

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 16 May 2018

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. A.L. McLachlan)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:16): I lay upon the table the first report of the committee.
Report received.

Ministerial Statement

MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:17): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on the subject of a secret Labor deal for the motor vehicle registry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: On 10 August 2017, the former Labor government privatised the Lands Titles Office in a deal which saw the Land Services SA consortium (LSSA), a consortium made up of Macquarie Infrastructure and Real Assets and the Public Sector Pension Investment Board, pay \$1.605 billion to be the exclusive provider of land transaction and property valuation services for the state for 40 years.

What was not disclosed was a secret deal that the LSSA paid \$80 million as part of the \$1.605 billion to the state to be granted an exclusive right to negotiate for the further privatisation of other state registry functions, such as the motor vehicle registry, currently managed by DPTI, and any other registry managed by the state. This deceit is clearly demonstrated by the press release from former treasurer Tom Koutsantonis on 10 August 2017, which only indicated:

The Government will receive \$1.605 billion in an upfront payment which includes certain optionality for the Life of the Contract.

There was no reference at all to the possible privatisation of the motor vehicle registry. In return for the \$80 million, the state is contractually obligated to use 'reasonable endeavours' to undertake necessary preparatory work to make a decision on whether or not to commence a formal process to privatise the management of the motor vehicle registry. The state is required to complete this task by 12 October 2020.

This secret deal will now require the government to undertake a scoping study for the privatisation of the motor vehicle registry. I am advised that the following functions are likely to be required to be included in the scoping study: software and hardware required to manage TRUMPS; direct technical support staff and back office support; customer service delivery, including processing registration and licensing transactions, handling customer inquiries, inspecting vehicles and conducting identity assessments, conducting driver licence tests, delivering the Rider Safe training program; and delivering personal/customised plates, known as EzyPlates.

Further, if the state proposes to privatise the management of any other state registry during the 40-year term of the LSSA agreement, LSSA has an exclusive right to negotiate with the state to be appointed as a service provider in relation to that registry. The state and LSSA must then reasonably endeavour to enter into binding contractual agreements.

I am further advised that if the state and LSSA do not enter a privatisation agreement for the motor vehicle registry by 12 October 2020 or the state appoints a third party to manage the motor

vehicle registry before this date, then the state must elect to either repay LSSA the \$80 million, including interest charges at 10 per cent per annum, or grant LSSA an additional seven-year extension to the existing 40-year term of the land services agreement. Therefore, the total repayment in 2020 under this secret deal, if the government does not proceed with the privatisation, could be up to \$104 million.

The government will seek further commercial and legal advice regarding the state's options associated with this contract and the actions it must undertake to fulfil the obligations committed to but not disclosed by the previous Labor government in this secret deal. It is now in the public interest—and also for transparency and accountability—that former ministers Tom Koutsantonis and Stephen Mullighan reveal publicly why they kept this deal secret.

The Marshall government makes no criticism of LSSA in relation to this deal. The Marshall Liberal government will now pursue what is in the best interests of the South Australian taxpayer, and I will return to this place and update the parliament at an appropriate time.

VISITING DELEGATION FROM BRITTANY

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:22): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to a visiting delegation from the region of Brittany made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Premier.

Question Time

OVERSEAS TRADE OFFICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment.

1. Has the government any costings for the new trade offices they have committed to establishing in Japan, Malaysia, the UAE, the US and Shanghai?
2. When does the minister think these offices will be up and running?
3. Will these offices utilise local employees, and what is the process to recruit such staff?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:23): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. Certainly, we committed, as an election commitment, to opening five new trade offices: Shanghai, Tokyo, Kuala Lumpur, Dubai and somewhere in the US—obviously a major city, but in the election commitment we didn't indicate which city that would be.

As members would know, I went to Shanghai, Guangzhou, Shandong and Jinan about three weeks ago to start that process. One of our commitments was to start that process before the 100 days elapsed—in the first 100 days. As yet, we don't have any firm costs on any of those particular offices. We have some preliminary options that are being prepared for the Shanghai office. Clearly, China and the United States are our two biggest markets and the ones we are having a focus on, looking at how we might be able to bring those to reality as quickly as possible.

One of the issues we have is the former government closed a lot of these offices, particularly in China. You need to have a business licence or an operating licence in China and, as members would know, you can offend the Chinese government quite easily. Of course, closing an office and walking away has, in effect, offended them—a loss of face is the term that's often used. It's not just a matter of turning up and saying, 'Well, we want to open an office', and being able to do so. So we are working through the process of applying for a licence.

The Chinese Ambassador to Australia met with the Premier a few weeks ago. The Premier made it very clear that it was a new government, that we are actually wanting to do business with China, we weren't turning our back on them like the previous government had done and that we were very keen to reopen a trade office. So we are working through those issues in relation to the business licence and how we might be able to open an office, maybe even prior to that, maybe using some other way of opening the office but ultimately, I think, we will need to get our licence.

When I was in Shanghai I met with a number of ministers from the other states and they said it could take between 12 and 18 months to get that licence in place. That does present somewhat of a challenge for us but, nevertheless, I think we are up to it and we will look at ways that we can open some sort of presence in Shanghai at the earliest possible opportunity.

Clearly, we have had a very, very preliminary look at what might be happening in other parts of the world—the US, Kuala Lumpur, Tokyo and Dubai—and I have met with a number of ambassadors. Of course, we also had the visit from the sister state group from Okayama only a couple of weeks ago and made it very clear to them that we would love to reopen an office somewhere, probably in Tokyo. They are very keen to help, even though Okayama as a region or province is not close to Tokyo.

Other government and semi-government organisations, like Food SA, for example—members would be well aware of the role that Food SA plays and the great leadership of Catherine Sayer—have a permanent person in Japan, although I don't think in Tokyo. They have said that if we were to open a trade office, then they would probably look at relocating their person who is on the ground in Japan into that office. So there is quite a lot of interest in these particular offices, certainly from our exporters. People are saying that it would be good to actually have a doorway and a landing pad back into some of these markets.

It is interesting that, while I was in Shandong and meeting with the Jinanese, my recollection is that—it was a bit like their chamber of commerce, but it's not called that—we discussed trade missions and the trade missions the previous government had undertaken, quite large affairs of 200 or 300 business people, which are big events when you are in certain cities. It's interesting to have a look at the guest list for some of those events. I haven't actually seen the lists, but it can use a lot of taxpayer resources if you are having big events on a regular basis.

Often, the consular corps would know that the South Australians were having a party, the Aussies would let all of the other nations know that there was a party on, and because we have great food, wine, prawns and oysters, everybody clustered around. Members would know that I am a big fan of supporting our food and wine sector, but it also means that you get a lot of people from the diplomatic corps who are there. They are great people serving their countries, but does it actually grow our economy? Are there businesses that want to do business? Are there business people that can open doors for our exporters? Probably not.

It is interesting that the president—as I said, my recollection was of the Jinan chamber of commerce—said that you have these big events, you run around and collect all the name cards, as they call them (we call them business cards), have lots of toasts and drinks and then everybody leaves. At the end, he said, you have a pile of name cards that you put in a bin, because the contact is too superficial. So one thing that we are going to focus on is actually having and building more of a relationship.

Clearly, when we open these offices, whenever that may be, we will want to make a bit of a statement because, of course, we are back in town—South Australia is open for business, but we will have a much more focused approach to our trade missions.

The opposition leader asked about employees—that is unresolved at this stage. Clearly, there are some expats in some of these markets who have market intelligence, live there and know the state of play. Of course, if they live there and are locals living in those particular cities and countries and are looking for a new challenge to come to work for the South Australia trade office, it is often much more fiscally responsible to employ somebody that lives locally, rather than try to relocate somebody from Australia to run these offices, because, of course, you often have a relocation package and there is education and a whole range of things that I think are the standard across most of the states and the commonwealth when it comes to relocating.

When the opposition leader asks questions in relation to the sort of staff, we actually haven't made any decisions. There have been very limited inquiries at this point, but clearly you can see that you will have more bang for your buck, shall I say, if you employ locals. I think there might have been some initial requests for information from those that might be in the China market in Shanghai to gauge the level of interest that might exist there, but that is unresolved as the actual model that we will use for employing employees in these particular offices.

OVERSEAS TRADE OFFICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): I have a supplementary question arising from the answer: has the minister had any conversations, or has anyone from his office had any conversations, with individuals about being employed or appointed to these overseas trade offices?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:31): No.

REX AIRLINES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:31): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Members would have heard reports that Rex Airlines is cutting back services to Mount Gambier, the only airline that provides services to us up there and an important avenue to help tourists travel to the South-East. Can the minister explain why he has failed to advocate to retain the Rex services to Mount Gambier?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for her question. The Minister for Regional Development has been taking up the cause on behalf of South Australian taxpayers and the South Australian community.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: We're a team.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: As my colleague the Leader of the Government interjects, we are a team. The Hon. Tim Whetstone has been doing that, and we do not like to double up. I haven't had an update from him from what I saw yesterday, which was that he was uncertain of Rex's reason for scaling back their services other than perhaps that they were struggling to find pilots and staff. If there is more information that I can get from the Hon. Tim Whetstone, I will be happy to bring that back to the member.

REX AIRLINES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:32): I have a supplementary question arising from the answer: appreciating that the minister is happy to handball it to his counterpart in another place, when was the minister here made aware that Rex Airlines was reducing services to Mount Gambier and what steps did he take?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:33): I became aware yesterday and spoke to the Minister for Regional Development and agriculture and food, fisheries and forests because he was the one handling the issue on behalf of the government. I am not sure what the honourable member is looking for.

REX AIRLINES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:33): I have another supplementary question arising from the answer: what I am looking for is representations from as many sources as possible to retain these very important services to Mount Gambier and to make sure that we don't lose services to Mount Gambier as the—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: What's the question?

The PRESIDENT: There is not an explanation, just ask him the question.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Sorry, forgetting that the minister did appear to ask me a question and I forgot that I don't need to respond.

The PRESIDENT: No, no, I appreciate that. You can have dialogue outside the chamber.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: So what measures is the minister now taking to retain Rex flight services to Mount Gambier or will he continue to only handball it to his colleague in the other place?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:33): Well, I hardly see that as a question, Mr President, but I will give it an answer. The actions I am taking are

working closely with my colleague the Minister for Regional Development to ensure that Rex Airlines maintains its services, like for all of the services they provide to South Australia and all of our regional services, and I reiterate how important they are for regional South Australia. Of course, 40 per cent of South Australia's population live outside the metropolitan area and we have had 16 years of a government turning its back on the regions. Finally we have one that is looking out to the regions to help the regions. We will be doing whatever is possible to ensure the services are maintained in all of our regional cities, including Mount Gambier.

REX AIRLINES

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:34): Is the Minister for Tourism telling this chamber that he has no responsibility for tourism in the South-East and for airline travel for tourists into the South-East?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister speak.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:35): It is fabulous to have all this assistance, Mr President. I have an immense amount of responsibility for tourism statewide, for the honourable member.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: For the South-East. I am one of the many members in this chamber who was born and bred in the South-East and hold it as a very dear part of the state and still have an immense number of friends in that part of the world. It is a very important part of the state and that is why we announced a whole range of regional initiatives in the lead-up to the election, to support the regions and not turn our back on the regions, like your government did.

The PRESIDENT: Before I call the next question, can members keep the discipline of referring to members of the other place by their electorates.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment on the forestry industry.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The Labor opposition believes the forestry industry is a crucial component of the state's economy, and especially important to regional South Australia. The Labor opposition has a dedicated portfolio for forestry in the shadow cabinet.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: In fact, in his last answer the minister referred to the minister in the other place and incorporated forestry, but he does not actually have such a portfolio. Before the last state election now Premier Marshall claimed that a government he led would back the regions. Why has your government downplayed the importance of forestry to our state by removing the forestry portfolio from the government's cabinet?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:36): Thank you, Mr President—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister is on his feet.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I thank the honourable member for her question. I do think it is a bit rich, given that somebody who represented her local town, the Hon. Rory McEwen, was minister for forests and was minister and local member when the sale of the forests was initiated by the Labor government. It is an asset that has taken more than a century to build. In fact, people like my mother used to have shares in SAPFOR (South Australian Perpetual Forests). It has been in this state's

DNA and the government of the day decided to sell the forest—the Labor government. They sold it—they gave it away.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: You have to understand—my colleague the Hon. Rob Lucas, the Treasurer, spoke about the deal they did around the Lands Titles Office and on how this former government views business. You have an asset that has taken more than a century to build, and you sell it at the bottom of the market—you only get \$630 million or \$670 million. It's worth \$1.5 billion. That's how smart you are! You give something away! It is unbelievable that you would give away the forest. It is a bit rich that the honourable—are you the deputy leader in the role here? You don't have a deputy leader?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: You are not asking the questions.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: You're completely out of order.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I apologise, Mr President. I was trying to make sure I addressed the member opposite with her correct title. I know the leader will need a number of deputies to help him. I know he will need a lot of assistance.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Minister for forests is one of my titles, unlike yourself.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Minister? Oh, very presumptuous!

The Hon. R.I. Lucas: What arrogance.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Very arrogant!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Shadow minister.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I would like to finish off, if I may. Forestry is an important part of our state's economy, we do value it and we have valued it for pretty much the bit more than the 100 years that it has been there.

But I think it is a bit rich for the member opposite—because the minister's title is the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. When I went to school, forestry was a primary industry. We don't have the food, the wine, fisheries and all the other industries whinging that they are not in there—they are primary industries. I am not sure which education system the honourable member went through, but forestry was a primary industry and is still a primary industry. It is a primary concern to us that you sold it for \$650 million or \$670 million; in fact, you gave it away. It is an important industry and we will support it with a whole range of initiatives to make sure the industry continues to grow.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Before I call the next speaker, I acknowledge the Hon. Mr Gilfillan in the gallery.

Question Time

DEFENCE INDUSTRY

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister update the house about the great work being undertaken in the defence space, and how is it leading to significant investment and partnerships in South Australia?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his question and very keen interest in the defence sector and, of course, you, Mr President, for having served this country with distinction overseas.

Recently, I had the great pleasure of attending a number of events to illustrate just how big the defence sector is and is going to be for South Australia's future and why investment in this critical space is such a high priority for the Marshall Liberal government. Such is the importance that our government has placed on this sector, the Premier himself has personally taken responsibility for this vital portfolio for the South Australian economy.

Yesterday morning, I attended the Centre for Defence Industry Capability's 'Introduction to the Defence Market' seminar. It was fantastic to see so many people had a strong interest in the defence industry, which is such an important part of our state's future economic prosperity. Incidentally, I think they have had about 17 of these seminars across the nation and talked to over 1,000 people. There was probably close to 200 people yesterday, so it shows the interest in South Australia is quite significant.

With a continuous program of naval shipbuilding on the horizon for South Australia, thanks to the great work of the federal government and their investment in our state, there are opportunities emerging in cyberspace, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance and electronic warfare.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It is interesting that members opposite interject. We have to look at the great work of the federal government and the way that this government, when in opposition, supported them. We did not go out and attack them and pick fights with them. We worked collaboratively with them.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We know what the former minister, Mr Hunter, did. His response was to use four letter words and walk off down the street—potty mouth. We actually sit down behind closed doors and negotiate, and I would like to think that we have had a great response. This is a huge opportunity for South Australia. Most of the time the former government was at war with the federal government rather than working collaboratively. It is a fantastic time—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: If you want to carry on a conversation, please do so outside. That includes the minister over there as well.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It is a fantastic time for businesses to capitalise on the opportunities in the defence sector and invest in South Australia, and many are doing just that.

South Australia already has more than 250 SMEs with the defence industry capability, and seven of the world's top 10 defence primes also have a presence here. Combined with our world-class defence research capabilities and test and training ranges, there is a well-established defence ecosystem.

Following the morning seminar introduction and strong messages of support for investment in Defence, it was fitting that I attended the opening of French company Dassault Systèmes regional centre at the University of Adelaide campus.

Dassault Systèmes, the 3DEXPERIENCE company, is a world leader in 3D design software, 3D digital mock-up and product life cycle management solutions, particularly in the defence sector, having worked in the defence space for more than 30 years. This is a significant development, and I congratulate the University of Adelaide on its agreement with Dassault Systèmes to establish this company's first office to be co-located with an Australian university.

South Australia recognises the crucial role that Dassault Systèmes will play in the Future Frigate and Future Submarine programs. I am delighted to see that one of the world's great digital innovation companies is forging deep relationships in Australia. This relationship exemplifies Dassault Systèmes and the university's shared commitment to innovation and cooperation.

Collaboration is critical to enabling innovation in highly complex environments, whether that is submarines, aerospace or smart cities. The co-location of Dassault Systèmes at the University of Adelaide's engineering department will explicitly drive across many of these areas of interest and opportunity in South Australia.

We have only seen Dassault Systèmes digital leadership through the digital shipyard project in the defence sector. The company is steering digital transformation of the South Australian supply chain businesses, helping them to be ready for the vast defence opportunities emerging globally, not just here in South Australia. In mining and energy, Dassault works closely with many of the industry giants to bring sophisticated digital capability and smart management to their operations.

Our government is fostering digital innovation and entrepreneurialism in this state, and we welcome pioneers such as Dassault Systèmes to the state. They are proof that South Australia is at last moving in the right direction. Of course, it's because of these great opportunities presented by the unprecedented scale of the federal government's investment in Australia's future defence capabilities that this Liberal government plans to implement a suite of policies designed around capitalising on the huge levels of defence investment in South Australia. These include:

- capitalising on the defence export opportunities by working with the Defence Teaming Centre to identify global projects being delivered by Adelaide-based primes;
- developing supply chain maps for these projects and informing sub-primes and small and medium enterprises in the defence sector about the opportunities to supply them;
- developing a comprehensive work plan;
- a defence industry employment program for ex-service personnel;

I'm sure that's something that you, Mr President, would have significant interest in. Also:

- funding 1,200 apprenticeships over the next four years to attempt to fix the skills shortage left by the former Labor government; and
- establishing a new technical college in Adelaide's north-western suburbs, with a focus on encouraging students to prepare for work in the defence sector.

We have already touched on the five trade offices to open up and further strengthen our trade links with the rest of the world. When talking to people in the sector about the magnitude of the investment opportunities, it's clear that government certainty is a key ingredient for a thriving defence industry. Knowing that the government is very supportive and keen on driving this sector and seeing it succeed gives companies lots of the confidence they need to make the crucial decisions that will benefit not only the current workforce but generations to come.

That's why the Liberal government will support the defence industry and why my department—the department for trade, tourism and investment—partners closely with Defence SA in delivering defence and non-defence projects for the defence supply chain across advanced manufacturing, space, cybersecurity and blockchain. I look forward to growing this industry and am very excited about the great opportunities for the defence industry that lie on the horizon.

CORA BARCLAY CENTRE AND CAN:DO 4KIDS MERGER

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services about the proposed merger of the Cora Barclay Centre with Can:Do 4Kids.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Three days ago, the media reported that the renowned Cora Barclay Centre, a crucial service provider for deaf and hearing-impaired children for more than 70 years, is being forced to merge because of lack of adequate funding. The centre is facing a merger with Can:Do 4Kids to ensure continuity of services. It is directly attributable to the NDIS, as the service is not receiving enough funding to sustain vital services. In 2017, the former Labor government requested an independent audit of the centre, which showed that it had suffered losses of about \$1.6 million due to implementation issues during the rollout of the NDIS.

In response, the government provided some \$430,000 in compensation for the loss of funding from the NDIS, which we know focuses on a one-size-fits-all funding model. My question is: why has the renowned Cora Barclay Centre not been adequately funded by the state government? What, if anything, is being done to address this? What is the government doing, more generally, to

address implementation issues with the NDIS to avoid other charities from having to go down a similar path in less than positive circumstances? Will this include further compensation for rollout delays?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think it's important, at the outset, to point out that the merger has been a voluntary one. I think it would be fair to say that both Cora Barclay and Can:Do 4Kids probably weren't really that delighted with the way the story was portrayed as a bit of a hostile takeover because there are a number of positives in terms of the merger. I will return to that in a moment.

Just to talk about the NDIS generally, I think it has been a big challenge for a number of providers across Australia, really, because they are shifting from a position where they have been provided with quarterly block funding in advance to a contestable market, which I think certainly has bipartisan support. I would be surprised if it doesn't have the support of all the other parties around Australia as well because it focuses on putting choice and control towards consumers so that they purchase the services of their choice.

They all have to change their business systems approach because they need to have new invoicing systems and the like. On that front, they all have access to the Community Business Bureau. They are being provided support in order to change their business systems. Certainly, the feedback that I have had from the non-government sector about that process has been quite positive and they are working through that.

As we know, the cohort of children was the first to enter the NDIS so some of the children's services are the ones feeling the impacts prior to the adult services. I think that some of the children's services are under some pressure. What is happening to the funding is that money that used to flow into the state and then be provided on a quarterly basis to the providers now goes to the NDIS, and the NDIS is responsible for distributing that to the individual participants—that is the language they use rather than 'clients'—and the clients are then in a position to choose particular services.

I would like to acknowledge the heritage of both the Cora Barclay Centre and Can:Do 4Kids in South Australia. Cora Barclay has been operating for nearly 70 years and Can:Do 4Kids—people may be familiar with the name of Townsend House which was established in 1874 as a school for accommodation for deaf and blind children, so it has been operating for a very long time in South Australia. Both of those organisations have been providing valuable services and service different client groups. From what I understand, these services will continue under the new branch.

Obviously, with a larger organisation, there are opportunities for moving—where one has a well-developed system that can be utilised in other areas. From my understanding, all of those services will continue and no services will be lost, and there should be a stronger provider in the long term.

LOBELINK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Can the minister advise if a business case for GlobeLink, or 'globlink', has been initiated per their election commitment?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for his question. I would like to inform him that it is GlobeLink. He might want to use some other name but that will only demean him, I expect, by using another name. It is GlobeLink.

We gave a commitment to invest—my recollection is \$20 million—into the business case. That is a responsibility for GlobeLink which I think will be a transformational project, a very long-term one that this government will look to once the north-south corridor is complete. Clearly, there has been a lot of interest over a very long period of time about taking the freight trains out of the Adelaide Hills because of fire, noise and efficiency reasons.

One has to understand that there are capacity constraints on that particular rail line between Adelaide and Melbourne because we have the old tunnels from some of the early rail alignment there and we can't double-stack containers, so to do that work you need to make the tunnels higher or lower the line. From information that we obtained from the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) the estimates were somewhere between \$800 million to \$1 billion to do that work and give us more capacity on the line and then you can make the train slightly longer.

The only other way you can increase capacity, to answer the honourable member, is to increase the frequency. If you do all of that you end up with more trains, longer trains and more often coming through the middle of the city. So, clearly there is an opportunity to have a look before we spend \$1 billion on that particular part of the network to see if there is another option. That is a good case for looking at taking the railway line around the back of the Adelaide Hills. We all know there is rough alignment and that's why we have committed the \$20 million to start that whole planning and business case process.

Then we have the issues with the South Eastern Freeway. We have seen the former government do a whole bunch of rezoning around Mount Barker, controversial as it was—farmland that was going under houses—nonetheless it was done. The Hon. Mark Parnell joined with me in being somewhat concerned about the way that process was initiated and done. However, you cannot unzone land and there are houses over most of it now—not most of it but a lot of it. But the actual traffic flow, for the honourable member's benefit, will increase significantly on the South Eastern Freeway, and ultimately we will need to build more capacity into the South Eastern Freeway. I have not had any official figures but I suspect that would be a billion dollar project as well.

We have seen the cost of the north-south corridor upgrade, so we have those three lanes each way on the bit that comes down towards the tunnels. Of course, you would have to take that, probably, back to Mount Barker to deal with the flows, so the investment you would need to deal with the increased freight load and all of the commuter traffic would be significant coming down that South Eastern Freeway.

Again, that is another good reason why you would look at potentially taking the heavy freight especially around the back of the Adelaide Hills. Of course, a lot of freight operators find the descent into Adelaide quite challenging. We have seen some tragic accidents with loss of life and loss of property, so there is a good reason why you would have a very good close look at taking the heavy freight around the back of the Adelaide Hills on a road corridor.

There might be some opportunities through all this innovation and these smart cities to have a Google road—maybe not Google but a road that is high tech. It has been put to me that you might have a road where the road lights only turn on at night as the vehicles come along, a road that detects kangaroos and animals on the road and that sends a message to the driver that there is an animal or other obstacle on the road in the next four or five kilometres, or 10 kilometres. There is a lot of technology that could be incorporated into a brand-new road that I think we should look at. We should look at those opportunities, especially with some of the technological expertise that will be clustered in South Australia around the great defence contracts that I spoke of earlier.

Then of course, with GlobeLink, we had the opportunity of the airport. Some members opposite might have been born, but probably some were not born, when the former premier from many years ago, premier Dunstan, talked about building Monarto and the city over the hills. Land was set aside for an airport which, thankfully, unlike most things with the former Labor government that they have sold or for which they have changed its use, the land has still been set aside for an airport. It's probably a fair way off but it presents an opportunity. If you have seen what has happened in Toowoomba with the Wagner family, they have built an airport, a bit like the movie *Field of Dreams*, 'Build it and they will come'. They have a significant amount of freight going out of that particular airport.

Again, there is an opportunity for South Australia to look at. We think GlobeLink is a transformational infrastructure project—that's why we committed the \$20 million to the planning study—but that is a matter for the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government to manage because that is his responsibility. I am not familiar with the exact time frame but I am sure, if I get some time frames of when that is likely to happen, I will then bring that response back to the member to keep him informed.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:57): A supplementary arising from the original answer: I am pleased that a commitment was given to bring something back to me, but if the business case says that GlobeLink is not viable, will the government discontinue that project?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:57): That's hypothetical. We haven't looked at the business case yet.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We would have to have a look at it. Who knows what the business case might throw up? It might say that it's a high priority, we should do it and stop other projects. Who knows? That is a hypothetical question. Let's do the business case.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The only reason it would not stack up is that the honourable member's party would be back in government again and the economy would collapse and we couldn't support it. But if we have strong government and strong leadership and a strong federal government and the investment we have in this state, I am sure that the project will stack up.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:58): Further supplementary arising out of the original answer: if the business case says that it is not viable but business conditions are good in the state, you may proceed with GlobeLink anyway?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:58): Again, it's a hypothetical question.

The PRESIDENT: No, it's not a hypothetical question, minister. It's asking your intent.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We will gain all the information and we will make a judgement once we have that information and have been informed by the business plan. I don't know what the business plan will throw up. We don't know what we will encounter. I might add that this is a large project that will be many years and quite a deal of time in construction, so it is not something where you are going to say, 'Well, we've got the business case. We are going to do it tomorrow.' It will be a long-term project. I would think the member will be very old and very grey-haired by the time we complete it.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:59): A supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: A further supplementary? I'm allowing one more.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I promise not to make it about my hair. Since becoming minister, what representations has the minister made to Adelaide Airport and the SA Freight Council about GlobeLink, and what representations has he received from them?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:59): I am in constant contact with Adelaide Airport. Since becoming minister, I haven't met with the Freight Council. I haven't had a meeting with them, but I have had a number of informal meetings with members from Adelaide Airport, their board and some of the senior employees there. It is interesting to note that Adelaide Airport did not comment on GlobeLink during the whole debate in the lead-up to the election.

I think Mr Evan Knapp from the Freight Council spoke, but nobody from Adelaide Airport came out and criticised GlobeLink, and, interestingly, nor did Monarto Zoo, which is right next to where the airport is likely to be built. The Monarto Zoo did not make any comment. In fact, they see it as a real positive, because it brings more business activity and more focus on one of our great tourism attractions. But it would be inappropriate for me to now talk about the Monarto Zoo, which I could do at length but I won't do that.

NURSING AND MIDWIFERY EXCELLENCE AWARDS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:00): My question is for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the council on the outcomes of the 18th annual Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his question and welcome the opportunity to put on record the admiration and appreciation of the Marshall Liberal government for the invaluable work done by South Australian nurses and midwives. Last Friday, I was able to show our appreciation in person when I attended the 18th Annual Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards, an event organised by SA Health to coincide with International Day of the Midwife on 5 May and International Nurses Day on 12 May, the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth.

Today, I was able to continue the celebrations, with more time with nurses and midwives at a light lunch I co-hosted with the member for Hurtle Vale here in Parliament House to celebrate these international days. I acknowledge the Hon. Tung Ngo and the Hon. Clare Scriven joined us on that occasion.

This year marks a significant enhancement of the prestige of these awards by the addition of what I think is a very appropriate stream within the awards. Considering the commemorations linked to the work of Florence Nightingale, one of the world's great humanitarians, it is extremely apt that SA Health has decided to add to the repertoire of awards recognising the humanitarian work of nurses. South Australians know and love the work that nurses and midwives do in terms of going above and beyond providing care to them in direct care environments, but the humanitarian awards highlight the great work being done by South Australian nurses and midwives providing care above and beyond their own workplace in the community, in the rest of the nation and in the rest of the world.

I would like to honour in this council today the five South Australians who were recipients of the humanitarian awards last Friday night and just briefly highlight some of their work. Annie Catanzariti has been a nurse practitioner involved in leading three homeless outreach team clinics at Kilburn, Melrose Park and Constable Court. All three clinics were founded on the partnerships Annie established with non-government organisations in her part-time capacity above and beyond. Annie sees 25 to 30 people a month, and is currently providing temporary case management for 19 young people.

The second award recipient, Carol Salmon, a registered nurse and midwife, has led the development and delivery of emergency nursing and midwifery education for Country Health SA. Carol also uses her skills as a qualified lactation consultant to volunteer her time to provide advice and support to mothers. Carol has volunteered overseas to deliver care and education programs to disadvantaged populations, including self-funded trips to Cambodia and Papua New Guinea.

The third recipient, Lisa Macdonald, a nurse practitioner, has worked as a volunteer in East Timor and was quickly recognised for her skills in palliative care, to the extent that Calvary Health Care now works with her to support clinicians with good end-of-life principles in that country. As a result of this experience, Lisa returns each year for a week-long placement to provide further professional development to the people of East Timor.

The fourth recipient is Dr Svatka Micik, the nurse unit manager in the intensive care unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. She has undertaken humanitarian work with Open Heart International, a non-profit organisation that visits Papua New Guinea, where she mentors, educates and works with local nurses to build their expertise in cardiac specialties.

I was particularly impressed with Dr Svatka Micik's work in identifying collaborators for her Papua New Guinea work within the South Australian community. She works with RAH volunteers, for example, who stitch quilts embossed with messages of love and humanity for children having heart surgery; with SA universities, which donate textbooks and provide articles to Papua New Guinea nurses; and with the RAH newsagency, which donates reading glasses to Papua New Guinea nurses.

The fifth recipient of a humanitarian award this year was a midwifery educator, Jenny Gardner. She has participated since 2013 in volunteer work in Cambodia, where she assists in educating traditional birth attendants with the aim of reducing maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality. Most recently she has been working with the 2H Project coordinator to set up maternal clinics for Cambodian midwives.

These are just some of the fantastic nurses and midwives we have working in South Australia. In paying tribute to them I would also pay tribute to all our hardworking and dedicated nurses and midwives and congratulate all of the recipients of excellence awards of last Friday night in what was truly an inspirational event.

ENDOMETRIOSIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of endometriosis to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The draft national action plan for endometriosis makes a number of important recommendations for education on endometriosis to facilitate early intervention on the condition, including:

A menstrual education program for school students that is tested and ready for delivery...

The plan makes a priority of awareness and education, stating:

Education, particularly in younger age groups, is fundamental for breaking the cycle of under-recognition and diagnostic delay.

This is the first priority area of the National Action Plan, which acknowledges the need to improve understanding and impact of the condition among patients, health and education professionals, the broader health sector, and the Australian community generally.

The plan goes on to state that a menstrual health education program should be 'delivered by specially qualified personnel'.

As the minister is no doubt aware, a recent study in Canberra of Australian teenagers showed that 26 per cent of girls are missing school because of their periods. Of these, 2 per cent reported time off school with every single period. Meanwhile, the November 2007 report 'The high price of pain' estimated that applying evidence-based treatments could halve the cost of chronic pain to the Australian economy, a saving of some \$17 billion per annum.

Last year, as the minister is well aware, the well-established ME program from New Zealand was successfully trialled in South Australia, with the results reflecting increased knowledge and awareness in those students, with the schools all indicating they were eager for it to return. However, on Wednesday 9 May *The Advertiser* noted in regard to this program, 'The state government is yet to commit to funding the school program'.

Can the minister advise whether the state government is yet ready to commit to funding this program that is tested and ready for immediate delivery via the specially qualified local personnel through the Pelvic Pain Foundation of Australia, therefore meeting those aims of the national action plan and, if so, when will this commence?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:08): I thank the honourable member for her question. The draft national endometriosis action plan was released by the federal Minister for Health on 14 May, which I count as two days ago, and is focused on three activities. These are awareness and education, clinical care and management, and research and innovation. Endometriosis and the draft national action plan have been a major focus of the Hon. Greg Hunt. Not only did he undertake this work, but specifically in discussions at the COAG council of health ministers he raised his eagerness to facilitate progress in this area.

Consultation to inform the development of the plan opened on 14 May and closes on 28 May, and the final plan is likely to be released in June 2018. South Australia intends to be an active contributor. As a government we recognise endometriosis is a condition which affects around one in 10 women, with potentially serious outcomes for women if not identified and managed early. We

acknowledge that some of these women will go on to have fertility problems, and many will suffer from chronic pelvic pain.

As the house would recall, the Menstrual Health and Endometriosis Program pilot, funded by the Pelvic Pain Foundation of Australia, was held in 2017 in 10 South Australian secondary schools and has been formally evaluated as a successful initiative. South Australia has undertaken commercial clinical trials in conjunction with the prevention and recovery unit at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, with two trials currently underway.

I certainly agree with the honourable member about the importance of increasing awareness amongst young women about endometriosis and what is and what is not normal pain. It is supported as an effective strategy to prevent the long-term impacts of the physical and mental health of women. That is why I have already met with the honourable member and proponents of that project. My understanding is that we have received the additional information that we requested out of that meeting, and I know that I am not alone in this government in being determined that action will be taken.

My understanding is that the honourable Minister for Education has also met with advocates in this area. We are looking to make sure that we not only contribute actively to the national endometriosis action plan but that we continue to build on the work done in this state, both through the Pelvic Pain Foundation and through SA Health, to make sure that we take effective action to support women and girls in Australia who are suffering from endometriosis.

BLOCKCHAIN AND CRYPTOCURRENCY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Has the minister, either in opposition or government, received any gift, support, benefit or sponsorship, actual or in kind, from any blockchain technology company or cryptocurrency company? If so, what exactly was the nature of that gift, support, benefit or sponsorship?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for his question. I don't believe I have received any gifts from any cryptocurrency or blockchain people. I will come back to support benefits in a minute, but I did receive about 0.8 per cent of a US cent in Bitcoin as a gift from somebody once.

I had a Bitcoin wallet on my phone, the old phone that I had, and with the increase in value of Bitcoin, that 0.8 of a cent—actually, no, it was about one-tenth of one cent. It had all the zeros, and eventually one zero disappeared, so I assumed that growth in the value of Bitcoin meant that my 0.1 of a cent might have been worth almost one cent at that point. Given we have this \$750 threshold, I didn't think 0.1 of a cent was—but, if I should have declared it, then I apologise to the house and I will correct the record if that 0.1 of a cent needed to be declared.

I did go to Washington last March, and I went to the second World Blockchain Summit in Washington DC. I don't think you would call it a benefit; I paid for my accommodation and I paid for my airfares. However, what I did get was the tremendous honour of hosting a dinner in the Australian Embassy. Our ambassador, the Hon. Joe Hockey, was out of town and he said, 'Ridgey, can you look after the place for me?'

I know that members opposite get a bit upset when I am doing things beyond the role of a state MP, but I hosted a dinner in the Australian Embassy for all of the important people who were at the second World Blockchain Summit, including Professor Robert Kahn, one of the inventors of the internet. He is an elderly gentleman, but he said that he and a group of other scientists had these computers and thought, 'Maybe if we get them to talk to each other, that might be something new and interesting to do.' Well, look where the internet is today, and he was one of the scientists behind that.

So while I got a benefit and enriched myself personally, meeting and talking with these people, I don't think I got any financial benefit. Of course, I am hopeful that Dr Robert Kahn will visit Australia this year. He has some interesting thoughts around blockchain. He sees blockchain as being about where the internet was in the 1990s.

When we say blockchain, it's actually distributed ledger technology—it's not blockchain. I am sure the honourable member knows the difference between blockchain and distributed ledger technology and the difference between Bitcoin and Ethereum and some of the other digital currencies and cryptocurrencies—I am sure he is across all of that. Lubin saw that as being at about the 1990s. He thinks the technology we have now is about where the internet was in the 1990s. It is quite special. Nobody quite understands what it will mean for the future of our economies, but it is something that is here to stay.

At that dinner also, Hugh Sheridan from *Packed to the Rafters*—a great Australian—was there. He sang the national anthem for us as well. So again, I was enriched personally by spending a few hours with Hugh Sheridan. I am not sure whether you have to declare those personal sort of enrichments. I was disappointed, and I put it on the record for ambassador Hockey, there was no South Australian wine on the menu—it was Californian wine. I thought that was something we need to rectify because we should have at least had Australian wine. As you know, Mr President, my preference would have been to have South Australian wine.

So while I attended this conference, I don't recall getting any benefit other than enriching myself personally, looking at some opportunities for South Australia in the cryptocurrency/distributed ledger technology. As members opposite recall, a few weeks after that, last year, we held a blockchain summit at Adelaide Oval hosted by the current Premier. It was an interesting turnout with a sell-out crowd. It was packed to the rafters, if you will pardon the pun—our star from *Packed to the Rafters* wasn't there.

Joe Lubin, the inventor of Ethereum and the digital currency Ether, was flying from Singapore to Sydney on his first ever visit to Australia. This is all about networking and meeting people and developing friendships. We convinced him to come to Adelaide. He had four hours in his diary and he stayed for four days, so impressed was he by the hospitality that the opposition gave him. We showed him around our great state. The Adelaide Fringe was on. The then opposition leader took him to a number of different places because he was very keen to demonstrate to these sort of world leaders that South Australia, when we win government, is open for business.

I don't recall and I don't think I have ever received a personal benefit from anything to do with blockchain and cryptocurrency other than being enriched personally and hopefully having the opportunity to enrich the community of South Australia with the adoption of those technologies.

HOMELESSNESS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:17): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. As the minister cares deeply about our most vulnerable communities, can the minister give us an update about the zero homelessness project in the city of Adelaide?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:17): It gives me great pleasure to respond to this question and I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this important area. I acknowledge, too, that the Hon. Mr Darley in his matter of interest last week talked about the zero homelessness project which is operating in Adelaide at the moment. The current phase that the project is in is phase 2, which is implementation, which is during the month of May, and this week is Connections Week. The project is running largely from the Hutt St Centre on Hutt Street in Adelaide. They have been gathering a range of volunteers, organising them into teams and going out to all parts of the City of Adelaide.

I attended part of the training on Sunday where there were a number of volunteers present. They had a lady who was explaining how to connect with people who were rough sleeping—obviously in a respectful manner. They are very, very organised. They have the cooperation of a range of partners, including the City of Adelaide, and they have mapped the entire City of Adelaide, the Parklands and North Adelaide. They will also be visiting car park locations, which are located on the perimeter on the opposite side of the Parklands.

There are teams of volunteers. They started going out last night, I think, from 4.30. I dropped into the centre again and all of the teams were out and about. They had some mobile teams who are able to visit other locations, should they be required. They are going out this evening again, and again tomorrow morning. They are meeting individual people, listening to their stories and trying to

map what each person is needing, and after that they will collate that information together to work on a plan.

It is the beginning of the operational phase of the project. There are close to 200 volunteers, which I may have already mentioned, and they conduct a vulnerability assessment with each person and this information is fed into a spreadsheet called a bi-name list. For those homeless people who provide their names, obviously their information will be put in and will be kept protected, it will assist agencies to monitor the outcomes for all those people who are sleeping rough to enable pathways for them to be developed.

The information is still being collected and a report will be provided on Thursday evening. I would encourage anyone who is interested in this issue to attend. It is at 5.30 at the Scott Theatre at the University of Adelaide. There will be presentations from the Reverend Peter Sandeman, who is one of the project co-chairs, Ian Cox from Hutt St Centre, some of the other partners, including Bendigo Bank, which is providing sponsorship, Kim Holmes from Neami National and myself. People will be able to find out more about what information has been collected as part of Connections Week, and we look forward to further progress on this project, which I hope to report in future.

ENTERPRISE PATHOLOGY LABORATORY INFORMATION SYSTEM

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Hon. Stephen Wade. Considering revelations today that SA Pathology blood tests are being delayed because of computer backlogs caused by the Enterprise Pathology Laboratory Information System, can the minister provide an update on how SA Health is now dealing with patient records since his government froze the rollout of the troubled EPAS system?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:22): I am not sure whether the honourable member wants me to talk about EPLIS or EPAS. EPLIS is the pathology laboratory information system. Perhaps I will address both programs. In relation to what I have inherited as the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, two of the biggest headaches are Labor's botching of health IT systems. The house and this state are very well aware of the disaster of EPAS. The costs have blown out to \$471 million, which is basically double the original estimate. It was supposed to be fully rolled out by 2014; that still has not happened.

In relation to what this government did: when we were elected we honoured our commitment to pause the rollout, following advice from clinicians and health professional bodies. We did not complete the stage 2 rollout of EPAS at the RAH, and that is still paused. The rollout at Flinders Medical Centre and at Mount Gambier, scheduled for later this year, is also put on hold. We are in the process of procuring an independent reviewer. As the government committed from opposition, all options will be on the table, including scrapping the project.

In terms of EPLIS, this was another bungled IT process from the former Labor government. It is very concerning to see that, particularly since December last year, there has been a significant increase in the number of issues that have been raised with SA Health. The implementation, the full rollout of EPLIS was completed in the middle of April. What has become evident in recent weeks is that there is a significant delay in test results.

Because of that, I spoke to SA Health and a task force has been established to look at improving SA Pathology testing times following those delays. Some wait times for laboratory tests have increased for hospitals and GPs, and the increase in test turnaround times is largely due to complex initial data entry requirements associated with the EPLIS rollout. Timely test results are obviously vital in providing prompt and appropriate care for patients. Delays have the potential to impact the level of care being provided.

The task force to be headed by Dr Tom Stubbs has been established to review all incidents due to test delays which have been lodged in SA Health's Safety Learning System—that is, all lodgements since January this year—so we are wanting to get a representative indicator of how the system is going. We will look at the reasons for the delays to determine the impacts on patient outcomes and recommend any additional action needed to ensure test turnaround times return to normal.

Following feedback from clinicians, the task force will also review the reporting format for the test results and if any errors have occurred as a result. It is expected the task force will report back in the next few months. Interim advice provided by the task force will be implemented as it is determined. I am advised that the first meeting of the task force will be held on Tuesday and that Dr Stubbs is planning to visit SA Pathology on Friday.

EPAS was supposed to be completed by June 2014, and it is now more than three years behind schedule. The problem with EPLIS is that the financial impact is yet to be determined. One of the responses that SA Health has taken to try to deal with the problem is to employ an additional 30 staff. I understand that will rise to 35. It is still not clear how many of those will be needed ongoing.

This was a program that the former minister, Mr Snelling, bragged about as an opportunity to make savings within the health system, yet here we have yet another Labor health IT project which is actually going to cost more than it was originally budgeted for and it is not delivering the level of care that South Australians expect or deserve.

Personal Explanation

MINISTERIAL BENEFITS

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:27): I seek leave to make personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: During question time I was asked about benefits and things that I may have received from blockchain and cryptocurrencies. During the answer to the question I indicated that I had received about maybe 0.1 of a cent.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: You said a cent.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: A cent; I have double-checked just so that everybody is aware. The current value of one Bitcoin today is \$A10,931. I downloaded and reloaded my Bitcoin wallet for this new phone I have and found that I have 0.0001092 Bitcoins, which equates to 11 cents. So I just wanted to correct the record. I have 11 cents as a gift. I just wanted to make sure that everybody was very clear on the gift that I have received.

Matters of Interest

ANZAC DAY COMMEMORATION SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:28): On ANZAC Day this year, women who served in the Australian Defence Force led Mount Gambier's ANZAC parade for the first time in history. Leadership of this parade raised awareness of women's contributions in armed conflicts, and it encouraged women, some of whom have not marched before, to join the march, wearing their medals quite correctly on the left-hand side. The By the Left initiative was one step in broadening the public perception of what a veteran looks like. Many women had reported that they no longer attended memorials because they were asked to wear their medals on the right, obviously by people who assumed that they had not earned the medals themselves.

One wears medals on the right if wearing them for someone else. Family members of a deceased recipient may wear that person's medals on commemorative occasions, such as ANZAC Day, but the placing of the medals on the right side shows that the wearer is not the original recipient. One's own medals are worn on the left. No veteran should be subject to the indignity of being asked to move medals won through hard work and sacrifice because of an outdated sense of who has served.

I was delighted to see that the Mount Gambier march encouraged people to thank women and younger personnel for their service, acknowledging that they are veterans. Women now make up about 15 per cent of the defence forces, but in the past, of course, there were far fewer women in the ranks. Indeed, much of our popular culture left out the contribution of women altogether.

Rudy Furlong, pastor of Mount Gambier's Liberty Church, alluded to the shaping of perceptions through our history in his address at the service which followed the Mount Gambier

parade. He talked about the over 2,000 Australian nurses who served in World War I, who were instrumental in saving the lives of the diggers who made it through but were left out of the ANZAC legend to a large degree—one might say until quite recently. He said:

During an era when women had only just received the vote in Australia and New Zealand, and were more often than not confined to the home, even signing up was a bold and brave move for the nurses.

Mount Gambier RSL President Bob Sandow reported that this year was the largest contingent of women marching in Mount Gambier's ANZAC Day parade. I had the privilege of attending the dawn service in Port MacDonnell on ANZAC Day, followed by the excellent breakfast at the community hall afterwards. My compliments to all the organisers of both the service and the breakfast, and special mention of my young neighbour, Natika Fensom, for her strong and lovely rendition of our national anthem.

It is estimated that this dawn service attracted more than 400 people, a considerable turnout for a town the size of Port MacDonnell, and similar, I think, to the number I saw when I attended last year's dawn service there. The Mount Gambier march and the service that followed brought together many thousands of people to honour those who have served our nation. Pastor Furlong's address at the 11am service also included a significant reflection:

Privilege and freedom always come at a great price.

Privilege and freedom always come at a great price. He recalled that it is those individuals who served their countries with distinction who paid the ultimate sacrifice in laying down their lives and who enabled us to live in freedom. We can pay tribute to their bravery and steadfastness in the midst of incredible odds, and we can keep that flame burning. We keep it burning when we acknowledge and remember their service. We keep it burning when we honour our current and former Defence Force members, and we keep it burning when we remember that freedoms that are fought for and dearly won must never be easily given up. Let us thank the women and men who have served so that we can continue to enjoy those freedoms.

BHUTANESE COMMUNITY

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:32): Last Friday and Saturday were very big days for the Bhutanese community in South Australia and beyond. On last Friday, the second Australian Bhutanese Conference was commenced at the Adelaide Festival Centre. I was very pleased to attend the opening ceremony, where the chief guest was the Hon. Chief Justice Chris Kourakis. I was delighted that the Hon. Jing Lee was there and spoke, representing the Premier and the government of South Australia. Also in attendance at the opening ceremony were the members for Badcoe and Reynell from the other place.

That conference was hosted by the Bhutanese Australian Association of South Australia (BAASA), an organisation I have had a lot to do with over a number of years. It is a very professional organisation, given the short amount of time in which people from that nationality—most of whom were forced to spend most of their lives living in Nepal before they came here—have put on a very professional conference, as well as all the other events that they have organised and I have been to. Delegates came from similar organisations in Sydney, northern Tasmania, Albury-Wodonga, southern Tasmania, Melbourne, Melton and Cairns.

The conference continued on the Saturday morning at the Victory Conference Centre in Pooraka where many more people were able to attend (being on a weekend). The conclusion of that conference was then followed by the 10th Settlement Day celebrations in the afternoon. A great feature of those celebrations was a special citizenship ceremony for 100 new citizens from within the South Australian Bhutanese community which was conducted by Senator Lucy Gichuhi, who is, of course, the first member of the Australian parliament who has a background from Africa. I know that Senator Gichuhi was humbled to have the opportunity to perform that role.

Having attended and spoken at several of the Bhutanese Settlement Day functions in the past it was a pleasure to speak on behalf of the Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall, and of course the Hon. Jing Lee, who is very popular with all of the multicultural communities, noting that it was the exact 10th anniversary of the settlement of the first Bhutanese refugees in South Australia and Tasmania on 12 May 2008.

I also note the attendance at the 10th settlement celebrations of the new member for King, Ms Paula Luethen, the member for Wright, Blair Boyer, and federal members of parliament, Tony Zappia and Nick Champion.

Another feature of the conference and the settlement celebrations was the presentation to all guests of the booklet called *A Decade in Retrospection*, a special publication edited by Indra Adhikari. That publication celebrates the 10 years of the resettlement and the history of the development of the Bhutanese community in Australia. I will certainly be making the parliamentary library aware of the existence of that publication.

FOSSIL FUEL EXTRACTION PROJECTS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:37): I rise today to draw attention to the government's irresponsible promotion of new fossil fuel extraction projects in the midst of a global climate emergency. As members know, the scientific consensus is that human-induced climate change is an existential threat to our planet and the imperative is to keep global warming to less than 2 degrees above pre-industrial levels.

Global warming cannot be stopped but it can be stabilised. We also know that global reliance on fossil fuels is the main culprit. If we are serious about meeting greenhouse gas reduction targets we need to transition rapidly away from fossil fuels and towards renewable energy and energy storage. That transition also involves leaving most remaining fossil fuels in the ground, not searching for and extracting new reserves.

Sadly, it seems that the state government has almost seamlessly picked up the fossil fuel baton from the previous government and is charging into the abyss regardless of the consequences for people and the planet. The particular issue I raise today is one that I have raised many times in parliament before: the dangerous and dirty process of extracting gas from underground coal seams known as underground coal gasification (UCG).

This industry is bad news for South Australia on many levels. As a fossil fuel project it will be responsible for substantial emissions as well as considerable likely fugitive emissions that will significantly add to global warming pressures. However, there are also local impacts to consider. Yesterday, Leigh Creek Energy Limited announced to the Stock Exchange that it was about to commence construction of a pilot gas plant at Leigh Creek in the state's north.

This announcement follows the approval last month by the Liberal government of the company's statement of environmental objectives. The announcement of commencement of the 'pre-commercial demonstration' stage involves moving buildings and equipment onto the site over the next eight weeks and then drilling three wells into the coal seam. For new members, UCG involves setting fire to coal under the ground and capturing the resulting gases that come to the surface. It is dirty, it is dangerous and it resulted in the biggest ever pollution incident in Queensland's history.

Members might think that the Leigh Creek project is only a trial, so what could possibly go wrong? Well, that is what they thought in Queensland; that was a trial as well. Linc Energy's Chinchilla trial resulted in the company being charged and now convicted of serious environmental damage. Charges against five executives are pending and expected to be heard in a few months. Members might have seen the article last week in the *Financial Review* which commences as follows:

Former rich lister Peter Bond's Linc Energy has been fined a record \$4.5 million for serious environmental damage at its controversial underground coal gasification plant in the Darling Downs, west of Brisbane, but don't expect the fines to be paid. District Court Judge Michael Shanahan said Linc Energy was 'persistent and in clear breach' of its obligations at the UCG trial site at Chinchilla between 2007 and 2013, with toxic gas contaminating soil and groundwater which could take decades to fix. But with Linc in liquidation with debts of \$320 million, the fines against Mr Bond's company are unlikely to be paid—a fact noted by Justice Shanahan when he was handing down his judgement in Brisbane on Friday.

The article continues:

'I am unsure of any of its assets or liabilities and capacity to pay fines,' he said. 'Linc was well aware of the damage being done and attempted to hide it from the regulator.' Justice Shanahan described Linc's behaviour as 'serious and extensive' saying the company was aware of the issue of leaking gas—with dangerous levels of carbon monoxide, hydrogen and hydrogen sulphide found at soils on the Chinchilla site...

One indication of the contempt with which Linc Energy and their management held the environment and their impact on it was in relation to substantial fugitive emissions. Often these are difficult to detect, unless of course it rains, and according to evidence provided to the Queensland court, there were 'tiny bubbles coming out of the ground everywhere' after rain at the Chinchilla site. However, whilst this should have sounded alarm bells for the company, it was laughed off by Linc managers as just a case of 'Mr Bubbles'.

My advice to the new state Liberal resources minister is to get on the phone to his Queensland counterpart, Liberal National Party opposition leader, Deb Frecklington, who had this to say last week. She said that the project should never have been approved in the first place, and the direct quote from her is:

I do support the court's decision but I would say that no amount of compensation can make up for the fact that this is a project that should never have been ticked off. That is why, years ago, the LNP talked about the fact that the UCG industry should be ruled out and in fact we went as far as moving legislation in that case.

So we do not want to be trading off the environment for the economy. This industry absolutely must be banned in South Australia.

SAFE RATES CAMPAIGN

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:43): I rise today to speak about the important work of the Transport Workers Union's continued advocacy for safe rates for transport workers. This speech today will be the first of a number of speeches, mainly because the campaign is so varied and has so many facets to it that it would not do it justice with a five-minute speech today. I would also like to acknowledge Matt Burnell, who has played a leading role in the Safe Rates campaign, who is in the gallery at the moment. Matt has seen the carnage on the road that the Safe Rates campaign is seeking to stop.

In 2017, 185 people were killed in 168 crashes involving heavy trucks across Australia. Statistics show that fatal crashes involving heavy and articulated trucks are increasing nationally. Shockingly enough, in the past 10 years, 2,500 people have died in truck-related accidents on our roads. That is almost five a week. We have all seen on the TV the results of these appalling crashes involving trucks with passenger cars and the sort of carnage, death and destruction which is left in their wake.

These figures are alarming and should give us all cause to reflect on the conditions of truck drivers. Low wages, long hours and tight time frames from retailers put massive pressure on trucking companies and their drivers. These pressures put every road user at risk.

Truck drivers and their families have long been fighting for change. For over 20 years now, the Transport Workers Union has been fighting for safe rates and safer roads for all Australians. Every truck driver should be guaranteed the use of a well-maintained vehicle, should never be at risk of falling asleep at the wheel and should never be under pressure to meet a near-impossible deadline. This means that truck drivers must be guaranteed rates and conditions that ensure they are paid for every hour, every kilometre and every cost.

When a transport worker leaves home and gives their loved ones a kiss, these loved ones expect their mother or father to come home at night. Unfortunately, this is all too often not occurring. Through community industrial action, the Transport Workers Union has had some big wins, including the establishment of the Road Safety Remuneration Tribunal and national agreements with major transport companies such as Toll and Linfox. Despite these wins, the national death toll is still far too high and there is a lot more work to do.

The Transport Workers Union continues to collate evidence which shows a direct relationship between pay and conditions for truck drivers and safety on our roads. Their own internal research shows that every 10 per cent more that drivers earn in pay is associated with an 18.7 per cent lower probability of a crash. While pressuring drivers to work faster and longer may sound like efficiency in the boardroom meeting, for everyone else who uses our roads it can be a recipe for disaster.

A Macquarie University study in January 2017 found a critical gap in national transport regulation, citing that there is no regulatory mechanism that can eliminate existing incentives for overly tight scheduling, unpaid work and rates that effectively are below cost. The Transport Workers

Union's Safe Rates campaign is as critical now as it ever was. The transport industry needs safe rates for all transport workers as a matter of priority.

I call on the federal government to work with retailers and the Transport Workers Union to set safety standards in the industry and put an end to the carnage on our roads. I acknowledge the continued hard work of the Transport Workers Union in fighting for the rights and conditions of truck drivers, and I would also like to acknowledge the state secretary, Ian Smith, for the great work the state branch of the Transport Workers Union is doing in conjunction with the federal office.

I urge all members to understand and present to learn more about this campaign and lend their support. The first step in showing your support can be to sign up to the Safe Rates campaign at www.saferates.org.au. It is incumbent upon this chamber to support any efficiencies or any campaign that seeks to reduce the death on our roads. What we need to do is make our roads look more like a highway to get people safely from one town to another, instead of looking like a war zone, which it currently does. I urge all members to support this campaign, to get on the website and sign up.

HARAN, MR P.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:48): I rise today to share with this place a deeply moving speech by Peter Haran. Peter is a journalist and author and a Vietnam veteran. Earlier this year, I had the privilege of listening to his address during the ANZAC Day commemorative service on the memorial grounds of the Jamie Larcombe Centre. It was the first such service held by the centre, which specialises in providing mental health care for veterans and first responders suffering post-traumatic stress. The staff at the centre carry out vital work and do so at an exceptional level.

As the Premier's representative, I was honoured to attend and lay a wreath on his behalf. I commend everyone involved in planning and conducting the ceremony. I look forward to seeing it grow from strength to strength in coming years. In Peter's address, he speaks about an article by Major Clare O'Neill from the official journal of the Vietnam Veterans Federation of Australia. This piece discusses the feeling of disconnect that the modern veteran has with stories of past Anzacs and that of her own. These feelings resonated with Peter, as they were similar to the experiences he faced on his return from Vietnam. The address had such a profound impact on all who attended. In particular, his words have left a lasting impression on me.

He has graciously allowed me to share his address in this place, and I thank him for the opportunity. It starts:

The contemporary veteran

Last week I read in a veterans newsletter comments by Major Clare O'Neil, Royal Australian Engineers and Afghanistan War veteran.

On the eve of Anzac Day Clare wrote:

'The word veteran may never sit comfortably with me when pointed in my direction.'

She calls herself a contemporary veteran—she struggles to equate with the terms Anzac and veteran because she is a contemporary veteran—that is generally a serviceman and woman who has been involved in conflicts since 9/11. She said she was searching for her identity.

I know how she feels. I am a veteran of the new wars, those post Korea and WWI and WWII. In my 20s and 30s I was contemporary veteran.

20 years after my war I had no identity, I wasn't comfortable inside my skin. I wasn't comfortable being called a Vietnam veteran. I certainly wasn't Anzac.

My first Anzac March I walked along the ranks of old diggers—there were also some WWI veterans then (Anzacs).

I thought I had little in common with these servicemen and women at the front of the parade. I still don't.

Now I'm like those old blokes, aged with issues, looking at the modern day returnee. I have little in common.

I don't know their war, what they did, I am not tech savvy like them. I don't even know their music.

Major Clare writes she has a blank canvas for her image and the Australian community know little about East Timor, Iraq, Afghanistan, the Solomons and Rwanda anyway.

Back from Vietnam, RSL members rejected us for not being part of a real war.

Today some Vietnam vets ask contemporary vets why they are wearing their medals on the left—relatives should wear them on the right...you're probably getting the point.

One thing will change all this—the relentless march of time. The old vets are passing on—50—
apparently were marching—
today I think.

I am no longer at the back of the march but the front.

AND I am referred to as a veteran. A War veteran. Not any particular war...today's generation see me as just a veteran...with my medals on the left hand side.

Contemporary vets are walking the same track. It'll be the same story. One thing doesn't change.

And contemporary vets should never forget that my veteran era doesn't need to know about your battles, your miseries and suffering—and good times.

Because we can all feel those experiences.

We share them without saying a word. Don't struggle to describe war events. Just lean on me and rest assured I know what you felt and are feeling now. I once felt and still feel just like you...I always will.

Major Clare doesn't need to search for or define her identity as a veteran. She already is one.

That concludes Peter's speech, and I thank him for the privilege of letting me put it on the record in this place.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:53): I rise to speak about the live export industry. I do so noting that today the federal government has ruled out a ban on the live export industry. I do so, though, knowing that the support to end this industry, to find an exit strategy for this industry, continues to grow and grow. I reflect on just a few weeks ago, early May, when I stood on the steps of this parliament with members of the Labor Party and members of SA-Best in a united force of compassion.

That force of compassion will be reflected on the federal benches in coming weeks with a bill that I understand has the support of the Hon. Sussan Ley, a former minister in the federal government, and indeed Derryn Hinch, well known for his television career but now on those red leather benches in the federal parliament, as well as, of course, those who have long called for the end to this cruel trade: Independent member Andrew Wilkie and the Greens.

We stood on those steps in the earlier part of this month because the *Al Shuwaikh*, a ship of shame, was docked down at Port Adelaide. That ship of shame had already seen 17,000 sheep die in transit. That ship of shame should not be going through our ports.

There is a way that we can transition from this cruel trade—a cruel trade that, time and time again, has been exposed not by the industry itself, not by the so-called safeguards but, indeed, by small groups. Small groups such as the Port Adelaide Monitors, a group of women who live in the Port Adelaide area and actually monitor the loading of the ships; the RSPCA, a charity; and, of course, people power groups such as Animals Australia. These have always been the groups that have exposed the cruelty in this trade. Yet, the government assures us that it can be done without the cruelty.

We know that the business model of this trade is not actually profitable, certainly not for South Australia if one is to read the Pegasus Economics report recently commissioned by Animals Australia. There would be little damage to South Australia's primary producers by exiting from this trade and there is a lot to benefit from by getting out of the live meat export industry and into the chilled and boxed meat export industry.

The figures add up, the facts speak for themselves when they are exposed, but these small groups are also now prepared to put their money where their mouths are. They have put up \$500,000 and encouraged state and federal governments to do the same to ensure that farmers are not left in the lurch as they were back in the early 2010s (around 2012) and to ensure that we can exit properly from this industry this time.

I think we are on a cusp here. We have seen time and time again that cruelty is actually intrinsic to the live export industry. We cannot accept a business model that trades on cruelty. When we trade in that cruelty, we also export jobs from this state. Across Australia and across regional communities across Australia, we have seen the loss of over 10,000 jobs due to the live export industry. We have seen the loss of over 150,000 slaughterhouses and abattoirs due to the live export industry. The time to start taking the toll, both on those animals and the welfare of those animals themselves and, indeed, our economy, is nigh.

We must all work together. I also very much encourage those members of the government benches in this place who, so far, have only had a few break rank to join with the force of compassion across the chambers. Across the Labor Party, across SA-Best, across the Greens and across the Independents in our parliaments, we are saying that enough is enough and it is time to exit and end the live export trade. It is cruel and we must stand up for compassion. If the RSPCA and Animals Australia are willing to put their money where their mouths are and support the farmers to end this industry and to support jobs and, in fact, create jobs in this state, then surely it is time for our state government to do the same.

KENYON, MR T.R.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:57): I wish to speak on the recent state election held in March this year. In particular, I wish to pay tribute to the former member for Newland, Tom Kenyon.

Tom served in the electorate of Newland with distinction from 2006 until 2018. He was always highly regarded by the residents of Newland and by all sides of politics in this place. In fact, it was commonly known that many people in Newland, who are usually rusted-on Liberal voters, would vote for Tom, not necessarily because of the party he represented but because of the person he was and still is. Of course, there could only be one winner and I congratulate the new member for Newland on his victory. I understand—I was there for it—that he ran a good, fair campaign and he should be commended for that.

Tom, over his many years in parliament, really did deliver for Newland. While it is impossible to list everything he achieved for his electorate during his time in parliament, I understand there are a few things of which he was particularly proud:

- The upgrade of the corner of Hancock Road and Grand Junction Road for the residents of the north-east. This intersection was a big issue for many years. Tom took it upon himself to lobby the minister to upgrade the intersection and he achieved that.
- The upgrade of the intersection at the corner of Golden Grove Road and Grenfell Road at Fairview Park in Surrey Downs. He also achieved that.
- The street renewal program, which built over 35 kilometres worth of footpaths in the City of Tea Tree Gully, a city I am well affiliated with, over the last three years. This funding came as a result of intense lobbying by Mr Kenyon, after knocking on thousands of doors and listening to residents who raised with him on a regular basis the issue of the lack of footpaths in the area.
- Furthermore, there is the O-Bahn tunnel extension, which makes it easier and much faster for residents to get into the city.
- There is the park-and-ride, and the hopefully soon to be built second park-and-ride at Modbury, which was something that Tom was a vocal advocate on.
- And, of course, there is the Modbury Hospital, where he ensured that the hospital was at the centre of the government's agenda and where he reminded the government of the importance of the hospital to the north-eastern community.

While Tom was the front person running for the ALP for the seat of Newland, he was supported and backed by many dedicated people who went above and beyond what was required. In this regard, Michael Iammarone and Lucas Jones, who ran Tom's campaign, and by the end of which were practically living at the Newland electorate office, I understand—in fact I think they might have had mattresses under their desks—worked particularly hard on all of Tom's campaigns.

Michael Bombardieri, a fine electorate officer who dedicated many hours to the Newland electorate and built amazing relationships with many residents, was also a key factor. Then there is the rest of the campaign team, who deserve great thanks. I would hate to exclude anyone, but I have a list as follows: Matt Deane, Simion Bugingo, Matthew Ferencz, Carol Putland, Olivia Savvas, Mel Smart, Nyan Agoth, Matthew Marozzi, Peter and Jennifer Stone, Brian and Jean Sparks, Josh Wiley, Peter Sekulic, Philip Argenio, Liam Quirke, Alex Pados, Sam Miller, Graham Williams, and Geeth Geeganage. I am sorry if I pronounced anyone's name incorrectly.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: What about the leopard?

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: I am getting to that. It's funny honourable members should mention that.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: There was one last volunteer who the now member for Newland came to know a fair bit during the campaign. I never met this person but I heard a great deal about them, and that, of course, was the 'Liberal leopard', mentioned by many members on the other side. Let me put on the record the great effort that the 'Liberal leopard' made in spreading the message about the Liberal Party's record on Modbury Hospital. I am told it was well received by many residents.

In conclusion, I wish Mr Kenyon all the best in his future endeavours. He was truly a local politician who knew that community counted. He will be missed by many in his electorate and his shoes will be tough to fill by any future member, no matter what party they hail from.

Bills

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (VOLUNTEER CHARTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:02): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:03): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill will be familiar to the continuing members of this chamber. It is a bill that passed this house and lapsed in the previous parliament, where I understand it had overwhelming support across the benches, but was unable to come to a vote in those last dying hours of the previous parliament due to an interest in electoral reform rather than volunteers recognition—much-needed electoral reform, but this is also a most important bill.

This bill reintroduces a bill, and I pay tribute to the work of both the former MLC Hon. Robert Brokenshire and the former member for Morphett, Duncan McFetridge, who both brought this bill before this parliament previously. This bill gives legislative recognition to the South Australian Country Fire Service and the SASES emergency services volunteers charters.

These charters, currently sit in the regulations, but this bill moves them into the legislation itself. I do not do so lightly—this has been a long-held campaign from the volunteers themselves, and I think it is time that the parliament recognised that, and I certainly expect the strong support that this bill has had in the past from members who have previously moved it, that was enjoyed across the benches across the chamber, will be seen again.

These charters were originally launched under the Rann government and then relaunched in 2013. The bill, is a relatively small change to the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. The changes are to section 58 of the act to insert section 58A, which talks about the parliamentary recognition of the SACFS volunteer charter, and there are a few new subsections. Under section 107 there is an insertion of 107A, which introduces parliamentary recognition under the SASES volunteer

charter. The legislation will cover the approximately 14,000 CFS volunteers and 1,600 SES volunteers from whom our state currently enjoys a service.

That respect by this parliament for their very valuable volunteer contribution I would hope would come as something on which we could all work together across our political divides. Both the SES Volunteers Association and the CFS Volunteers Association support moving their charters into legislation. It mirrors what has been discussed in Victoria. Of course, the role of volunteers in the CFS and the SES has expanded greatly in past years, and the demands have not only expanded greatly in past years but we know, with the impacts of climate change, are likely to continue to grow.

So we need to make sure that our volunteers know they are valued and that they are supported not just in words, in regulations, but through the work and in law of this parliament, and recognised, of course, by governments of all colours. The first paragraphs of both charters reads:

The government of South Australia supports and recognises the role that emergency service volunteers play in our community.

One way of demonstrating support for these volunteers is through enshrining these charters in legislation. That is what they have called for, as members are no doubt well aware, and that is what we should do in the new parliament.

We should rectify our error of having let that last bill lapse in that dying day of parliament and ensure that this is one of the first pieces of legislation through this new parliament. It will show deep respect for our volunteers and acknowledge not just that they need to be recognised in a regulation, which of course can be disallowed at certain stages, but of course in legislation.

I am sure that many members will welcome the opportunity to laud the fine work of those who give their service to protect people and places in this state. They are often incredibly ordinary but inspirational members of our community, very valuable members of our community, and I think it is the least we can do to recognise those charters within the highest laws of our state. With those few words, I commend the bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins.

Motions

INTERNATIONAL MIDWIVES AND NURSES DAYS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:09): I move:

That this council—

1. recognises International Day of the Midwife held on 5 May annually, with the theme this year being 'Midwives leading the way with quality care';
2. recognises International Nurses Day held on 12 May annually, with the theme this year being 'Nurses, a voice to lead: health is a human right'; and
3. thanks all midwives and nurses for the important work that they do in caring for our community.

I acknowledge the presence in the parliament earlier today of Elizabeth Dabars, the state secretary of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation (ANMF), as well as Jocelyn Douglass, the president of the ANMF in South Australia, as well as many branch members, clinicians and academics. They have come to parliament today to hear this notion moved in the other place, where many members of that place were pleased to play tribute to the fine work of nurses and midwives throughout the state.

I had the pleasure of being able to join them for a light lunch, along with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing; Nat Cook, member for Hurtle Vale; Chris Picton, shadow minister for health; Eddie Hughes, member for Giles; the member for Narungga; the member for King; and my colleague in this place the Hon. Tung Ngo. It was an opportunity to thank nurses and midwives for the amazing work they do in our community, in hospitals, in nursing homes, with at-home care and in many other centres throughout our community.

International Day of the Midwife has been celebrated since 1992 as a way of focusing on the role of the midwife. Each year a theme provides the motivating call to action to all midwives to get

involved and to focus and to celebrate and to champion their work. This year, 'Midwives leading the way with quality care' is the theme. Midwives play such a vital role preparing women for pregnancy, ensuring that women and their precious newborns navigate pregnancy and childbirth safely, respectfully and powerfully.

It may not surprise members to learn that I have had quite a high level of involvement with midwives. Each of my six children was born with the help of midwives only, and I can attest to the important role that those midwives played.

I applaud programs that enable an expectant mother to build a relationship with one particular midwife throughout her pregnancy, have that midwife deliver her baby and have the same person involved in postnatal visits. This is such a beautiful partnership in women's care. But of course midwives are also involved in births that have complications, in stillbirths and in other difficult and tragic circumstances. We salute those who are with us through these most difficult of days as well as the most wonderful of days.

We hold International Nurses Day on the birthday of Florence Nightingale, known of course as the Lady with the Lamp. She lived a fine innings, dying at the age of 90 in 1910. Every year there is a theme for International Nurses Day also. This year the theme is 'Nurses, a voice to lead: health is a human right.' Nurses, too, play a vital role in our society. In fact, 2 per cent of the workforce are nurses. There are over 220,000 nurses across Australia. People who choose to become nurses do so because they are caring and compassionate people who support the wellbeing of our most vulnerable patients in a time of need.

Our nurses must be cared for also. The life of a nurse is difficult emotionally as well as physically and is often confronting. Our nurses often spend 10 hours on their feet without much of a break. If the hours are not draining enough, the sights seen certainly are. From nursing terminally ill patients to first responder nurses who witness firsthand the trauma of patients, this is not a job that when you finish at the end of the day you are likely to forget everything you have seen when you head home.

In spite of this, nurses are there when people are at that time of most need. They are there when people are uncomfortable, they are there when people are in pain, they are there when people are afraid. The work that nurses do is vital. Nursing is one of the most innovative of careers where change is constant. I am told, however, that a culture of friendship, camaraderie and solidarity is second to none.

It is also important to acknowledge the amazing work that nurses and midwives do in regional South Australia. There are thousands of nurses who service our regions with distinction—remote areas also, including the APY lands. Their commitment to serve ensures that everyone in our state has access to world-class healthcare.

As a Limestone Coast local, I was particularly pleased to see the nomination in the SA Health Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards, 'Excellence in practice—registered midwife', of Rachael Yates, who lives in Mount Gambier and was a finalist in this category. Congratulations, Rachael! And congratulations to all of those who were nominated and who won in those awards.

Of course, the opening of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital has seen thousands of nurses enter a state-of-the-art and purpose-built public hospital in which a skilled and experienced nursing staff will continue to drive person-centred care, leading innovation and inspire others with their passion and commitment. So to all the nurses and midwives of South Australia, thank you for your commitment; thank you for your dedication; thank you for your service. I commend the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DECriminalISATION OF SEX WORK) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 May 2018.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:15): I rise to continue my remarks that were briefly made in the last week of sitting, regarding the decriminalisation of sex work and the statutes amendment bill to decriminalise sex work that we are debating in this parliament. This is a reintroduction of the 2015 private members' bill that was brought to this place by the Hon. Michelle Lensink. It was passed in the Legislative Council in strong numbers, with 13 votes to 8, before lapsing at the end of last year in the House of Assembly, the other place, when the parliament was prorogued.

The bill also builds on the previous bill and the work of the Hon. Steph Key, the former member for Ashford, on the same subject. I acknowledge the many years of past work that have gone on here in the campaign for the decriminalisation of sex work. This is not the first attempt in this parliament at decriminalising sex work or effecting sex work reform. Those efforts date back to the 1980s, at least. Despite all these previous efforts, however, we are in a situation where South Australia has the most archaic and the oldest sex work laws in the country, and we need reform now.

There are approximately 2,000 sex workers currently operating in our state, many of whom work privately and are not employed by what is known as a brothel. This bill is based on the New Zealand model of decriminalisation of sex work and it seeks to achieve the following: safeguard the human rights of sex workers, protect sex workers from exploitation, promote the welfare and occupational safety and health of sex workers and create an environment conducive to public health. This bill will amend the Summary Offences Act 1953 and the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, which criminalises activities related to sex work in South Australia.

The new legislation, if passed by this parliament, will bar minors from conducting sex work and prohibit the provision of services to children.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, the member seeks you to show courtesy.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Mr Ridgway, it would be really appreciated if you could get off the phone—or at least not talk on the phone. Just listen. It would be nice if all the members in this council would listen to this debate. Thank you, Mr President, for your protection.

It will also address occupational health and safety concerns of sex workers. Due to criminalisation, sex work is unregulated and without industrial or workplace health and safety protections. Criminalisation has created an environment of stigma, discrimination and systematic exclusion that prevents sex workers from accessing health and support services and increases the risk of violence and abuse. It has also silenced sex workers from reporting to the police sexual abuse, harassment or damage to property caused by their clients.

Among a number of notable supporters, there are many in support of the decriminalisation model. Those include UNAIDS, the World Health Organization—indeed, the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, Ban Ki-moon, is on record—as well as bodies such as Amnesty International, which in 2015 announced their support for the full decriminalisation of all aspects of consensual work. The work that they did to develop that policy position included references to Australia.

I also acknowledge support for the model of decriminalisation from those sex workers themselves, such as the New Zealand Prostitutes Collective, as well as the Sex Industry Network in South Australia, Scarlet Alliance, the Sex Worker Action Group, Gaining Empowerment Rights and Recognition (SWAGGERR), as well as women's groups such as the YWCA, the Working Women's Centre, Zonta International, Soroptimists and the Women Lawyers' Association. As I introduced this bill last week it came with the support not only of the Women Lawyers' Association but of the Law Society of South Australia, both of whom put out media statements recommending the passage of this bill as it stands.

However, the stigma that is created by our current laws allows abuses for which we should not be standing. This bill, which previously went through a select committee, embodies a principle of 'nothing about us without us'. In the spirit of this I also welcome the supporters of this bill and those affected by the current laws who are not only with us today in the gallery but also those who have long advocated for this reform, such as Ari Reid and others who have had a voice in this space that certainly those of us who wish to listen have heard loud and clear.

Sex work is their occupation. This occupation has long existed and it will exist into the future. The antiquated laws surrounding the sex work industry in this state need an overhaul and sex workers themselves deserve and need the same rights and protections as any other worker. As it stands, this industry is often cloaked in criminality. This puts workers, who are in the majority female but by no means all female or female identifying, at risk every single day. Not only is their safety at risk but if they change their career later on their opportunities for different work or volunteering may be limited due to not only stigma but, of course, enforced discrimination, and if they accrue convictions they will follow them for the rest of their days.

Therefore, this bill also amends the Equal Opportunity Act to include discrimination on the grounds of being or having been a sex worker to the criteria for establishing discrimination. Whether you believe that sexual favours in exchange for money should or should not be a crime, it should not overshadow the fact that this is a human rights issue. The leading body on human rights, Amnesty International, has recommended decriminalisation as the model that will support those human rights.

The industry itself has been active in discussions and instrumental in shaping this bill which safeguards the rights of their workers. Most importantly, it is a bill that has involved and respected the input of those very workers that it concerns. A consideration of current laws may lead to some confusion, while the specific practice of sex work is not of itself actually illegal in South Australia. Exactly what is illegal and what is not is a little puzzling which is why, again, we have the need for such reform.

In the current Summary Offences Act, offences include soliciting, which is loitering or accosting someone in a public place, procuring for prostitution and living on the earnings of prostitution. Part 6 of the act refers to brothels with a range of offences including the keeping and managing of brothels, permitting premises to be used, and various others. Then there is the Criminal Law Consolidation Act which makes the keeping of a common bawdy house (a brothel) an offence.

Under this new bill sex in a public place will still be illegal; sex with a child will still be illegal; sex with a child purporting to be a sex worker will still be illegal; sex with someone who is not consenting will still be illegal; and trafficking and sexual servitude will still be illegal. None of these things will magically become legal because of the passage of this bill.

Despite some of the offences I have outlined, nowhere in South Australian law is there a specific offence of exchanging sexual services for money. For example, it may not be expressly prohibited for a person to engage in sex work itself but it is an offence to earn a living from its earnings or to work in a brothel. There are, therefore, gaping inconsistencies that demonstrate the need for reform.

The current laws are unworkable and from a policing point of view, in May 2016, when giving evidence before the select committee that was held into the previous version of this bill, SAPOL Assistant Commissioner Linda Fellows stated:

I think it is reasonable to say, and I think we have been consistent in our views over many years, that there are some definite challenges and difficulties in policing the current legislation as it exists. We do commit policing resources to the industry; however, it is a difficult thing under the current legislation to police, and I think some of the outcomes in our court matters, where we have proceeded to criminal charges, probably reflect those difficulties.

Meanwhile, I have recently been provided with evidence that in the past few months there has been an escalation of prosecutions in the Magistrates Court for offences under parts 5 and 6 of the current Summary Offences Act. A letter from Andrew English from the Legal Services Commission, Manager of the Criminal Law Practice Division, to Leah Marrone, President of the Women Lawyers' Association of South Australia, has detailed how duty solicitors at the Adelaide Magistrates Court have kept statistics on offences involving sex work between 3 August 2017 and 20 April 2018, noting the following:

The evidence would seem to suggest that SAPOL are embarked upon a significant operation of law enforcement in this area the likes of which we have not seen in South Australia for more than two decades.

To me, this underscores the need for urgent reform. So while interstate jurisdictions such as New South Wales have gone down a path of decriminalisation, there is currently a very strange use of police resources in South Australia, and as members of parliament we should be questioning what

is achieved by all of this. Furthermore, it reinforces an environment where workers do not have a trusting relationship with the police and, therefore, are put at such greater risk of personal harm.

Activities are pushed underground and other potential illegal activities are unlikely to be reported to the police in this environment. We must listen to those people who work within the industry who wish to keep other illegal activities away from their workplaces in order to enjoy a safe working environment. With all of these inconsistencies, there is clearly a need for reform. In making these reforms, we must listen to workers themselves, and that is why I advocate for the model of reform of decriminalisation contained within this bill where laws against sex work activities are repealed by removing the references from the criminal law.

This enables regulations covering other areas such as health and employment, enabling a focus on the health and safety of the workers and their conditions. This approach is not a new one. It currently operates in both New South Wales and, of course, in New Zealand. The changes, in fact, took place in New Zealand in 2003, and in the last 15 years the sky has not fallen in on the land of the long white cloud, and it will not fall in here in South Australia should we pursue this model.

There has been no evidence of an increase in street work in New Zealand as a result of decriminalisation. Indeed, the opposite is true. Street work in that country has diminished as a result of decriminalisation. Last week, the Law Society of South Australia put out a statement endorsing this bill and this model. It states:

The Law Society welcomes the introduction in Parliament today of a Bill to decriminalise sex work. The Statutes Amendment (Decriminalisation of Sex Work) Bill provides for the full decriminalisation of sex work, which the Law Society believes is the best model for the protection of workers, most of whom are women in the sex industry. 'After several attempts to decriminalise sex work, it's high time that existing antiquated laws are overhauled and sex workers are afforded the same rights and protections as any other employee,' Law Society President Tim Mellor said.

Mr Mellor went on to say that the safety and wellbeing of sex workers is compromised by existing laws which criminalise sex work. The Women Lawyers' Association of South Australia President, Leah Marrone, also put out a media statement endorsing this bill:

Our Association stands strongly for women's rights to full bodily autonomy. The evidence is clear that decriminalisation increases health and safety conditions for Sex Workers. We think it is vital that these workers are granted the same rights and protections as other workers in the State. It is vital that prior convictions for these offences can be spent to allow those workers to move ahead with their lives without having those convictions preventing them from gaining employment in other areas, or being involved in volunteering or various other aspects of community life. There must be full decriminalisation. No other model is appropriate or will achieve these outcomes because other models, such as criminalising those who use sex work services, criminalise the women by default and keep the industry underground.

I would note that many who do work in the sex industry actually choose to, and we should respect that choice. They have bodily autonomy and to not give women their own agency certainly is not something that I would see as a feminist principle, although those proponents of the Nordic model might perhaps disagree.

To summarise the provisions of this bill, part 2 of the bill deals with the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Section 68AA will be inserted, prohibiting services from being provided to a child, with a maximum penalty of 10 years. The offence of keeping a bawdy house (that relates to landlords) is deleted, as are common law offences related to prostitution. Amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 in part 3 are important to remove discrimination against sex workers. These changes will assist people who either have other jobs or do not wish to work in the industry.

Discrimination on the grounds of being or having been a sex worker are added to the existing grounds currently listed in the act. Part 4 of the bill deals with the Spent Convictions Act 2009, rendering convictions for prescribed sex work offences as spent, therefore dealing with the adverse effects of a criminal record. The Summary Offences Act 1953 is amended in part 5. The offences of soliciting and procurement and living on the earnings are deleted, as are the sections that relate to brothels. Part 6 of this bill deals with the Return to Work Act 2014, to extend provisions of that legislation to cover those who work in this industry, the sex industry.

In this place, I know there have been many long and sometimes heated debates about this matter. Certainly, for some it is a moral issue, but I would point both new and continuing members to parliamentary reports from New South Wales and New Zealand which have found that

decriminalising their laws has been effective in improving the health and safety of sex workers, as well as in reducing crime rates.

Also, I note that in 2005 this very bill in its previous form was referred to a select committee of seven members of the Legislative Council, they being the Hon. Robert Brokenshire, the Hon. John Darley, the honourable myself, the Hon. John Gazzola and the Hon. Michelle Lensink, as well as you, Mr President, and the Hon. Tung Ngo. This committee took evidence and reported after 18 months, and by a majority of four to three the committee agreed to support this bill. However, it is worth noting, Mr President, as you well know, that all seven members of this Legislative Council who were on that committee agreed that the body of the report is a true and fair representation of the evidence.

I refer members to the report of that select committee to inform their deliberations, and I note that there will no doubt be interest from members. I expect that this will be a conscience vote among many. It is actually a party vote for the Greens. We have a policy of decriminalisation. We respect the work of both the sex work organisations themselves, such as Scarlet Alliance, SIN and SWAGGERR, and of course Amnesty International, the World Health Organization and women's groups across the world. In this way, it is our party position to support decriminalisation.

I will be hosting, with other members who are supportive of a decriminalisation model, forums for members to ask questions, to be further educated. I welcome briefings, either in those forums or on a one-on-one basis, with interested members. I urge all members to speak to sex workers themselves about the implications of this bill for them and about their long campaign for decriminalisation. I also urge members to avail themselves of that select committee report. I look forward to an informed debate, I hope a historic debate, where we finally get this done. With those words, I commend the bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.J. Stephens.

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

Adjourned debate on motion for adoption.

(Continued from 15 May 2018.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:34): I rise to welcome the Address in Reply and the Governor's speech, and in doing so I thank His Excellency the Governor for his contribution to our state and indeed congratulate him on his fine service to our state and our community. It is, of course, not lost on me that our Governor, His Excellency the Honourable Hieu Van Le, came to this country in a way that in this day and age certainly would not see him across the road in that Government House building; it would see him languishing in an offshore detention centre. That is to our shame.

But he came with his 'suitcase of dreams', and this government certainly comes with their suitcase of dreams, some of which the Greens will wholeheartedly welcome: decentralisation of decision-making; and grassroots democracy is something that we will always support. There are many things, of course, that it will not surprise those on the government benches that the Greens will not countenance.

In terms of the government's vision for this session of parliament, it will be something to be commended should the government take seriously their pledge for transparency and for such things as shield laws to protect the sources of journalists and to ensure a free press, which is indeed one of the fundamentals of our democracy.

The Greens also welcome a commitment not to use government advertising for political purposes. We will hold this new Marshall government to that pledge, just as we held the former government to their pledge. Certainly I, for one, have lodged a few complaints over the years with respect to certain advertising campaigns that seemed to me a little bit too politically coloured and charged.

I welcome the appointment of a new TAFE SA board. The Greens have long been critical of the management of TAFE in this state. We have not been critical of those fine workers within the TAFE sector, certainly not critical of our need for technical and further education and certainly not

supportive of the words of the current federal minister with responsibility for this portfolio, who defined TAFE as somehow a bunch of basket weavers.

Firstly, Mr President, basket weaving is actually really hard. I do not know if you have ever done a class, but I have, and it is a very important skill! I think, however, the new minister was referring to one of the former Hawke era sledges of this sector as somehow underwater basket weaving, but perhaps he will at some stage correct the record. But of course plumbers, electricians, carpenters, digital creatives, those in the games industry and hospitality—so many things come through the technical and further education sector.

It is of vital importance to our state to ensure that we have the range of vocational options and educational options that do not just end with high school or indeed only countenance a university education. Vocational education should be treated with the respect it deserves. Unfortunately, for far too long it has been seen as the Cinderella of the education and training industry, and I look forward to there being some importance placed on this sector.

On that note, while I do welcome a new TAFE SA board, we also see that there is a role for public vocational education in this country, and the Greens strongly support the role of TAFE within that. A system of full contestability is a folly.

However, a system that ensures that we address the needs that we are to have into the future before they become either too pressing to deal with and require visas to fill, or in fact entire industries go under, is most welcome. The rejuvenation of the industry skills boards will be something that we will support. The decentralisation and the support for regional communities, particularly through TAFEs, will be something that we will support. A transparency of decision-making and ministerial accountability will be something that the Greens will support. We urge, in both this sector and the education sector, however, for the new government to consider the role of ombudsmen so that we stop seeing students ripped off, staff treated appallingly and the whole thing being seen as in the too hard basket.

We on the crossbenches in the Greens certainly think that vocational training and high-level skill creation is crucial for our state's future. We look forward, with those provisos, to working with the new government to achieve that. We are not sad to see the former CEO or, indeed, especially the chair of the previous board, lost to this state and we look forward to a far brighter future for TAFE.

In terms of the government's commitment to regions—and the Greens welcomed the briefing that we had prior to the election from the many mayors across our regions—we look forward to there being a decentralisation of some of those decision-making forums, but certainly the resourcing. We do not necessarily know whether or not the Royalties for Regions scheme as it stands is the best model, but we look forward to the government putting that on the table.

We also look forward to what the government has seen to be one of their big-ticket items: the extension of shop trading hours being debated in this place. I would have thought that would have been here by now. I would have thought that on the first day of parliament we would have actually had some form of legislation or, indeed, an outline of what this government's plan is to further deregulate shop trading hours.

So far, we simply have a promise in this Governor's speech that it will somehow create more jobs as well as provide consumers with greater choice. Well, unless there is a magic pudding, I fail to see how this will create more jobs, where the duopoly—the Coles and the Woolies and the big players—will be given the advantage over the local chicken shop and those small businesses will be put out of business. That is not creating jobs: that is simply pandering to the big end of town. The Greens will not support that. We will stand up for small businesses and will stand up for true choice.

The Greens will support some of the reforms of the education and children's services act. The transition of primary school into high school at year 7 is something that we welcome. We also very much welcome the reinvigoration of language studies in our South Australian schools. We also welcome the difference in the bill that we are yet to receive in this place, which will not seek to restrict the parent voice and the governing council voice. We would have moved to amend those from the previous government's legislation and we will support this government.

We will also urge this government again to ensure that we have true transparency and accountability in the sector, again through an ombudsman. The Greens have long called for an education ombudsman. We have seen time and time again those within this sector, be they the students, the parents or the staff themselves, identify flaws in the system but have nowhere to take those flaws to until they become scandals. That is not an appropriate way to deal with systems. We know that no system is perfect. We know that there will always be issues. Those issues should have a remedy and a redress before they become irreparable.

In terms of the government's proposal to introduce legislation that will provide legal safeguards for adults who are vulnerable to abuse or neglect, we note that that has come not only in the wake of Oakden but in the wake of the work of the previous member, the Hon. Kelly Vincent, with her long efforts in that, and certainly from the Greens benches we will be supporting mandatory reporting of elder abuse. We think it is high time that we took seriously the issue of elder abuse in this state and we will support the government in its bid to elevate that.

We will also be pushing to ensure that this state does whatever it can to increase the standards in our aged-care facilities. That means that, even if we do not see ratios agreed to at a federal level, in South Australia the Greens will put forward a bill to require those aged-care facilities to publish on their website, in their prospectus, their staff ratios: that is the least that we can do to ensure transparency and accountability to those families, loved ones and residents of those facilities. It is a simple measure but it could have a very big impact.

We will also support the abolition of the limitation of actions for claims arising from institutional child sexual abuse and look forward in the coming weeks to debating the state disability inclusion plan—yet again, another disappointment that that bill lapsed on those final days of the last parliament.

It is with great pleasure that I welcome and commend the announcement of the appointment of a commissioner who will have carriage of the safety and wellbeing of Aboriginal children and young people. We welcome the great outcomes this could bring that we have seen just across the border in Victoria. It is one of those Victorian things that we do not mind pinching and do not mind emulating. A Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People has had a great impact on the outcomes for those young people in that state, and we welcome the introduction of a commissioner here.

I commend at this point the work of ALRM in particular in progressing this debate, and the goodwill shown by all political parties in the recent state election in coming to the table to support such a commissioner. I think it will be a position that will not be simply symbolic but will have real practical outcomes for those children to have fulfilling and excellent experiences and lives, and that is what we should want for all children in this state. It is to our shame that Aboriginal children do not have those outcomes, compared with non-Aboriginal children at this point in time.

It is often the First Peoples and the last peoples who are the least equal in our state. I have noted that, had His Excellency our Governor come in this day and age he would not be over in Government House. The First Peoples of this nation have long suffered with inequality and conditions, stigma and discrimination that is simply unacceptable.

One thing that is simply unacceptable in the government's commitment is the idea that they will enshrine Australia Day celebrations within legislation in this state, somehow compelling local councils to comply with this law. I look forward to that piece of legislation coming before us. It was certainly confused messaging during the election that somehow local councils would be compelled to observe Australia Day.

In the wake of a change-the-date debate that is growing in force and includes former members of the federal Liberal government in its supporting ranks, to shut down a debate is the exact opposite of welcoming transparency and is the exact opposite of ensuring grassroots democracy. It is a totalitarian approach. I also look forward to seeing how constitutional it is and note that there is a Constitution Day in the calendar, and perhaps we might start observing that and all be educated about just how we came to have Australia Day on 26 January each year. That should be an interesting debate.

In terms of the shield laws, as I have said, I look forward to supporting those. I also look forward to seeing that freedom of information and, indeed, the commitment to losing the spin doctors

within government abided by. I hope that one of the conventions of this place is honoured for a change, that what is said in opposition is held to in government. With those few words, I commend the motion.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:50): I rise to speak in reply to His Excellency's speech to the opening of this session of the South Australian parliament. I thank the Governor for his opening address and for providing detail to the parliament of his new government's agenda. I, too, join the Governor in passing on my condolences on the passing of six former members since the opening of the Second Session of the Fifty-Third Parliament. Mr President, I acknowledge your promotion to the chair of this place and I know that you will conduct yourself in the role in an impartial and professional manner.

I also would like to quickly acknowledge the recent election of various members to this place. On my side of the chamber I already know the positive impact the Hon. Clare Scriven, the Hon. Emily Bourke and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos will have on this place. I have also come to know the Hon. Connie Bonaros through her previous employment in the parliament. I am sure both she and her colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo will serve the people of this great state to the best of their abilities. At the last election we also lost two outstanding contributors to this place, the Hon. Rob Brokenshire and the Hon. Kelly Vincent. I had the pleasure of getting to know the two of them over the last four years, and I wish them every success in their future endeavours.

The Governor outlined some of the key priorities that the new Marshall Liberal government wish to advance over the next four years. I would like to take this opportunity to speak to some of them. Ultimately, the message I got from the Governor's speech is that this government views economic growth as its overarching priority, which will assist in reaching its various targets and aspirations for South Australia. From our side of the chamber, I think you will find furious agreement on this particular sentiment.

The government has reflected, through the Governor's speech, that economic growth will assist in implementing its mandate to create more jobs, lower costs for households and businesses, and deliver better government services. I do not think there would be a single member of this chamber who would dispute these three priorities. Of course, how you get there is where our differences lie, particularly in terms of how our state budget is managed. In any case, I think you will find that, on our side of the chamber, there is a level of acceptance of the fact that, with an incoming Liberal government, there will be a change of economic policy in this state.

It has been highlighted by the Governor that this government believes economic policies must be set in a manner that support growth in the private sector because our state's history shows that is what works best for South Australia. The Labor Party wholeheartedly agrees with this. However, one can assume that, through many of this Liberal government's iterations since taking power, the only way they believe they can achieve this goal is by cutting taxes and almost never through direct government intervention in the economy. Now in opposition, Labor must accept that this government holds this philosophy and therefore it is incumbent on us to give them the opportunity to implement their ideas.

It is quite clear that our leader, Mr Peter Malinauskas, is prepared to be constructive. He has already indicated that our party will be supporting the government's proposed cuts to payroll tax. In saying this, I warn the new government that tax cuts are not the only way to stimulate growth and, if not implemented properly, can do more harm than good when considering the state's financial position. My concern is that the new government says it sees no role for government intervention in the economy. The government says it is very deliberately refocusing support for industry away from short-term stimulus and heavy reliance on individual company grants and subsidies.

It was the previous Weatherill government's intervention, along with the hard work of the Defence Teaming Centre and local industry, that has ensured the submarines will be built in South Australia. It was also the Weatherill government's collaboration with the defence and space industries in South Australia that has ensured that our state is in the best position to have the majority of work on the frigates based here, as well as being best placed to become the home of Australia's national space agency.

There is already bipartisan support for the establishment of a national space agency in South Australia, but it was the Weatherill government that created the South Australian Space Industry Centre (SASIC) to drive space industry innovation research and entrepreneurial developments. I have no doubt that this work, as well as the signing of the memorandum of understanding with the ACT, has left our state better prepared to advocate for the national space agency to be based here. In fact, in an article just yesterday in *The Advertiser*, it has been reported that the number of space technology organisations in South Australia has doubled to 60 in the last couple of years.

SASIC's director, Mr Nicola Sasanelli, said that this had created a vibrant ecosystem. He also said that 80 per cent of the investment was private and only 20 per cent by governments. The point is that this private investment is only following on from the planning of then premier Weatherill and the then Labor government to ensure that industry was well aware that we would fight for its interest. Following on from this, my question to the current government is: what good would a tax cut be to component suppliers in the space technology industry if there was no work for them to generate an income in the first place?

That work is only guaranteed by a strong state government that acts in the state's interests, not one that believes market forces should almost always be left to their own devices. I hope Premier Marshall shows the strength that Labor showed in government to ensure that the national space agency is located in South Australia.

A noticeable aspect of last week's federal budget has been the more favourable terms of trade that the nation is experiencing, with mining rebounding after its recent slump and the value and volume of our exports picking up substantially. Whilst in regional terms this has meant that exports have picked up more rapidly in the mining states, it will still mean extra money flowing into our state coffers. It was reported that there is up to \$500 million in extra GST in the next financial year alone.

I am happy that the incoming Treasurer has insisted upon the maintenance of horizontal fiscal equalisation (HFE) when calculating grants made to states through the Commonwealth Grants Commission. It has also been noted that HFE is now ensuring that Western Australia gets a greater share of the national pie of GST in recognition of the downturn in its economy in the last few years. It is now receiving an extra \$1 billion this coming financial year.

The nature of the way GST payments to the states works is that there is always some lag time in how they are adjusted. For example, at the height of their boom, WA was still getting its historically higher levels of GST payments. In fact, up until 2006, WA was still a net recipient of GST. We only heard them complaining when their payments were lowered which happened to coincide with their Liberal government's economic mismanagement and saw them enter into a recession.

Ironically, the greater share now being granted to WA is now coinciding with a boost in its economy and its commodity exports once more. HFE is not perfect but it serves a purpose to ensure fairness across the country. I say this because particularly post Olympic Dam it is likely that South Australia will never experience the rivers of gold that WA and Queensland obtained by exploiting their natural resources.

The one caveat is whether this government has the fortitude to explore the possibilities of greater involvement in the nuclear industry, something not offered by the now Premier in a bipartisan way when Labor was in government. Likewise, unless the incoming government plans on allowing for an extremely rapid expansion of our local population, the likelihood is that we will not have the same level of service industries here that Sydney and Melbourne have.

I welcome yesterday's news that the Commonwealth government is putting a policy in place to force new migrants to stay in regional areas longer. This will benefit South Australian regions in the long term and is something that the previous state Labor government had long been advocating for. How we best exploit the comparative advantages we have as a state, compared to the rest of the nation and the world, means more than cutting taxes; it means working with industry and helping them address the many challenges that they have domestically and internationally. We have always been an export-driven state and the success or otherwise of our exports is driven by a greater suite of factors than simply how much payroll tax our companies are paying.

I welcome the new government's initiative to open up various trade offices in Asia. I am a big supporter of this policy as it provides practical on-the-ground assistance for our exporters. I hope the

government will consider opening more offices across the region, particularly in Vietnam where there is strong growth.

It is important that this government stands up for South Australia and takes every opportunity it gets. I can assure them that leaving everything to the market will not help them in their target of reaching the national growth rate in the long run. It is this target that the government has set itself that we, as an opposition, will now hold this government to account on.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (17:04): I rise to make a few comments in relation to the Address in Reply. Firstly, I thank and congratulate the Governor for the wonderful work that he does as the Governor of our state. I may have said this in past contributions but I remember the opportunity I was given in opposition when Martin Hamilton-Smith was opposition leader. He was also the shadow minister for multicultural affairs and he asked me to be the shadow assistant minister for multicultural affairs. The very first function I went to was the very first function—

The Hon. J.E. Hanson interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The Hon. Justin Hanson laughs. It was actually a Serbian church service, so you might want to control your laughter. At my very first function, the Hon. Hieu Van Le came as Lieutenant-Governor to his very first function as Lieutenant-Governor, so we joined each other at a Serbian church service. I have watched his contribution and service to our community over that 10-year period (or longer) and I am filled with admiration for the work that he and his lovely wife, Lan, do in serving our community in the role as Governor and Governor's wife. We are very proud of what they do, and it is always a pleasure to see the Governor.

To you, sir, congratulations on your elevation to high office. I recall when you gave your first speech in this parliament you were called the honourable and gallant Andrew McLachlan by the former president, and it is nice to see that the honourable and gallant Andrew McLachlan is now President of this Legislative Council. The Governor outlined the economic road map that this government has for transforming South Australia's economy and righting some of the wrongs that have been done, so I do not wish to go over that—and it is 5pm on a Wednesday.

I want to take the opportunity, firstly, to say farewell to two members who stood for re-election but are no longer here in the Hon. Robert Brokenshire and the Hon. Kelly Vincent. The Hon. Robert Brokenshire, as members would know, was part of the Liberal Party many years ago and then joined this place as one of the members of Family First. His contribution was quite significant while he was here, and he certainly agitated for regional South Australia and farmers. I was the shadow minister for agriculture during a lot of that time, and you had to be up early to beat him to a news grab on the radio.

I saw the Hon. Kelly Vincent here yesterday, as did a number of members. I agree about the contribution she made. I will always remember her maiden speech where she said that, given her predicament in life, she did a lot of reading and writing and her favourite book as a child growing up was a thesaurus. I think she had a command of the English language, certainly better than mine, and probably better than most people's in this place. I think she made a significant contribution for somebody so young at the age of 21; certainly, at 21, I would not have been able to make a contribution such as the Hon. Kelly Vincent made. I think she was a strong advocate for her constituency and a strong advocate for the disability sector. I think the community in South Australia is better because of it.

I also congratulate all the new members, especially those on our side of the chamber, on our side of politics. I will quickly touch on the House of Assembly. It is a wonderful privilege to be elected to government, and there are 11 new members of the Liberal Party in the House of Assembly. Not only have we been elected to government, but we have renewed the team as well which I think stands us in good stead for having a real depth of talent.

We have a depth of talent, so I would like to acknowledge and congratulate the member for Narungga, Fraser Ellis; the member for Colton, Matt Cowdrey; the member for Morphett, Stephen Patterson; the member for Elder, Carolyn Habib; the member for Finniss, David Basham; the member for Davenport, Steve Murray; the member for Heysen, Josh Teague; the member for Kavel, Dan

Cregan; the member for King, Paula Luethen; the member for Newland, Richard Harvey; and the member for MacKillop—my home stomping ground—Nick McBride. I congratulate them all. They all worked very hard, focused on the campaign, and they all had success. Perhaps some found it a little easier than others, but nonetheless at the end of the day, we supported each other as a team, and I am delighted to see those people elected.

I also acknowledge the election of the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the Hon. Connie Bonaros, and on the other side of the chamber, the Hon. Emily Bourke, the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos and the Hon. Clare Scriven. I finish with the Hon. Clare Scriven because one of her closing comments of her maiden speech is the reason I thought I would stand up and make some comments today. She said she looked at the House of Assembly and saw all of these men in blue suits and so few women on the Liberal side of parliament.

I probably spoke about this topic a number of times in the last parliament, but those comments struck a chord with me. It was her faction and her party that were behind the You Can't Trust Habib campaign that attacked Ms Carolyn Habib in the 2014 election which, I think, was a disgrace. The Labor Party often says of the Liberal Party that we do not have enough women in parliament, yet we get a quality young woman and they decide to turn one of the nastiest, most vile and racist attacks on her as a candidate.

It was not just the Liberal Party that was outraged. Ed Husic, a senior member of the Labor Party in Canberra, made public statements at how outraged he was. The media was outraged—I think Sarah Martin, who writes for *The Australian* was outraged, as was Matthew Abraham, who was on ABC Radio at the time. They were all outraged that this particular action would be taken by a party in an election against a young woman who had put herself up to represent her community, and their only action is to attack her because of either her name, her ethnicity or the colour of her skin. It was a disgraceful attack.

So while the Hon. Clare Scriven will say that we do not have enough women, until her party acknowledge publicly that it was wrong and they apologise for it, I will hold her and her party responsible for one of the nastiest attacks I have seen in modern politics. It is interesting that afterwards, the then premier Weatherill tried to distance himself from it, and I think it was the treasurer at the time, the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis, that came out and defended it. I was interested to see how the Labor Party tried to defend their actions at the time, saying it was not racist, yet we all knew it was and we all knew what they were trying to do, to play that race card in an election.

I was very disappointed that the then member for Elder, Annabel Digance, made no effort whatsoever to offer any apologies, either privately or publicly. In fact, she claimed she knew nothing about it, and she was upset, I am told, that I made a couple of speeches in the last parliament about it. She said she did not know about it, but she should have come out publicly and said who was behind it. It would have made it much easier for her to have somewhat of a clearer conscience, but she did not ever do that.

Now, it is interesting that, as when you are faced with execution or are in your final hours, I had the sort of fortune to come and spend a little bit of time with a former minister on election day. I related this story that I was so offended, and I thought it was one of the low points in the now 16 years of parliament (it was 12 back then) that this outrageous attack would be levelled against a quality young female candidate by the party that says we do not have enough women. Yet, they are prepared to do that; something I do not think any other political party in this state would ever stoop so low as to do, but the Labor Party was prepared to.

This former minister wanted to confess before they were 'assassinated' or before the final curtain fell on the Labor Party. They claimed to know who was behind it and they told me a few things about the actions that were taken, all inwardly by the Labor Party, not externally. They tell me—I do not know whether this is true, but they tell me that a Mr Tim Picton was the architect of this particular bit of material. I do not know, but that is the name that they offered to me.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Point of order: the minister is obviously going to use this speech to slander, and all sorts, people who are not even in the parliament. I think the President should warn him that there is a certain dignity and respect that this house should show for other people, and under parliamentary privilege. He would not have the guts to go out on the front steps and say it so why

should he use parliamentary privilege on an Address in Reply speech just to mud rake against people? I have never heard of all this, and to stand there and name names of people that you are putting the blame on is outrageous, absolutely outrageous.

The PRESIDENT: I note your concern, but the member is entitled to use his privilege. If he uses it unwisely, then the person affected can use the motion we moved on the first day of parliament.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thank you for your guidance, Mr President. What I am told is that premier Weatherill was outraged—but of course he did not show that externally; he was saying it was not racist—so much so that he refused to sit in meetings with the person whom I mentioned formerly. He also made sure that a committee was formed to vet these things so that it did not happen again. It was a committee of lower house candidates; I am not quite sure who, but I was told there was a committee formed to vet this sort of thing.

What that shows to me is that they actually knew it was wrong but they did not have the courage to come out and say, 'We are sorry. We overstepped the mark.' That is all it would have taken. We know that in the heat of battle sometimes silly things are done, but this Labor Party has never ever had the courage to say, 'Actually, that was wrong. We went too far and we apologise.'

Until we get that from the Labor Party, I will hold them responsible for the fact that they do not value the contribution of women in parliament, because of the attack that they levelled against Carolyn Habib. People like the Hon. Clare Scriven have no grounds whatsoever to attack us or any other political party for the make-up of our political teams in relation to gender until there is a proper apology from the Labor Party about the campaign entitled, 'Can you trust Habib?' It was disgraceful, it should never have happened and they should apologise to the member, the person involved, Carolyn Habib, the parliament and the people of South Australia.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher.

At 17:16 the council adjourned until Thursday 17 May 2018 at 14:15.