000
- 2019-20: \$40,000

Scouts SA were eligible for this program because they are a not-for-profit active recreation and a community organisation that deliver active recreation services in South Australia. While eligible for the Active Club Program, Scouts SA currently do not meet the eligibility of other programs.

#### SPORTS VOUCHERS

**497 Mr DULUK (Waite)** (13 May 2021). Will the sports voucher program be extended to cover activities provided by Scouts SA and Girl Guide participants?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** The current purpose of the Sports Vouchers program is to increase the number of children playing organised sport or participating in dance activities by reducing cost as a barrier. As it stands, Girl Guides and Scouts offer much broader outcomes than just sport, and as such are not considered solely dance or sport providers.

I will continue to work with the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing and the community to further improve the Sports Voucher Program and ensure the vouchers remain accessible to as many people as possible. We are continually looking at opportunities to develop and expand the program to get kids active.

#### AGED-CARE PACKAGES

**505 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (25 May 2021). How many of the 80,000 aged-care packages announced in the 2021 federal budget are earmarked for South Australia? How many approved applications here in South Australia will remain unsupported?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The number of packages attributed to each jurisdiction has not yet been released by the commonwealth government.

#### AGED-CARE WORKERS

**506 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (25 May 2021). In light of the Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety, which stated, 'The sector exploits the good hearts of the low-paid workers most of whom are women,' what assurances can this government make to guarantee aged-care workers in South Australia will benefit from the increase in funding announced in the 2021 federal budget?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Aged care and the implementation of the federal budget are federal government responsibilities. Aged-care workers in state-run facilities are supported by enterprise bargaining arrangements.

#### GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

**509 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (27 May 2021). What has been the total spend on advertising, promotions and communications across the health portfolio for each of the following years, (not related to COVID-19):

- (a) 2018?
- (b) 2019?
- (c) 2020?

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

- (a) In 2017-18 the total cost of:
  - a. communications staffing across SA Health was \$4,340,000.
  - b. advertising media buy across SA Health was \$3,455,494.
- (b) In 2018-19 the total cost of:
  - a. communications staffing across SA Health was \$4,150,000.
  - b. advertising media buy across SA Health was \$1,919,980.
- (c) In 2019-20 the total cost of:
  - a. communications staffing across SA Health was \$4,072,000.
  - b. advertising media buy across SA Health was \$3,059,262.

**AFFORDABLE HOMES PROGRAM**

**511 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). For the past 10 years, can the minister provide the number of homes offered for sale under the Affordable Homes program (now known as HomeSeeker SA) in each individual year broken down by:

- (a) those offered for sale by the SA Housing Authority?
- (b) those offered for sale by private vendors?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The number of homes offered for sale by the SA Housing Authority under the Affordable Homes program and HomeSeeker SA has reduced over recent years due to the significant reduction in the sale of public housing by the Marshall Liberal government.

The Marshall Liberal government is now boosting opportunities for affordable housing purchase through the Affordable Homes Initiative, which will build and offer for sale 1,000 affordable homes to eligible South Australians over five years.

The number of homes offered for sale under the Affordable Homes Program and HomeSeeker SA are:

Year	SA Housing Authority	Private vendors
2020-21	96	425
2019-20	90	270
2018-19	187	337
2017-18	256	157
2016-17	240	270
2015-16	351	266
2014-15	398	197
2013-14	397	93
2012-13	408	116
2011-12	424	114
Total	2,847	2,245

Figures include homes offered for sale from the Affordable Housing Initiative.

**AFFORDABLE HOMES PROGRAM**

**512 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). For the past 10 years, can the minister provide the number of homes sold under the Affordable Homes program (now known as HomeSeeker SA) in each individual year broken down into:

- (a) those sold to eligible purchasers under the income thresholds?
- (b) those sold to other purchasers?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

As the previous Affordable Homes program had become dated and was no longer attractive to many potential purchasers, the Marshall Liberal government launched HomeSeeker SA in February 2021. The new program is more effective at linking eligible buyers to affordable properties, boosted by affordable supply generated by the SA Housing Authority with longer listings (extension from 30 days to 90 days) to enhance opportunities for eligible households.

The increase in the total number of sales to eligible purchasers in 2020-21 coincides with the successful launch of HomeSeeker SA and a renewed interest from South Australians in accessing affordable housing.

Sales outcomes of homes listed under the Affordable Homes Program and HomeSeeker SA:

Year	Sold to eligible purchasers within exclusive listing period	Sold outside exclusive listing period
2020-21	207	314
2019-20	55	305
2018-19	103	421
2017-18	148	265
2016-17	170	340
2015-16	218	399
2014-15	296	299
2013-14	276	214
2012-13	240	284
2011-12	224	314
Total	1,937	3,155

Figures include homes listed from the Affordable Housing Initiative.

Figures include homes under offer, pending settlement and sold.

Data on homes sold outside the exclusive listing period is not reported. Homes could have been sold to either a purchaser who meets the eligibility requirements, or does not meet the eligibility requirements, or the property was withdrawn from the program and sold at a later date.

#### AFFORDABLE HOMES PROGRAM

**513 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). For the past 10 years, can the minister provide the number of homes sold under the Affordable Homes program (now known as HomeSeeker SA) in each individual year broken down by:

- (a) those offered for sale by the SA Housing Authority?
- (b) those offered for sale by private vendors?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The number of homes offered for sale by the SA Housing Authority under the Affordable Homes program and HomeSeeker SA has reduced over recent years due to the significant reduction in the sale of public housing by the Marshall Liberal government.

The Marshall Liberal government is now boosting opportunities for affordable housing purchase through the Affordable Homes Initiative, which will build and offer for sale 1,000 affordable homes to eligible South Australians over 5 years.

Number of homes sold to eligible purchasers within the exclusive listing period<sup>1</sup> through the Affordable Homes program and HomeSeeker SA:

Year	SA Housing Authority	Private vendors
2020-21	60	147
2019-20	40	15
2018-19	88	15
2017-18	126	22
2016-17	109	61
2015-16	151	67
2014-15	182	114
2013-14	202	74
2012-13	181	59
2011-12	171	53
Total	1,310	627

Data on homes sold outside the exclusive listing period is not reported. Homes could have been sold to either a purchaser who meets the eligibility requirements, sold to a purchaser who does not meet the eligibility requirements, or the property was withdrawn from program and sold at a later date.

Figures include homes under offer, pending settlement and sold.

Figures include homes sold from the Affordable Housing Initiative.

#### AFFORDABLE HOMES PROGRAM

**514 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). With regard to the Our Housing Future 10-year housing strategy's 20,000 'affordable housing solutions':

- (a) What is the definition of a 'housing solution'?
- (b) How does the definition of 'housing solution' differ from 'house', 'dwelling' or other terms for residential accommodation?
- (c) What is the minimum tenure requirement for something to be deemed a 'housing solution'?
- (d) What is the minimum physical requirement for something to be deemed a 'housing solution'?
- (e) Why doesn't the strategy refer to 20,000 'additional' housing solutions?
- (f) What is the baseline number of projected affordable housing outcomes/solutions over the period of the strategy subcategorised into the eight groupings/categories listed under substrategy No. 2 on page 26 of the Our Housing Future?

(g) What is the additional number of affordable housing solutions that are associated with actions in Our Housing Future that were not announced until the release of Our Housing Future?

(h) How many 'housing solutions' have been delivered under each of the eight groupings/categories listed under substrategy No. 2 on page 26 of the strategy?

(i) How many 'housing solutions' have been delivered under each of the eight groupings/categories listed under substrategy No. 2 on page 26 of the strategy in each of the following periods: from the release of the strategy to 30 June 2020; from 1 July to 31 December 2020; and from 1 January 2021 to today?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

An affordable housing solution is an initiative, product or service that contributes to a customer achieving an affordable housing outcome such as purchasing an affordable home or securing affordable rental.

Our Housing Future 2020:2030 outlines the number of projected affordable housing outcomes.

The Marshall Liberal government is well underway in delivering affordable housing solutions.

#### HOUSING AUTHORITY

**515 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). What was the approved annual maintenance budget for the SA Housing Authority in each of the financial years: 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21?

(a) What was the actual maintenance expenditure for the SA Housing Authority in each of the five years referred to above (with expenditure for 2020-21 being expenditure up to and including the date of this question)?

(b) How does the minister reconcile budgeted and actual maintenance expenditure with the minister's public comments regarding the agency's \$115 million annual maintenance budget?

(c) What are the differences between the actual maintenance expenditure (provided in response to these questions) and those included in the SA Housing Authority's audited financial statements (signed by both the chief executive and chair of the board)? Can the minister please provide an explanation that reconciles any differences?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

(a) SA Housing Authority's total expenditure for maintenance on housing stock it manages was:

Year	Budget	Expenditure
2016-17	\$129.9m	\$129.4m
2017-18	\$125.4m	\$126.0m
2018-19	\$129.6m	\$127.9m
2019-20	\$131.9m	\$130.8m
2020-21	\$151.9m	\$124.7m

Budget and expenditure figures exclude stimulus and refurbishment programs.

Expenditure figures as at 31 May 2021.

(b) The budget for annual maintenance programs (capital and recurrent) for public and state Owned and Managed Indigenous Housing averages \$115 million per year for the past four years. This does not include additional housing stimulus spending or other specific maintenance programs/projects.

(c) Maintenance figures published in the South Australian Housing Trust's audited financial statements relate to recurrent (expensed) maintenance and do not include capital maintenance spending, neither for the annual capital program nor for other capital maintenance projects.

#### SA HOUSING AUTHORITY

**516 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). With regards to the claimed \$550 million investment in housing by the government, announced in December 2019, please provide a breakdown of:

(a) Projected value of land contributions?

(b) Projected value of cash contributions?

(c) Projected value and type of other contributions?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The SA Housing Authority are undertaking planning activities for the full delivery of initiatives outlined in Our Housing Future.



**HOUSING AUTHORITY**

**517 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). With regards to the claimed \$550 million investment in housing by the government, announced in December 2019, how much of the invested resources have been, or are projected, to be sold?

1. With regards to sales, can the minister provide an annual budget for each year over the period that investment and sales are scheduled to occur?
2. After accounting for sales, what is the projected net investment (total assets invested balanced against total projected sales revenue)?
3. Can the minister advise the source of the land for the 1,000 new affordable homes to be constructed and exactly how many allotments of SA Housing Trust land will be sold to support this project?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

I refer the member to my answer to question on notice number 516.

**HOUSING TRUST**

**518 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). Up to November 2014, Housing SA delivered services and managed assets on behalf of the SA Housing Authority. After this time, Renewal SA and Housing SA managed separate matters under agreements with the SA Housing Trust. Can the minister provide (either for 1 November 2014 or 30 June 2014 depending on data availability):

- (a) Total number of homes that were owned and managed by the South Australian Housing Trust?
- (b) Total number of head tenants and extra persons (being the total number of declared residents) residing in homes that are owned and managed by the SA Housing Trust?
- (c) Total number of staff (by FTE and headcount) attached to the South Australian Housing Trust?
- (d) Total number of SA Housing Trust employees on South Australian Executive Service contracts?
- (e) Total number of SA Housing Trust employees with a base pay above \$100,000 per annum?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Data for (b) and (e) is not available. The remaining data is available in the 2013-14 South Australian Housing Trust Annual Report.

**HOUSING TRUST**

**519 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). For today, or 30 June 2020 depending on data availability, can the minister provide:

- (a) Total number of homes that are owned and managed by the South Australian Housing Trust?
- (b) Total number of head tenants and extra persons (being the total number of declared residents) residing in homes that are owned and managed by the SA Housing Trust?
- (c) Total number of staff (by FTE and headcount) attached to the South Australian Housing Trust?
- (d) Total number of staff on South Australian Executive Service contracts?
- (e) Total number of staff with a base pay above \$100,000 per annum?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

This information is available in the South Australian Housing Trust annual report 2019-2020 and state Budget Papers.

**HOUSING AUTHORITY**

**520 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). In view of the minister's pledge to establish a new Housing Authority, can the minister confirm that 'SA Housing Authority' was simply added as a business name to the existing South Australian Housing Trust Australian business number registration on 11 July 2018?

1. Can the minister advise exactly what legal changes were made to the SA Housing Trust Act 1995 that differentiates the new legal structure from the previous legal structure that had existed for decades?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

All required legal changes to establish a new Housing Authority were undertaken.

**DISABILITY SERVICES**

**521 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). How many individuals have been escorted and supported for respite holidays from state government operated supported disability accommodation in:

- (a) 2018-19?
- (b) 2019-20?
- (c) 2020-21?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Department of Human Services does not collect this data.

**PASSENGER TRANSPORT ACT, PROSECUTIONS**

**522 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (9 June 2021). When did the last prosecution take place for a breach of compliance under the Passenger Transport Act?

1. How many taxi drivers have been prosecuted since 2015?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised that as at 18 June 2021:

1. 10 June 2021.
2. Fifty-seven (57).

**CROWN LAND**

**523 The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (9 June 2021). When does the minister intend to respond to the correspondence from Mr Phaeton Angelo of Specialty Foods Pty Ltd dated 7 May 2021 in relation to the disposal of Crown land at 8 West Thebarton Road, Thebarton?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have provided a response to Mr Phaeton Angelo, and staff from the Department for Environment and Water have met with Mr Angelo of Specialty Foods Pty and discussed the land in question.

**SPECIALTY FOODS PTY LTD**

**524 The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (22 June 2021). Will the minister commit to a prompt response, enabling Specialty Foods Pty Ltd to make timely and important planning decisions for the business?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

Since receiving correspondence from Specialty Fine Foods Pty Ltd on 7 May 2021, staff from the Department for Environment and Water have met with Mr Phaeton Angelo of Specialty Foods Pty to discuss his business proposal.

**SPECIALTY FOODS PTY LTD**

**525 The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (9 June 2021). Are there any issues or obstacles in relation to the disposal of the Crown land to Specialty Foods Pty Ltd, and if so, what are those obstacles?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

The Crown land that Specialty Foods Pty Ltd has identified is currently leased.

**SPECIALTY FOODS PTY LTD**

**526 The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (9 June 2021). Will the minister commit to working with Specialty Foods Pty Ltd in relation to their expansion plans that will enable the company to employ more staff, expand operations and production capacity and capability?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

Staff from the Department for Environment and Water have already met with Mr Phaeton Angelo of Specialty Foods Pty Ltd and are providing him with support in relation to the proposed expansion plans of the company.

**AMBULANCE RAMPING**

**527 Mr PICTON (Kaurua)** (10 June 2021). What was the longest ambulance response time to a Priority 2 ambulance patient, in hours and minutes, for each month for the past 12 months?

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

SAAS performance against its KPIs is published periodically.

**HOSPITALS, SECURITY**

**529 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (10 June 2021). For each of the past 12 months how many Code Black (security incidents) events were called at each of the major metro hospitals (Royal Adelaide Hospital, Lyell McEwin Hospital, Flinders Medical Centre, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Noarlunga Hospital, Modbury Hospital, Women's and Children's Hospital, Glenside Hospital, Hampstead) on a month by month breakdown?

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

	Code Blacks								
	RAH	LMH	FMC	TQEH	NH	MH	WCH	GH	HRC
12 Month Total	3583	2486	2499	858	410	518	723	251	22

**HEARING HEALTH**

**531 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (24 June 2021). Is addressing hearing conditions such as otitis media, one of the ways the government is looking to reduce Indigenous incarceration rates?

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

SA Health works closely with Aboriginal community controlled health organisations and communities to promote the benefits of ear health screening with the aim of increasing these health checks.

Ear health screening for Aboriginal populations features as part of the Medicare Item No. 715 health check.

The Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services has been advised that on entering the prison system, all prisoners are assessed in conjunction with the South Australian Prison Health Services, and private prison health officers.

A range of health services are available for prisoners. Any medical issues, including those that relate to audiology and/or issues of the ear, are referred to health staff.

In relation to reducing Indigenous incarceration rates, the Department for Correctional Services (DCS) continues to progress the 'Reducing Reoffending: 10% by 2020' ('10by20') strategy.

The 10by20 strategy is currently demonstrating a downward trend in reducing recidivism.

The Marshall government is also providing programs designed for Aboriginal offenders such as the 'Violence Prevention Program—AM', a culturally informed program for Aboriginal men with a significant focus on cultural identity.

The government has provided DCS with funding for several budget initiatives as part of our ongoing commitment to 10by20, in addition to Closing the Gap strategies to reduce the rate of Aboriginal reoffending and overrepresentation in the criminal justice system.

**HEARING HEALTH**

**532 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (23 June 2021). What role does poor hearing, particularly induced through lack of attention to conditions such as Otitis Media, play in retarding and impeding learning in both Indigenous and non-Indigenous students and what measures are in place in the education department to alleviate the loss of education?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education):** I have been advised of the following:

In addition to the information I have already provided; it is well known that hearing loss can have a severe impact on an individual's development and education. The impact on language development which has implications on reading and writing, is well documented and has the potential to effect literacy long-term and negatively affect employment and life prospects.

The Department for Education has a number of initiatives to support children and families affected by hearing loss from diagnosis through the Early Intervention Service and through detection with the screening of Indigenous student hearing on the APY Lands and in the metropolitan area. These screening programs provide referrals for medical intervention and further audiology support through Hearing Australia.

In addition, the department provides statewide specialist support through Special Educators Hearing who offer support to children, families, preschools and schools from diagnosis through to the end of schooling.

Four Centres of Deaf Education and 2 specialist preschool programs are in place providing inclusive support to children and students with severe hearing loss.

In recognition of the need for specialist support required by those with hearing loss the department funds staff members wishing to learn Auslan and offers scholarships to teaching staff to gain a master's qualification to become a Teacher of the Deaf.

**DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION, STAFF TRAINING**

**534 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many staff have had manual handling refresher training at supported disability accommodation sites in:

- (a) 2018-19?
- (b) 2019-20?
- (c) 2020-21?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

- (a) 506.
- (b) 572.

(c) In 2020-21, DHS made a policy change to upgrade Manual Handling refresher training with Advanced Manual Handling training and this is required every three years.

#### **DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION, STAFF TRAINING**

**535 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many staff have had advance manual handling training at supported disability accommodation sites in:

- (a) 2018-19?
- (b) 2019-20?
- (c) 2020-21?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The number of staff completing Advanced Manual Handling refresher training was:

- (a) 153.
- (b) 168.
- (c) 609.

#### **HOUSING INFRASTRUCTURE FACILITY SCHEME**

**536 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). With regard to the five year contract signed between the South Australian Housing Authority (SAHA) and the National Housing Finance and Investment Corporation (NHFIC) as part of the \$1 billion national Housing Infrastructure Facility Scheme:

- (a) What proportion of the scheme is loan?
- (b) What proportion of the scheme is grant?
- (c) For loans, who is paying, what is the repayment schedule and what is the interest rate?
- (d) Where SAHA is repaying, has any new money been provided by the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF) to cover repayments?
- (e) Where SAHA is repaying, what is the difference in interest rate on money held in the bank and money taken on loan?
- (f) For the 600 homes:
  - i. How many will be retained as public housing?
  - ii. How many will be other social housing?
  - iii. How many existing social housing properties will disappear?
  - iv. How many of the 600 homes will be sold?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The \$45 million infrastructure funding agreement between the National Housing Finance and Investment Corporation (NHFIC) and the South Australian government provides debt and grant funding for infrastructure works needed for new housing, including roads, water, sewerage, electrical, communication and remediation.

The infrastructure funding will support the SA Housing Authority to deliver the Neighbourhood Renewal initiative, which will deliver a mix of social housing, affordable housing and market housing in the Blair Athol, Felixstow and Woodville Gardens urban renewal projects. It will renew concentrations of aged SA Housing Authority (the authority) assets over a five-year program and increase social housing outputs. The initiative will deliver 146 social housing outcomes from 101 existing properties.

The authority will partner with builders and developers to deliver renewal projects, providing significant stimulus to the residential construction industry. The initiative will increase housing diversity, tenure diversity and

improve neighbourhood amenity within renewal projects. New social housing delivered within the renewal projects will be designed to better meet the needs of current and future authority tenants.

The loan between SA Housing Authority and NHFIC contains standard terms. The agreement provides a net operating benefit to SA Housing Authority, with interest repayments and additional staffing resources offset by the receipt of grant funding. SA Housing Authority will begin loan and interest repayments when they apply to access funding from the facility. A concessional variable interest rate applies to the term of the loan.

#### GOODWOOD RAILWAY STATION

**537 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (24 June 2021). With regard to the scheduled \$5 million upgrade to Goodwood Railway Station under the railway Station Refresh program:

1. What specific work will be undertaken at Goodwood Railway Station?
2. Will:
  - (a) new shelters be funded?
  - (b) new seating be provided?
  - (c) new bins be provided?
  - (d) any new safety measures be provided?
  - (e) new lighting be provided?
  - (f) painting be done?
  - (g) landscaping or greening be done?
  - (h) any public art be provided?
3. When will the work commence?
4. When will the work be completed?
5. Will there be any stages in the work? If so, what will each stage involve?
6. Will there be a community consultation regarding the upgrade? If so, when will this community consultation commence?
7. How will community consultation be conducted? Who will be included in the community consultation?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The \$5 million committed towards the upgrade of the Goodwood Railway Station forms part of the \$99 million Station Refresh program, announced in the 2021-2022 state Budget.

The scope and extent of works to be delivered is currently being assessed.

It is proposed that the works will be undertaken in conjunction with the Mike Turtur Bikeway Overpass Project, which is expected to begin in early 2022 (after detailed design is finalised later this year).

The engagement strategy will be informed by the defined scope of the project and the proposed construction methodology. Engagement will form an important component of the project and we look forward to connecting with the local community.

#### WOODLANDS PARK RAILWAY STATION

**538 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (24 June 2021). With regard to the scheduled \$1.5 million upgrade to Woodlands Park Railway Station under the railway Station Refresh program:

1. What specific work will be undertaken at Woodlands Park Railway Station?
2. Will:
  - (a) new shelters be funded?
  - (b) new seating be provided?
  - (c) new bins be provided?
  - (d) any new safety measures be provided?
  - (e) new lighting be provided?
  - (f) painting be done?
  - (g) landscaping or greening be done?

- (h) any public art be provided?
3. When will the work commence?
  4. When will the work be completed?
  5. Will there be any stages in the work? If so, what will each stage involve?
  6. Will there be a community consultation regarding the upgrade? If so, when will this community consultation commence?
  7. How will community consultation be conducted? Who will be included in the community consultation?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The \$1.5 million committed towards the upgrade of the Woodlands Park Railway Station forms part of the \$99 million Station Refresh program, announced in the 2021-2022 state budget.

The proposed scope for the Woodlands Park Station refresh includes a new shelter, new furniture (seats and bins) and LED upgrades to the existing lighting. Also proposed are works to improve the asphalt surface, installation of tactile ground surface indicators along with platform line marking and fencing and painting of platform faces so as to improve the overall appearance of the station. Given that the platform is an island platform there is very little scope for landscaping within the rail corridor.

The works are proposed to be undertaken in the 2021-22 financial year with planning and long lead procurement currently underway. The works will be undertaken in accordance with Department for Infrastructure and Transport station standards and will be delivered to minimise disruption to the travelling public.

#### STATION REFRESH PROGRAM

**539 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (24 June 2021). Will any other railway stations in the southern suburbs, other than Goodwood and Woodlands Park stations, receive upgrades under the railway Station Refresh program up until 2025? If so, which ones?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The Station Refresh program is aimed to target all stations across the network that have not been rebuilt, upgraded or refreshed in recent years, and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport are currently undertaking further assessment to develop a list of priority stations.

#### STATION REFRESH PROGRAM

**540 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (24 June 2021). Will any other railway stations in the southern suburbs, other than Goodwood and Woodlands Park stations, receive upgrades under the railway Station Refresh program, or any other funding line or program, up until 2031? If so, which ones?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** I have been advised:

The initial commitment for the Station Refresh Program will address all stations on the Seaford, Flinders and Belair lines (in addition to the Gawler, Outer Harbor and Grange Lines) that have not been rebuilt, upgraded or refreshed in recent years.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport will undertake a prioritisation process across the network in the coming years and develop business cases for further upgrades over and above the initial refresh.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**541 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing homes currently require maintenance?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority (the authority) has recently completed inspecting its stock as part of the Asset Condition Inspection Survey (the survey), delivering on a key Marshall Liberal government election commitment to initiate a full condition assessment of SA Housing Authority-managed properties within 30 days.

The Survey has generated key information on asset viability that is being analysed by the Authority.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**542 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing homes have more than one maintenance issue raised at their property?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority is unable to provide an exact figure as the number of outstanding orders include maintenance works which may have been attended to and completed by a multi trade contractor, but the authority has not yet been notified of its completion.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**543 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing homes have had maintenance completed on their home in the past 12 months from 1 July 2020?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

31,657 SA Housing Authority properties had maintenance works completed during 2020-21.

This included a significant number of properties that had capital upgrades and preventative maintenance completed as part of the Marshall Liberal government's record investment in maintenance and renewed focus on strategic and planned maintenance.

Urgent maintenance identified through this government's Asset Condition Inspection program was also undertaken, as we begin to address the maintenance backlog left by the former Labor government.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**544 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing homes have had multiple maintenance completed on their home in the past 12 months from 1 July 2020?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

26,307 SA Housing Authority properties had two or more maintenance works completed during 2020-21.

This included a significant number of properties that had capital upgrades and preventative maintenance completed as part of the Marshall Liberal government's record investment in maintenance and renewed focus on strategic and planned maintenance.

Urgent maintenance identified through this government's Asset Condition Inspection program was also undertaken, as we begin to address the maintenance backlog left by the former Labor government.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**545 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing homes maintenance jobs have been commenced and then left incomplete in the past 3 months:

- (a) In category P1?
- (b) In category P2?
- (c) In category P3?
- (d) In category P4?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority does not report on this data.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**546 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing homes are currently unoccupied as of 24 June 2021?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Data as at 24 June 2021 is not available.

The number of vacant properties in an area fluctuates regularly, depending on how many households leave or move to other public housing, and the progress of maintenance and upgrades. The majority of vacant properties are unoccupied for short periods and become offerable following routine maintenance. In some cases, offerable properties may remain vacant for longer periods of time due to location and/or desirability by prospective tenants, or if the authority plans to significantly upgrade, redevelop or sell the site.

I am pleased to let you know that the Marshall Liberal government invested \$142 million in 2020-21 in maintenance, upgrades and renewal of public housing to ensure our homes are fit for purpose. During this time the properties remain vacant to ensure works can occur, however, hundreds of newly renovated properties have recently been completed and are being offered to new tenants.

**PUBLIC HOUSING**

**547 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing habitable homes are unoccupied as of 24 June 2021?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

I refer the member to my answer to question on notice number 546.

**PUBLIC HOUSING**

**548 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing homes needing significant upgrade (estimated cost more than \$10k) are unoccupied as of 24 June 2021?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority does not report on this data.

However, I am pleased to inform you that as at 30 June 2021, there was 273 properties undergoing major or capital works as part of the Marshall Liberal government's record maintenance investment.

**PUBLIC HOUSING**

**549 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many public housing homes needing minor upgrades are unoccupied as of 24 June 2021?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority does not report on this data.

**PUBLIC HOUSING**

**550 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many attempts to undertake maintenance work in a public housing property has resulted in a non-access report in the past 12 months from 1 July 2020?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

12,102 maintenance works orders resulted in non-access during 2020-21.

**PUBLIC HOUSING**

**551 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). As of 24 June 2021, how many people are in the following categories for Housing SA public housing:

- (a) Category 1?
- (b) Category 2?
- (c) Category 3?
- (d) Category 4?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The number of registrations for public housing has decreased by 20 per cent under the Marshall Liberal government, from over 20,000 registrations under the previous Labor government.

As at 30 June 2021, there was 16,613 applicants on the housing register for public housing.

Category	Applicants
Category 1	3,293
Category 2	4,451
Category 3	8,807
Low demand or no category assigned	62
Total	16,613

**EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION**

**552 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many hotel rooms are being funded for use as emergency accommodation as of 24 June 2021?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:



SA Housing Authority has an approved panel of 23 hotel/motel providers that are under contract to provide emergency accommodation. When clients are approved for emergency assistance, one of the approved panel suppliers is utilised. The panel providers are funded to provide rooms as required.

#### EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION

**553 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many individuals are being supported within hotel rooms (total number of people being accommodated) as of 24 June 2021?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority does not currently report on this data.

#### EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION

**554 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (22 June 2021). How many of the following are being accommodated in hotel accommodation as of 24 June 2021:

- (a) Children under the age of 18?
- (b) Men?
- (c) Women?
- (d) Individuals who do not identify as male or female?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority does not currently report on this data.

#### FRUIT FLY

**555 Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (24 June 2021). What portion of the \$33.3 million total spend for the eradication program of fruit fly is allocated to:

- (a) The purchase of traps?
- (b) Bait costs?
- (c) Production of sterile fruit fly?
- (d) Wages?
- (e) Advertising?

How many traps have been infested upon collection?

**The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):**

- 1. Almost all of it.
- 2. There is no data available because the contents of the traps can't be identified.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**556 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). As of 24 June 2021, how many people are in the following categories for Housing SA Public Housing:

- (a) Category 1?
- (b) Category 2?
- (c) Category 3?
- (d) Category 4?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

This question has already been responded to and I refer the member to my previous answer to question on notice No. 551.

#### EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION

**557 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). How many hotel rooms are being funded for use as emergency accommodation as of 24 June 2021?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

This question has already been responded to and I refer the member to my previous answer to question on notice number 552.

#### EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION

**558 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). How many individuals are being supported within hotel rooms (total number of people being accommodated) as of 24 June 2021?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

This question has already been responded to and I refer the Member to my previous answer to question on notice number 553.

#### EMERGENCY ACCOMMODATION

**559 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). How many of the following are being accommodated in hotel accommodation as of 24 June 2021:

- (a) Children under the age of 18?
- (b) Men?
- (c) Women?
- (d) Individuals who do not identify as male or female?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

This question has already been responded to and I refer the Member to my previous answer to question on notice number 554.

#### HOUSING AUTHORITY

**560 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). What is the total cost of agency staff being used by the SA Housing Authority for the financial year 2020-21?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority expenditure on agency staff is not yet available as it is subject to the completion of year-end accounting processes. The expenditure will be available in the 2020-21 South Australian Housing Trust Annual Report.

#### HOUSING SA

**561 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). Can you provide a breakdown of the Housing SA maintenance budget as provided over the forward estimates into yearly baseline for maintenance and other stimulus (such as COVID stimulus) for the financial years:

- (a) 2021-22—\$133.7m?
- (b) 2022-23—\$133.0m?
- (c) 2023-24—\$132.9m?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority's maintenance budget for 2021-22 is:

- Public and state-owned and managed Indigenous housing—recurrent and capital: \$115.9m.
- \$75 million capital investment: \$6.5m.
- National Partnership Remote Housing: \$11.2m.

The breakdown of maintenance budgets over the forward estimates are estimates only, and subject to change.

#### PUBLIC HOUSING

**562 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). Can you provide a breakdown for new builds over the forward estimates by public housing, affordable housing and proposed location(s) for new builds for the financial years:

- (a) 2021-22—\$145.9m.
- (b) 2022-23—\$168.4m.
- (c) 2023-24—\$104.2m.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The number and location of new builds within each program is not available over the forward estimates as scheduling and tendering is not complete.

#### HOUSING SA

**563 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). Of the 200,000 work orders raised each year, how has the budget been spent on Housing SA maintenance each year for the last 3 years 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21?

- (a) How many orders are completed of the 200,000 each year?
- (b) Of 200,000 work orders, how many properties does this account for (properties with multiple work orders or single)?
- (c) How many Housing SA properties did this lead to being fixed up to be inhabited again?
- (d) As of 30 June 2021, what was the backlog of outstanding work orders?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

(a) The number of maintenance orders completed each year is not available as multi trade contractors (MTC) may have completed the required works, but not returned their invoice for payment prior to the end of financial year.

(b) Over the past three years, an average of 32,900 properties had maintenance works completed each year. This includes a significant number of properties that had capital upgrades and preventative maintenance completed as part of the Marshall Liberal government's record investment in maintenance and renewed focus on strategic and planned maintenance. Urgent maintenance identified through this government's Asset Condition Inspection Program has also been undertaken, as we begin to address the maintenance backlog left by the former Labor government.

(c) Over the past three years, an average of 2,900 houses became vacant each year and received vacancy maintenance before they were re-allocated.

(d) SA Housing Authority is unable to provide an exact number of outstanding orders as maintenance works may have been completed by a multi trade contractor, but the authority has not yet been notified of its completion.

#### HOUSING SA

**564 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale)** (21 July 2021). How has the budget been spent on Housing SA new builds each year for the past 3 financial years 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21?

- (a) How many two-bedroom houses were built?
- (b) How many three-bedroom houses were built?
- (c) How many houses in total were built?
- (d) What suburbs have these been built in?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority new builds over the past three financial years have been constructed in various locations across metropolitan Adelaide and regional South Australia, with a majority of properties having two bedrooms.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND WHARF FACILITY

**565 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson)** (20 July 2021). With regard to the Smith Bay Wharf:

- (a) Why haven't you made a decision about whether the Smith Bay wharf should or should not proceed?
- (b) When will you be making a decision?
- (c) Do you have a conflict regarding the decision-making process around this proposal?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** On August 9 2021, I announced my decision to refuse the application by Kangaroo Island Plantation Timbers to build a deep-water port facility at Smith Bay, Kangaroo Island.

#### REGIONAL LANDSCAPE LEVY

In reply to **Mr ELLIS (Narungga)** (9 June 2021).

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water):** I have been advised:

The government's intention is to equalise the levy collected by councils during the transition period, with equalisation achieved through the Levy Transition scheme by the end of the 2022-23 financial year.

#### **MOUNT GAMBIER, PUBLIC HOUSING**

In reply to **Mr BELL (Mount Gambier)** (22 June 2021).

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

SA Housing Authority's head contractors for maintenance services tender is for maintenance on all public housing properties across the state.

The amount of maintenance expenditure over the contract period will be dependent on future responsive maintenance requests from public housing tenants, future planned programmed and vacancy maintenance.

#### **HOUSING SA**

In reply to **the Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (24 June 2021).

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government):** The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The SA Housing Authority sells South Australian Housing Trust (SAHT) properties on the open market to support its financial viability. I am pleased to inform you that under the Marshall Liberal government, the number of financial viability sales of SA Housing Authority reduced by 77 per cent from peak sales in 2013-14 under the former Labor government.

The SA Housing Authority last sold three homes in June 2020 and has not sold any since. This is in stark comparison to the previous Labor government, which sold an average of 12 homes in Port Pirie each year during their final term in government.

The number of vacant properties in an area fluctuates regularly, depending on how many households leave or move to other public housing, and the progress of maintenance and upgrades. The majority of vacant properties are unoccupied for short periods are offered following routine maintenance. In some cases, offerable properties may remain vacant for longer periods of time due to tenant choice, or if the authority plans to significantly upgrade, redevelop or sell the site.

I am pleased to let you know that the Marshall Liberal government invested \$142 million in 2020-21 in maintenance, upgrades and renewal of public housing to ensure our homes are fit for purpose. During this time the properties remain vacant to ensure works can occur, however, hundreds of newly renovated properties have recently been completed and are being offered to new tenants.