

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 30 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.

### *Ministerial Statement*

#### **ABORIGINAL VETERANS COMMEMORATIVE SERVICE**

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:16):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the 12<sup>th</sup> annual Aboriginal Veterans Commemorative Service made earlier today in another place by the Premier.

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

### *Question Time*

#### **NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** An SBS news article dated 25 May 2018 reports, in reference to remote Aboriginal housing, that:

While Minister Scullion said he's confident a deal with both Western Australia and South Australia will be signed in coming week—

and I assume that should be 'in the coming week'—

he called his negotiations with Queensland problematic and challenging.

Further to this, in question time in this place on 9 May 2018, the Minister for Human Services said that negotiations regarding the NPARIH agreement were happening at a Treasurer to Treasurer level. I think the exact quote from *Hansard* on 9 May was, 'Those have been taking place at a Treasurer to Treasurer level'. My questions to the Minister for Human Services are:

1. Does the minister stand by her comments that those negotiations have been taking place at a Treasurer to Treasurer level?
2. As the responsible minister, has she now satisfied herself that these discussions are in fact on track and a decision is imminent?
3. What formal advice has the minister sought and received on the NPARIH negotiations and agreement?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:19):** I thank the honourable member for that question. The responses that I made at the time stand. The negotiations are ongoing. I am not going to be in the practice, when negotiations are taking place between the South Australian and the commonwealth government, of giving an ongoing commentary about where they are at, but I am confident that our government is doing everything it can in the best interests of this agreement for South Australians and I look forward to some announcement in due course.

**NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Supplementary arising from the answer: has the minister informed herself, via formal advice from her department, as to the status of these negotiations?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:19):** I am fully aware of the status of these arrangements, but I will not be providing an ongoing commentary in the public domain when there are ongoing negotiations.

*The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** No, I haven't finished. The Leader of the Opposition would be well aware, as would anybody who has ever been involved in any negotiations that are taking place at whatever level—whether it is officer to officer, minister to minister or any other level within government to government arrangements—that you do not provide an ongoing public commentary in the interests of your negotiating position. That would be a foolhardy approach and I don't have anything to add.

**NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** Supplementary arising from the answer: has the minister received a written briefing from her department since 9 May on this issue?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:20):** As I said at the conclusion of my previous response, I have nothing to add.

**NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21):** Final supplementary arising from the original answer and the question that talked about the comments from minister Scullion. Is the minister calling minister Scullion foolhardy by referring to the state of the negotiations?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:21):** I will not be verbally by the Leader of the Opposition. He is a little hard of hearing; I said two questions ago that I have nothing further to add.

**NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Treasurer.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** During question time on 9 May and again today, the Minister for Human Services not only threw the federal Minister for Indigenous Affairs, Nigel Scullion, under a bus by calling him foolhardy, but has also thrown the Treasurer under a bus.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, no political commentary. It's for contextual only.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** The Minister for Human Services has repeated her previous assertion that negotiations regarding the NPARIH agreement were happening at a Treasurer to Treasurer level. Will the Treasurer advise:

1. The state of these negotiations?
2. What formal communication he has had with the federal government, given the Minister for Human Services says they were happening at a Treasurer to Treasurer level?
3. When he expects these negotiations to be concluded, given that the tens of millions of dollars per year runs out at the end of this financial year?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:22):** I am sorely tempted to say I have nothing further to add. However, I will say marginally more than that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The government front bench will act with some decorum. Do not provoke the front bench, Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** Point of order: I just heard the Minister for Human Services refer to the Leader of the Opposition as a grub. I don't think that's good parliamentary behaviour and I think she should withdraw that.

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Mr President, I apologise and withdraw that remark.

**The PRESIDENT:** Thank you, minister. Treasurer, please resume your answer.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I had hardly started. I really do not have much further to add to the excellent responses given by my ministerial colleague in relation to the series of questions that the Leader of the Opposition put to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Treasurer, continue.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I will restate it again: I really have nothing much further to add to the excellent responses given by my ministerial colleague to the series of questions and supplementaries put to her by the Leader of the Opposition in relation to this particular matter. The answers that the minister gave were entirely accurate and the minister's response was also entirely accurate in relation to the general approach, not only of her as minister but also of the government. That is, by and large and in general terms, the government will conduct its negotiations like adults, or like grown-ups, which might be a bit of a surprise to the Leader of the Opposition and others. But the new government believes the most productive way to conduct negotiations with either other governments or, in particular, the federal government is to behave like adults and have sensible, rational discussions in the interests of the people of South Australia.

There will be occasions where the state government will take a strongly differing view to the position of the federal government. Mr President, I remind you and other members of the strong position the incoming government has taken in relation to the GST distribution and horizontal fiscal equalisation, where we have unequivocally nailed our colours to the mast and adopted a different position to the federal government. If it is in ultimately the best interests of the people of South Australia on a negotiation, we will indicate and indicate publicly a difference of opinion, if we have a difference of opinion. Until we get to that stage, we will conduct our negotiations like grown-ups.

As the minister has indicated, there are ongoing discussions in relation to this particular important issue for South Australia. I have been involved, as the minister has indicated, in those discussions, as indeed, more importantly, have Treasury officers in terms of the negotiations of either partnership agreements or federal-state funding arrangements. The role of Treasury officers is obviously important, as are the roles of officers in the respective agencies as well. There is a partnership that needs to be developed. I can only concur with the statement and the answers that my ministerial colleague has given in relation to this particular issue.

#### **NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** Supplementary arising from the answer: given that the Treasurer has characterised the Minister for Human Services' answers as entirely accurate, will the Treasurer confirm that he himself has had formal communication with the federal Treasurer on this matter?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:26):** I am not sure how slowly I have to speak for the Leader of the Opposition. I indicated clearly in my response that the minister's answers were entirely accurate. I'm not sure how much more explicit one can be. I indicated that as Treasurer I had been involved. I indicated also that Treasury officers had also been involved. That is, to any sensible person listening to the responses, an indication that as Treasurer I have been involved in discussions not only with the federal Treasurer but also with other state treasurers as well. This is an issue of

shared concern amongst all treasurers in terms of states and territories, but it is much more significant for some states and some territories in terms of the funding arrangements. I think that is probably a fair characterisation of the slightly differing views amongst state treasurers.

I have been engaged and involved, and that is indeed what I said in response to the first question. If the Leader of the Opposition wants me to take up question time by repeating an answer I have already given, I am happy to do so and do so again if he wants to ask another supplementary.

#### **NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** A final supplementary: given that the Treasurer has confirmed that he has had personal discussions with the federal Treasurer and he has also confirmed that he has had discussions with state treasurers, in the interests of being an open and transparent government, what other state treasurers has the Treasurer had discussions on this issue with? I'm not asking the nature of those, just which ones.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:28):** Mr President, I am not sure how hard of hearing the Leader of the Opposition is.

*The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I indicated all state and territory treasurers.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** You have talked to every state and territory Treasurer on this?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I attended a meeting—

**The PRESIDENT:** It is not a conversation, Leader of the Opposition. Let the Treasurer respond.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** It's difficult in trying to get a simple answer through to the Leader of the Opposition. I indicated that I had had discussions with the commonwealth Treasurer and with other state and territory treasurers. There are two separate meetings that treasurers have the opportunity to participate in. One goes by the acronym of CFFR, which is all of the state and territory treasurers with the commonwealth Treasurer. As of last Friday, there is another forum called the Board of Treasurers, which involves the state and territory treasurers, which meets in the absence of the commonwealth Treasurer.

They are the two vehicles through which a state treasurer in South Australia has the opportunity to share views with other Treasury colleagues. On both of those occasions, this important issue, amongst others, was amongst the agenda items, the discussion items, that were discussed, both in the formal session and also in informal sessions afterwards. There have also been a range of other interactions, which I will not go into, between myself as Treasurer and other representatives of other jurisdictions outside of those two particular fora of the Board of Treasurers and the CFFR meeting as well. I am not sure, I would hope after three endeavours that the Leader of the Opposition may well at least now understand that the responses the minister gave were, as I characterised them, entirely accurate in relation—

*The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** —entirely accurate in relation to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, allow the Treasurer to complete his answer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** —and minister and front bench of the government, please do not encourage the Leader of the Opposition. Treasurer, please conclude your remarks.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I will conclude my remarks by saying my ministerial colleague's comments were entirely accurate as I characterised them in my first response and I can add nothing more than the two supplementary responses I have given subsequently.

**NATIONAL PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT ON REMOTE INDIGENOUS HOUSING**

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:31):** I am seeking some clarity on this issue because we have the Minister for Human Services saying that the Treasurer was conducting treasurer-level agreements and negotiations, whereas the Treasurer just told us now that he was in fact 'involved' in discussions. Now, those things are quite distinctly different. I ask the Treasurer: are you leading these discussions at a national level on the NPARIH agreement, or is the Minister for Human Services?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:31):** As always, this new incoming Marshall Liberal government is a partnership, it is a collaboration. We have ministers who take responsibility and we have shared responsibilities in relation to these particular issues. In terms of the discussions with the federal Treasurer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Allow the Treasurer to respond in silence.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** In terms of the discussions with the federal Treasurer and the state and territory treasurers, I have had sole carriage of those discussions. I have led the discussions. I have been involved in the discussions, whichever particular phraseology the honourable member would like to use—involved, led, participated in—whatever phrase he would like to use I would be quite comfortable with. So in those discussions with the federal Treasurer and with state and territory treasurers I have been the state minister involved in all of those discussions.

In terms of discussions with housing ministers, that is not an issue in terms of the housing ministers that I have had direct negotiation or discussions with, other than of course my ministerial colleague in South Australia. The discussions in terms of national partnership agreements—and I am not sure whether the Hon. Mr Hunter was asleep at the wheel at state cabinet meetings but if there were national partnership agreements with education, for example, or with health, as we are currently having discussions at the moment, and housing, and I think there might be a fourth area, as the Treasurer, I am actively engaged, involved, participate, whatever word you would like to use, in all of those discussions. But in relation to health, for example, there is obviously a discussion that also goes on between health ministers at their particular level as well, but as the Treasurer I am also involved or participate in terms of discussions with federal Treasury because ultimately there are very significant budget impacts.

**ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34):** My next question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** It is reported that at the Royal Adelaide Hospital we have seen an unexpected spike in infections from hip and knee surgery that has caused SA Health to cancel, as has been reported, 27 elective hip and knee replacement surgeries at the new hospital in recent weeks. It has been reported that there are infection rates three to four times above the accepted level for these procedures. My questions to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing are:

1. When did he as minister first become aware of this issue?
2. When did his ministerial office first become aware of this issue?
3. What steps has the minister directed be taken to fix this problem?
4. Why has the health and wellbeing minister not issued a public statement and instead tried to hide this issue?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:35):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his questions. Through the clinical governance processes at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, it was noted that there was a significant increase in infection rates following the opening of the new RAH in September 2017. I am advised that this correlates to an infection rate of 3.5 per cent,

which is above the expected rate for the surgery, which is 1 per cent or less. So it was identified internally and it has been addressed.

As a precaution orthopaedic surgeons have postponed hip and knee replacement surgeries at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for this week and next. Work is underway to maximise patient safety by ensuring that infection prevention and control requirements are met within the areas where this surgery is performed. Work is underway to reschedule those surgeries as soon as possible, and it is planned for some surgeries to be undertaken at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, depending on the availability of surgeons and beds.

Emergency and urgent surgery is continuing as per normal, and all other elective surgery is expected to go ahead as planned. A group has been established to try to identify the possible causes and develop an action plan to resolve the matter. In terms of when I was advised, I was advised orally late last week, and I was provided with a parliamentary briefing note this week.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:36):** Supplementary: just to follow up on the minister's answers and some of the original questioning, when was the minister first made aware of the situation and when was his office first made aware of the situation?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37):** My recollection is that I was orally advised late last week. In relation to the knowledge of my office, I will make inquiries.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:37):** Final supplementary (and it was the fourth part of the question): why did the minister decide not to issue a public statement when he first became aware and instead tried to cover up this matter?

**The PRESIDENT:** The last bit of that question is inserting an inference. The question is fine, barring the inference. I was going to correct you after that, but I will take the opportunity to do it now. Minister, you can answer the first bit; you don't need to make comment on the inference.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37):** All the information I have received indicated to me the clinicians are dealing with the clinical issue appropriately. I don't see the benefit to the public of taking up the Leader of the Opposition's suggestion that somehow the minister needs to direct all clinical responses.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:38):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.S. LEE:** There has been significant public interest and discussion about the design flaws in the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Can the minister update the council on what steps the government is undertaking to address those design flaws?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:38):** I thank the honourable member for her question and appreciate her ongoing interest in the wellbeing of South Australians. The former Labor government's approach to building the new RAH was like a child who designs a house of Lego: not for the world that is but for the way they want the world to be.

We saw that in Labor's plan for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, because they designed a hospital with two-thirds less outpatient capacity, not because they had models of care that would deliver two-thirds less need for outpatient capacity but because they were hoping that in 10 years the new world might be there. Instead, 10 years later we are still in the same situation: we still need a large amount of outpatient capacity, and Labor has left us a hospital with two-thirds less.

What did that mean for real South Australians in real need? It meant that people with cystic fibrosis, people with lung transplants and people with other forms of respiratory conditions were forced to continue to use a stranded clinic on the east end of North Terrace. Labor built the new RAH. They promised in 2014 that all old RAH services would go to the new RAH, yet a whole range

of services, including the TB clinic, the pain unit and the CF clinic, were left behind. There are no plans to transfer the pain unit to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital because the former government broke that promise by transferring that clinic to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

I have been working with CALHN management and SA Health since I was appointed as minister; in fact, it was in October or November last year that the Liberal Party indicated its real concern about that clinic being stranded. I note, for the sake of the record, that the Centre Alliance, then SA-Best, during the election campaign indicated that the transfer of the chest clinic was a high priority for that group too. So I was very pleased today to be able to join the Premier at the Royal Adelaide Hospital to announce the relocation of the chest clinic. It will mean that we will be able to have outpatient services provided for people with chronic lung conditions, such as cystic fibrosis, tuberculosis and lung transplants, at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Space has been identified within the RAH and a lease agreement entered into, which ends months of uncertainty for patients and staff and will ensure that the patients of the chest clinic can return to have high quality care on the same site as the RAH. Services will begin as soon as possible, following a fit-out of the space. I understand that's in the order of about a month.

Of course we understand that patients will continue to need care during that transition. There is an additional pharmacist full time at the chest clinic site, there are arrangements in place for patients to get Cabcharge vouchers to travel between the two sites and there are additional administrative and nursing staff who have been engaged.

What I look forward to is not only a co-location of those services but also the opportunity to relinquish those short-term measures that have been put in place to deal with the dislocation. The Marshall Liberal government takes no joy from highlighting the bumbles of the former Labor government, but we are delighted when we fix them.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:42):** Supplementary: is the reason the minister hasn't made a public statement about surgical infections at the RAH because he wanted to make a good news story public announcement today about opening the pain clinic?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:42):** Mr President, that seems to me to be a comment, not a question.

**The PRESIDENT:** No, minister, it was a clear question.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** No.

#### NATIONAL PARKS

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:42):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Tourism about developments in national parks.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** Eighteen new nature-based tourism business opportunities were released by the department for environment and water back in October 2017. Expressions of interest for these opportunities closed on 31 January this year. Some of these opportunities involve the construction of new infrastructure, including tourist accommodation, roads, wastewater and other facilities inside national parks. The governing principles for these projects include the relevant local development plan, but also the approved management plan for each of these parks under the National Parks and Wildlife Act.

For example, if we look at the expression of interest sought for tourist accommodation in the Lincoln National Park, the government's website suggests that areas of more than five hectares might be allocated and a minimum of 11 and a maximum of 50 tourist accommodation units might be built. Under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, section 40 provides that operations must not be undertaken in any national park unless they are consistent with the adopted plan of management.

But when you look at the plan of management for Lincoln National Park, it says nothing about new tourist accommodation. In fact, the only reference to accommodation is an historic cottage that

has been there for 100 years and is rented out to tourists. There is no mention of any new tourist accommodation.

My question is: can the minister assure the chamber that any new tourism infrastructure inside national parks or other conservation areas will be consistent with the approved management plans for those parks? I appreciate that this crosses three portfolios—the planning minister, the tourism minister and the environment minister—so if the minister isn't able to give that assurance, will he commit to consulting with his ministerial colleagues, the Minister for Environment and the Minister for Planning, to ensure that approved management plans for national parks will be followed before any new infrastructure is approved?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:45):** I thank the honourable member for his question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I know the members opposite get a bit excited, but I would like them to listen in silence today. Nature-based tourism is, I think, an important initiative that enjoys bipartisan support—we have a former minister across the chamber—and probably broad support, if done properly, by all members in this chamber.

In fact, I was always reluctant to say this when the former minister was the minister, but I did actually walk on the walking trails on the tip of Kangaroo Island in the Flinders Chase National Park. I was always reluctant to say this prior to the election, but they are a very wonderful tourism asset in South Australia. I didn't have a particularly long time on it. At the time, I thought I was a little bit sceptical when the minister was answering the plethora of Dorothy Dixier questions he was receiving about his initiative in the Flinders Chase National Park, but I think that's a very good example of how you can have some modest development in a national park and showcase some of the wonderful natural beauty that South Australia has.

We grew up here. Those of us who have lived here all our lives tend to take the natural beauty that we have in South Australia for granted. When you start to talk to interstate, overseas and even intrastate tourists—ones who have perhaps not experienced that before—you begin to realise that we do have some wonderful assets.

Even this morning, at the South Australian Tourism Industry Council (SATIC) conference, the Minister for Environment and Water, the Hon. David Speirs, addressed that particular breakfast on the topic of nature-based tourism, and you could tell by the enthusiasm in the crowd that certainly the tourism sector sees this as an important initiative to expand our offering in the tourism industry, to create more jobs in regional South Australia and to grow these businesses.

In particular, when I had the good fortune to visit Innes National Park—I think it was about 15 months ago; I went on a particular visit to do a proper tour of the park—a lot of the park officials, the former minister's department, were saying, 'One of the things we miss down here in Innes is to have a critical mass of jobs so that there are some jobs for young people to do, for people in the hospitality sector, because our community is very seasonal and if we had more jobs here then we would actually have a chance to grow a more vibrant community.'

You can see that there are some wonderful opportunities around nature-based tourism. Another example that springs to mind was when the Hon. Joan Hall, a former minister in the Olsen government, announced a long time ago that we would build a whale watching centre at the Head of Bight. I think it was one of those projects that transcended the change of government. I think the Hon. Jane Lomax-Smith was the minister who opened the facility.

It was always intended to have some more development there and some accommodation, and to make that facility even more accessible. Sadly, in the last 16 years, that hasn't happened. That is another example from the very early stages. For those who have had the chance to go to the Head of Bight to see 100 or more whales in the bright blue ocean with their calves, it is a very spectacular sight.



I am getting back to the member's question now. I got distracted. I am so enthusiastic about nature-based tourism. I see that as another beautiful chapter in South Australia's rich tourism history. I will take that question on notice because it is a technical question. We are talking about management plans in parks, which the honourable member knows, and I would assume the honourable former minister would know, is a matter for the new minister's department to look at. There is a whole range of aspects, so I will take those details on notice. But I assure the member that this government has no intention of damaging our national parks. In fact, we will open them up to get more investment and grow jobs in regional South Australia.

### HOUSING RESEARCH PROGRAM

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:49):** My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Given the revelations in parliament during the last sitting week that the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI) had alleged links to the Calabrian mafia, and the minister was unsure whether she had received advice about AHURI:

1. Will the minister now advise whether, on checking, the minister or the minister's staff had received a brief about AHURI, and what did it say?
2. What further advice did the minister seek on AHURI?
3. Does she intend to continue with the election commitment to engage AHURI to audit the state's current housing assets—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, I cannot hear your own member ask the question. Those comments equally apply to the front bench of the government. You can start the question again, the Hon. Ms Scriven, if you feel you need to.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The minister yesterday talked about a conference, I understand, not this question, so the minister might like the beginning of the question again:

1. Will the minister now advise whether, on checking, the minister or the minister's staff had received a brief about AHURI, and what did it say?
2. What further advice did the minister seek on AHURI?
3. Does she intend to continue with the election commitment to engage AHURI to audit the state's current housing assets and map future demand?
4. Is the commitment to engage AHURI to audit the state's housing assets distinct and separate to the commitment to initiate full conditions assessment of Housing SA properties within 30 days?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:51):** I thank the honourable member for her questions. Can I just point out for the record that her comments in her first question are entirely incorrect and should have been corrected, if she had bothered to read the *Hansard* yesterday, where quite clearly they were indicated as incorrect. AHURI has not been indicated as being linked in any way to those mafia allegations.

There were allegations made in relation to an organisation called Development Victoria which was under the investigation of the Victorian government. The Victorian government has not investigated AHURI, and AHURI's reputation should not be sullied by the Australian Labor Party in this state. It should be embarrassed. Its own spokesperson for homelessness and housing, the Hon. Doug Cameron, is a guest speaker, a keynote speaker, at two AHURI conferences. So I urge the South Australian Labor Party to cease and desist from making such comments on the parliamentary record which are clearly incorrect.

I have received a lot of information about AHURI and have placed a number of items on the record yesterday. The election commitment is indeed to engage AHURI to audit the state's current housing assets and map future demand. Analysis is being undertaken by the department, the precise value of which will be determined. It is the intention of this government to engage AHURI as per our election commitment within our 100 days.

The final question relates to the asset assessment versus this, so they are two very separate issues. They are being undertaken by two separate organisations, as is appropriate. The asset inspection is being undertaken by RTC, and this was subject to a question which I will be bringing back further details on as per my commitment when I took some of those questions on notice. I will be bringing those back within a couple of weeks, and that is quite separate to AHURI, which is a research organisation to map the demand across South Australia. So they are very separate pieces of work and very separate functions.

#### HOUSING RESEARCH PROGRAM

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:53):** A supplementary question arising from the answer: I thank the minister for the answer. Can she further tell the chamber, on the basis of her answer just now, the investigation the Victorian government has commenced into an organisation which she mentioned, which allegedly had some connection with AHURI, when was she first advised of this Victorian government investigation?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:54):** I stand by my comments in the previous question time that I was unaware until those matters were raised in question time. I understand that those investigations by the Victorian government into Infrastructure Victoria may have been completed—

**The Hon. D.W. Ridgway:** Development.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Development Victoria, I apologise—and that the Victorian government is no longer concerned.

#### HOUSING RESEARCH PROGRAM

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:54):** Further supplementary: when was the minister's office or staff aware of these allegations or of the Victorian investigation, and when did they advise the minister?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:54):** I stand by my comments that I was unaware of these allegations until they were raised in question time.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** It's the cover-up that gets you, Michelle; it's the cover-up that gets you. I'd be honest about this.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order, the Leader of the Opposition! We don't need commentary.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I have received since a whole range of information and I am absolutely convinced, as is every other state and territory government in Australia, that the allegations that have been raised are false and besmirch—

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** You know we can FOI this.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** —an organisation that the former state Labor government was quite happy to be associated with and conveniently forgot that it was involved with.

**The PRESIDENT:** Is this a further supplementary?

#### HOUSING RESEARCH PROGRAM

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:55):** It is, sir. The minister might like to take on notice my question: when was her office first advised or became aware of the Victorian investigation, and when did they advise the minister?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:55):** I will need to look into those matters and get back to the honourable member if there is indeed some further information that I need to provide to the chamber.

#### FAST MOVERS AWARDS

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:56):** My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister update the house on some of the fastest growing businesses in

South Australia and how the Marshall Liberal government's pro-trade agenda will assist them to expand into new markets?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:56):** I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in growing our state's economy. Last Friday, I had the pleasure of witnessing some of the fastest growing businesses in our state being awarded for their hard work and dedication at the Fast Movers 2018 breakfast, presented by BDO SA and Brand South Australia.

Fast Movers celebrates the top 25 fast moving businesses in South Australia for 2018 and this year attracted more entrants than ever. I was very pleased to see that there was a very strong regional representation in the entrants. Apparently, the competition for top spots was so tight that there was only a 15 per cent difference in average growth between the positions of 26 to 50.

The overall winner was a company called Enviroclad Australia. Enviroclad makes expanded polystyrene (EPS) products, including external cladding and rendered wall and fence systems. They currently employ 20 staff and have had an average revenue growth of over 298 per cent. What was even more encouraging was the news that the company is expanding into Victoria and is seeing tremendous growth opportunities.

Second place went to Elite Building and Renovations, an Underdale-based property group specialising in renovations and extensions to existing homes. The company had an average revenue growth of some 209 per cent. Uniti Wireless brought up the podium in third spot, which is a high-speed internet provider and is building a fixed wireless broadband network in Adelaide and Melbourne to feed growing demand for its internet services. They currently employ more than 60 staff and their average revenue growth was some 176 per cent.

Seeing these companies grow, expand and reinvest in their own business is very encouraging and it just illustrates the confidence that they have in a positive future under a Marshall Liberal government. The government is very proud of the work our small businesses do and we are doing everything we can to encourage them to expand and access growth opportunities. We understand that today's fastest growing companies locally are the exporters of the future. Indeed, some of the place winners are already doing so. Ferguson Australia, which came in at eighth place with revenue growth of 112 per cent, currently exports to China, the United States, Russia and a couple of other smaller markets.

Our government has placed such emphasis on growing exports because they are vital to our economy and the future of our state. That is why we have committed to establishing an international trade office in China, our biggest trading partner; the United States of America, our second biggest trading partner; Japan; Malaysia; and the Middle East. Such is the importance we have placed on allowing local business to easily access trade opportunities that the Premier himself was recently in China to further our connections and build on the relationships we are fostering.

The federal Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (the Hon. Steven Ciobo) was also in attendance, which goes to show the collaborative nature our government has towards working with the federal government to grow international trade opportunities. The great work of the federal government is opening up markets with free trade agreements and has greatly assisted our producers and businesses to secure vital overseas contracts and expand their operations. While in China, both the Premier and minister Ciobo witnessed Port Adelaide Football Club defeat the Gold Coast Suns by some 40 points. It was great to see a South Australian team coming up a winner on the international stage.

The Fast Movers Awards show that South Australia is home to some truly innovative, dynamic businesses that have the possibility of being world-beaters if the government enables and empowers them to take advantage of the growth opportunities. The Marshall government's ambitious international agenda for growing local businesses will ensure they get the support they need to grow, expand, invest in themselves, and easily and efficiently access the overseas markets they need to continually grow their prosperity. I congratulate all the winners of the Fast Movers Awards and wish them all the very best for the exciting years ahead.

### TRADE OPPORTUNITIES

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:59):** Supplementary arising from the answer: can the Minister for Investment outline what the government is doing to promote the sector of the economy that Uniti Wireless is involved in?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:00):** Uniti Wireless, of course, is a wireless broadband supplier. We have a very strong agenda on start-up and innovation under the Marshall government, so there will be a whole range of activities, especially on the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site when that innovation hub is unveiled and opened. Companies like Uniti Wireless will play a very important part in the connectivity across that part of Adelaide and also across a number of regional business operations across South Australia and the metropolitan area and also some domestic users.

### LAND VALUATIONS

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:00):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, or the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, questions regarding the Valuer-General.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY:** In the 2016-17 budget papers, the Valuer-General was provided with \$15.4 million over the forward estimates to commence a five-year rolling revaluation program. This five-year program will involve the Valuer-General adjusting valuations for a fifth of the state every year. My questions are:

1. Given section 19(3) of the Valuation of Land Act requires that valuations have to be consistent or relative across the state, how will relativity be ensured if one-fifth of the state is to be valued each year for five years?
2. Does the Marshall government intend to proceed with this ill-conceived project?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:01):** I thank the honourable member for his question. This is an issue that the honourable member has had a long and abiding interest in over a period of time. He has pursued it through budget and finance committees, questions of the former government in this house and by way of personal meetings with ministers and statutory office holders.

I shall refer the honourable member's question in its detail to my ministerial colleague the Hon. Stephan Knoll, who is in the process of taking the responsibilities of the Valuer-General's office from my department, Treasury, in the machinery of government changes. Under the former administration, the Valuer-General's office was attached—if that is the right word—to the Treasury portfolio, but under the machinery of government changes it is being transferred to minister Knoll; therefore, I will refer the honourable member's question there.

Because I have had some involvement and discussion with the honourable member, what I can say, and put on the public record, is that, as the member would probably understand, this five-year plan is supposedly two years in; that is, it was to commence in 2016-17 and we are almost at the end of 2017-18.

The funding of \$15 point whatever million that the member quoted was provided by the former government for a five-year plan, and we are supposedly two years into that particular plan. So the prospect of being able to unravel the former government's initiative in relation to this would be a challenge indeed, if that was to be the position of the new government, given that we are two years into the rollout of that particular plan. In terms of the detail, which I am sure the member would prefer rather than my general responses, I shall refer the honourable member's question to the Hon. Stephan Knoll.

### FUND MY NEIGHBOURHOOD

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:04):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** The following is an extract from an email that was recently brought to my attention. The message was signed off by the acting executive director for government communications and engagement:

Fund My Neighbourhood will not continue in 2018. Fund My Neighbourhood funding will be allocated to support commitments made by the new State Government that will improve South Australian communities.

My question to the Treasurer is: does this statement correctly reflect the government's decision to cut round 2 of the fully funded Fund My Neighbourhood Program? If so, was it the Premier's decision or the Treasurer's decision to cut round 2 of this funding?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:04):** The member's characterisation of the decision is entirely accurate, to use a phrase that I used earlier. This was a Labor program, one which we were not committed to. We made no commitment prior to the election to continue the \$20 million stage 2 of Fund My Neighbourhood and, indeed, when asked, explicitly refused to do so. This was an example of the sort of programs and the waste that the former government sadly engaged in in a desperate but unflinching attempt to get re-elected prior to the last election. There was so much money being sloshed around the community by the former government—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Let the minister respond in silence.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** —whether it was money being thrown at companies who, when they received the \$10 million, said they were coming to South Australia even if they didn't get the \$10 million; whether it was the \$2.7 million personal slush fund of the former Treasurer so that every Greek community, church or organisation in a marginal Labor seat or a seat that the Labor Party wanted to win could get a grant prior to the last election; or whether it was programs like Fund My Neighbourhood, where the Labor Party or the former Labor government threw \$20 million at the community. They just threw \$20 million at the community and said, 'Go on, pick whatever project you like. Whatever you want you can have, and the taxpayers of South Australia will pay for it.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** 'There is \$20 million in the first round, if you want another \$20 million in the second round...' It only happened in the period leading up to the state election, of course. This wasn't good policy; this was a desperate, failed attempt by the former Labor government at trying to get re-elected. It was a poor program, it was a poor use of resources and, when asked prior to the election, we unashamedly refused to give a commitment to wasting another \$20 million on this particular program. Yes, it was stopped; it was a decision of the former Liberal Party opposition and now of the Marshall Liberal government. It was one made as Treasurer, that together, arm in arm and in lock step with the Premier and with my ministers, we are happy to defend and to support.

#### FUND MY NEIGHBOURHOOD

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:07):** Mr President, supplementary question arising from the answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

*The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Yes, I know, I just love hearing about it.

*The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Leader of the Opposition, you are inhibiting your own member from asking a question. You are displaying no courtesy to your own member. The Hon. Ms Bourke, proceed with your supplementary.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Thank you, Mr President. Can the Treasurer advise how this \$20 million will be spent—I mean \$20 million, I apologise—to support communities in South Australia?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08):** I only wish it were \$20, because that would have only been the cost of a cup of coffee and a sandwich under the former Labor government! It wasn't \$20, it was \$20 million—\$20 million that they were wanting to waste under the next stage of this particular program. As I said, the way this program was structured was, in essence—I am happy to get some numbers at a later stage. I won't take it on notice, but maybe at a particular appropriation bill debate or something like that I can put on the record the number of people that actually voted for some of these particular programs in terms of the expenditure.

We committed and are still committed to delivering the promises that we took to the last election. To answer the honourable member's question, 'Where will this money go?', this money will go to delivering quality services, for example in health. My colleague the Minister for Health will be delighted at the prospect of getting \$20 million that he will be able to spend on quality programs, whether it be in palliative care, whether it be for veterans, whether it be for the Repat site, the health precinct, there are a variety of programs that we as a new government are committed to in relation to the expenditure of our total savings package.

There are a range of other initiatives that we will be providing. We made a number of commitments, for example, to important community recreation sporting programs. We made a number of commitments to community organisations and one in particular on the Fleurieu Peninsula that my colleague the Hon. Ms Lensink is familiar with. There is a range of programs and commitments that we gave across the recreation and sport portfolio, the human services portfolio, the health portfolio, the schools and education portfolio, and they were all part of the total package that we put together.

This particular funding in part will be used to help fund some of the community development and recreation and sport programs, and some of the human service programs. Any money that is left over from the \$20 million will go towards helping to fund all of the other commitments that the people of South Australia importantly voted for at the last election when they threw out a failed, discredited Labor government.

#### FUND MY NEIGHBOURHOOD

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:11):** A supplementary arising from the original answer: the Treasurer has characterised this as a waste of money. Does the Treasurer have a particular disdain for a particular community that received funding, such as Mount Gambier or Tumby Bay, or does he hold all communities in equal disdain?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:11):** The only disdain I hold is for the Leader of the Opposition and the failed former Labor government. Importantly, it is not the disdain that I hold for the former Labor government; the people of South Australia held the former Labor government in disdain, because they threw out of office the Hon. Mr Maher, the Hon. Mr Hunter and they threw out of office the former Labor government. Most importantly, it is not the view that I have, it is the view the people of South Australia have. The vast majority of them expressed that comprehensively on 17 March.

#### NYRSTAR

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:12):** My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer update the house on the ongoing negotiations with Nyrstar?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:12):** I thank the honourable member for his question, because on 17 May I did make a ministerial statement in this house on the important Nyrstar Port Pirie development. In that statement I did indicate that I would update the house from time to time in relation to the progress of that most important issue.

Again, I repeat, as I said on that particular occasion, based on the statements that Nyrstar have made, that the redevelopment of their project at Port Pirie, from their statements, is going well. They believe it will be, from their company's viewpoint, productive. More importantly, from South Australia's viewpoint in terms of jobs and families in Port Pirie and surrounding areas, we are hopeful that the statements that Nyrstar have made about the progress of their project are indeed accurate, because we do want to see the Port Pirie community thrive in terms of jobs and development.

On 17 May, however, I indicated that Nyrstar had advised the government that the payment of \$37 million scheduled for 28 May would be deferred. I can indicate now that, after further discussions, Nyrstar this week paid \$7.88 million in funds to cover the interest and fees component of this scheduled payment amount. However, an amount of \$29.125 million, representing the first targeted amortisation payment under the financing arrangements, remains outstanding. The government has agreed to continue further discussions with Nyrstar on the issue of this payment, together with the additional payments that I referred to in my ministerial statement, scheduled for November of this year and May of next year, which, as I indicated, Nyrstar has previously indicated to the state that it also intends to defer.

As I indicated on 17 May, and it remains the position of the government, we continue to reserve our right to take all steps that may be necessary to ensure that Nyrstar meets its contractual obligations. As I indicated on 17 May, I would continue to update honourable members on developments as appropriate, and I believe, in the interests of transparency and accountability, the development this week was something that I should recount to the Legislative Council chamber and, as I said, where appropriate in the future as these negotiations or discussions continue, I will update the Legislative Council chamber at that particular time.

#### **BRABHAM SUPERCAR**

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:15):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, or the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, the Hon. David Ridgway—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** We've got to work out which one—about the Brabham supercar. Leave granted.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** I note the lavish launch last night in Adelaide of the extravagant Brabham supercar which is to be manufactured in Adelaide and sold to exclusive luxury car buyers and collectors for the significant sum of \$1.8 million each. My question is: can the Treasurer or the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment inform the house if the South Australian government and taxpayers have offered the company a financial incentive to set up shop in South Australia, including whether it has contributed to the establishment of the manufacturing plant of Edinburgh Parks and, if so, how much and what benefit will there be for the state?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:16):** I am happy to take the detail of the question on notice. What I can say at the outset is that I can absolutely, unequivocally, rule out the prospect of when the replacement of the ministerial fleet comes around that the Brabham car will be the replacement for the Holden. The price is a little bit out of the range of the parsimonious incoming Marshall Liberal government.

In relation to whether or not a financial incentive is provided, certainly from the media reports in the last 24 hours my understanding is that the former government did make a financial commitment. My recollection from the media reports was that it might have been of the order of around about \$1½ million but I am happy to take on notice as to whether that was a grant or a loan, or a combination of grants and loans, and what the arrangements in relation to the former government's offer of assistance might have been.

#### **BRABHAM SUPERCAR**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:17):** Supplementary arising from the answer: is this support for the Brabham project one of the areas that the Treasurer has asked to be put on hold if it hasn't been fully paid to the company?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:17):** No, the incoming government's position, which I have enunciated on a number of occasions, is that where the former government had already made or already signed firm contracts or had made firm letters of offer to companies, that the incoming Marshall Liberal government would not be reversing those particular decisions. Whether or not we actually agree with the individual decisions or not, they were commitments that the former government had either signed or had had firm letters of offer in relation to.

My understanding in relation to this particular one is that it is longstanding and it is in one of those two categories: there is either a contract that had been signed by the former government with the company or its principals or there had been a firm letter of offer. So the simple answer to the question is no.

### **BRABHAM SUPERCAR**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:18):** Final supplementary arising from the original answer: does the Treasurer agree with the support that was given to this company to make this car in South Australia?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:19):** I will make a judgement about that when I see the nature of the support, the nature of the clawbacks that might be provided. As a general principle, the incoming Marshall Liberal—

*The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Well, the honourable leader doesn't have to write this down; it has been said about 15 times in this chamber and about 100 times publicly, so there is no news here. The incoming Marshall Liberal government's position in relation to jobs growth and economic growth is quite simply that what we want to do is actually ensure that our businesses in South Australia, in particular our small and medium-sized businesses, are nationally and internationally competitive. To do that we have to try to reduce the costs of doing business in South Australia, so that the costs of doing business are both nationally and internationally competitive. That means looking at the range of state taxes and charges, and that's why the incoming state government, unlike the former government, is pledged to abolish payroll tax for all small businesses in South Australia.

Any small business with a payroll under \$1.5 million, after 1 January next year, under a Marshall Liberal government will not be paying payroll tax. That's the sort of tax reduction, reducing the costs of doing business in South Australia, of which we are supportive. We also want to reduce the range of other taxes and charges that apply to businesses.

We want also to look at the costs of doing business, such as workers compensation. Credit to the former government and the former attorney-general in putting through legislation in the parliament, which we supported in a bipartisan fashion, that saw a reduction in workers compensation premiums from almost 3 per cent to 1.8 per cent, and again in the last four weeks, I think it was, the 1.8 per cent is to be further reduced to 1.7 per cent. We are still at a slightly higher level than some of the Eastern States, but we are pledged to reduce the costs of doing business.

We are pledged also to reduce the costs of doing business in terms of utility costs: electricity, the much lauded and widely acclaimed incoming government's energy plan, being led by minister van Holst Pellekaan, is in terms of reducing the cost of electricity. With the cost of water in South Australia, an independent inquiry is to be conducted by someone commissioned by the government to try to drive down water prices and water costs in South Australia.

Red tape and overregulation: whether it be in shop trading hours, whether it be in planning or whether it be in related areas like that, all of those areas add costs for doing business in South Australia. So there is a comprehensive program from the incoming government to reduce the costs of doing business, and therefore there will be less emphasis on picking winners.

We don't think Labor politicians—or even Liberal politicians, but particularly Labor politicians—are the best people in the world to be picking winners in terms of growing jobs and the economy. The record of Labor politicians in South Australia, with the State Bank, with SGIC, but also nationally, does not show them in a good light. We don't think a combination of politicians and public servants, with the greatest respect, is the best way of picking winners in South Australia.

Frankly, if we reduce the costs of doing business, so that our businesses are nationally and internationally competitive, we believe that is where jobs growth will occur, and there will be much less emphasis on picking winners. It will never be a case where governments will not invest in certain industry sectors in particular, such as the defence sector and a variety of industry sectors like that, but that is the mature way to go about jobs growth and economic growth in South Australia, rather than the juvenile way the former government went about it.



**The PRESIDENT:** Before I call on the business of the day, I remind honourable members that, when they seek leave to make a brief explanation, they should advise the chamber of the topic, as it is a matter of courtesy for the other members whether they wish leave to be granted.

*Matters of Interest*

**LYMPHOEDEMA ACTION ALLIANCE**

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:24):** I rise to speak on the important work of the Lymphoedema Support Group in South Australia and the Australian Lymphology Association, two of 20 groups nationwide joined under the Lymphoedema Action Alliance, formed in an effort to help improve the lives of Australians living with lymphoedema.

I had the privilege of meeting with members of the LSGSA (as I will refer to it for the rest of this contribution) very recently, and was moved to raise awareness of the issues we had the opportunity to discuss. I wish to acknowledge their presence in the chamber today, along with a number of their fellow advocates. I certainly appreciate their time and efforts to be present on behalf of the community they represent, and I know they are pleased that their plight is being held and heard by the chamber today.

For those who are not familiar with this condition, 'lymphoedema' is a term used for chronic progressive swelling, typically in the limbs, trunk, head or groin regions, which frequently causes infection and may result in skin breakdown. It is predominantly attributed to a malfunction of the lymphatic system due to treatment for certain cancers or physical trauma and, less frequently, as being a result of underdeveloped lymphatics. Although there is no data available for the incidence of lymphoedema in South Australia, research undertaken in the United Kingdom suggests a conservative estimate of over 2,000 people would be living with the condition in our state at the current time.

With increasing cancer diagnosis and survivorship, South Australians will inevitably require continued access to lymphoedema treatment, both now and into the future. The latest research indicates that the development of lymphoedema following cancer treatment affects 20 per cent of breast cancer patients, a figure I was surprised to hear; some 30 to 50 per cent of gynaecological cancer patients; shockingly, almost 75 per cent of head and neck cancer patients; and up to 29 per cent of melanoma patients. These are very significant numbers, and it is indeed potentially a very debilitating condition. I am sure members would agree that these statistics are very concerning and action should be taken where current provisions fall short of current and anticipated needs.

Thankfully, the Lymphoedema Support Group SA and the Australasian Lymphology Association are endeavouring to ensure that this occurs. The LSGSA is a consumer-led body supported by the Flinders Medical Centre lymphoedema research unit and the Cancer Council SA, which provides peer support, raises awareness about lymphoedema and strives to improve patient services in South Australia through consumer advocacy projects. It works in cooperation with the ALA, a peak professional body committed to promoting the development of lymphology in Australasia and delivering excellence in lymphoedema management, research and education. Together, the LSGSA and ALA seek to foster greater levels of peer support and increase community awareness of the condition and its effects.

The groups inform me that they are frequently contacted by a number of South Australians with the condition seeking treatment and advice who are unable to afford consultation fees for private practitioners, which can be substantial. In the absence of proper treatment, the frequent GP visits, hospitalisation, home care and early nursing home admissions can all lead to those affected requiring assistance from support agencies and the government. In South Australia, I am advised that there are no comprehensive lymphoedema clinics, dedicated lymphoedema practitioners, clear treatment pathways or equitable sustainable access to affordable lymphoedema compression garments, although I understand that in other states there are.

As lymphoedema can be controlled with early detection and timely treatment by appropriately trained practitioners, more resources dedicated to this condition would inevitably decrease the burden of care for both individuals and the SA Health system. I therefore look forward to bringing this

issue to the attention of the Minister for Health, who I am sure will be pleased to give due consideration to the vital needs of those suffering with this serious condition.

Again, I express my thanks to the Lymphoedema Support Group SA, the Australasian Lymphology Association and the Lymphoedema Action Alliance for ensuring those in positions of influence are well informed of these needs within our community. It was something I was unaware of, and I am genuinely grateful to the people who brought it to my attention. They could otherwise quite easily remain overlooked without the dedication and tenacity of their members. I commend them on the work they do and assure them of our government's interest in this issue.

### **FUND MY NEIGHBOURHOOD**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:28):** I was hoping today to share with the chamber some stories from many South Australians about the success of the program that brought communities together. But instead of sharing stories about the success of the \$40 million Fund My Neighbourhood program—one of the world's largest community-based grants, which was implemented right here in South Australia by the Labor government—I will instead share my disappointment about what, in the words of the Treasurer, the Premier and the Treasurer have, arm in arm, cut from the community.

As committed in the budget by the Labor government, round 2 of this tremendously popular program was scheduled to commence before the end of this financial year, fully funded. The previous state Labor government created Fund My Neighbourhood, which gave South Australians the power to improve their local communities through pitching and voting for their favourite ideas, because no-one knows what locals need or want in their community quite like a local.

Fund My Neighbourhood was not just about receiving additional funds for local projects. Importantly, it brought neighbours and communities together so they could decide what was best for their neighbourhood. The Premier's and Treasurer's decision to scrap Fund My Neighbourhood will take \$20 million from community groups and individuals who are working hard to make a difference in their local neighbourhood. In the first round of Fund My Neighbourhood, over 122,000 votes were cast by South Australians, resulting in more than 200 neighbourhood projects being funded, projects that would not otherwise have been funded. A total of 33,000 South Australians took the time, and took their own private time, to vote for their favourite projects.

Impressively, more than \$4.3 million was given to regional communities. Fund My Neighbourhood offered the state's regional residents a chance to harness their envied community spirit and allowed locals to campaign to get their ideas funded. What was the best part? The best part was that people were the decision-makers. It was your next-door neighbour, your friends and your family who were pitching ideas and voting on the best projects for their neighbourhoods.

By cutting Fund My Neighbourhood, what message is this government sending to the community? Does the government not trust communities to decide how and where funds should be allocated in their neighbourhoods? Round 2 has been scrapped. What will happen to the \$20 million that was allocated for this community program? A resident who shares my concern about the future of Fund My Neighbourhood is a farmer from Tumby Bay, Dion Lesbrun. I am disappointed that I am going to have to leave this chamber to advise him that this program has been cut.

I would like to take this moment to congratulate the town of Tumby Bay, which displayed an extraordinary case of community spirit by receiving funding for not one, not two, but three projects: the Tumby Bay silo mural, the Tumby Bay Pioneer Tower and the Port Neill community hall. The residents in Tumby Bay did this with a population of just over 2,000 people. In fact, the Tumby Bay art project received the fourth highest number of votes in the state—far from a slush fund.

The successful silo project has already brought an unprecedented economic boost to the Tumby Bay community. I quote Dion from Tumby Bay, 'Visitor numbers are going gangbusters.' Dion struggled the other day to find a car park in the main street because the caravans had taken over. They had stopped to take a photo in front of the new silos that have been painted, and brought that funding and money back into the community.

Dion and his community were already planning a number of projects for round 2, and I do not look forward to calling him to tell him that it will not be happening. I saw firsthand the gratitude in the community for this unique program. Applicants appreciated the opportunity to put ideas forward,

from playgrounds to repair cafes, ideas the Labor government helped turn into reality. I am very disappointed that this great program has been removed from the community, removing the opportunity for the community to have their say.

### ABORTION

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:34):** I rise today to speak about a woman's right to choose, to say let's have a conversation about abortion law reform. It is a topic about which this particular legislature has previously been very willing to speak out. Well before many other jurisdictions, in South Australia we had laws to end the horrors of backyard abortions.

South Australia was the first Australian state to liberalise access to abortion through legislation. Abortion is legally available under certain circumstances in South Australia, though restrictions remain. There is uncertainty around our laws which, while progressive when they were created many decades ago, where we once led we now lag. It is a conversation that we need to have.

It is estimated that half of all pregnancies in Australia are unplanned and that half of those are terminated. Also, between one-quarter and one-third of Australian women will experience an abortion in their lifetime. It is a conversation in which it is often said by those who support the right to choose and for abortion to be legal that they would want to see it as safe, legal and rare. Now in light of the recent Irish referendum and the laws currently being debated in New South Wales and Queensland, it is the perfect time to say in South Australia, 'Stay calm. Let's talk about abortion.'

One question we might ask is: why are there still so many abortions when contraception is readily available? While the prevention of pregnancies is desirable, it is unrealistic to expect that all sexually active women will never experience an unplanned pregnancy. No contraception is 100 per cent effective and contraception can fail, even when used correctly and consistently. Indeed, the World Health Organization estimates that even if all contraceptive users use contraceptives perfectly in every single relevant encounter, there would still be six million unintended pregnancies every single year.

Studies in New Zealand and Australia of women seeking abortion have shown that over half the women presenting for abortion had been using contraception prior to becoming pregnant. The reality is we live in an imperfect world and things go wrong. Indeed, around one in four Australian men who had used condoms in the previous year reported that at least one time the condom had broken.

Of course, women overwhelmingly support the right to choose. Australians support the right to choose. When a person faces an unwanted or unplanned pregnancy in Australia, they have a range of options but they vary from state to state. In Queensland and New South Wales, that gets the most attention because they have the most restrictive laws. In fact, abortion can be a crime for women and doctors in those jurisdictions and a bill to decriminalise abortion exists in both of those jurisdictions, as do bills for safe access zones.

In Western Australia, it is legal to 20 weeks, with some restrictions, particularly for those who are under 16, and it becomes very restricted after 20 weeks. In the Northern Territory, it is legal to 14 weeks with one doctor's approval, and at 14 to 23 weeks with an additional doctor. It is not legal after 23 weeks unless it is performed to save a pregnant person's life. More recently, it is also illegal to protest within 150 metres of an abortion service. In the ACT, Victoria and Tasmania, they have progressed. In Victoria, it is legal to 24 weeks, and after 24 weeks with the approval of two doctors.

In South Australia, where we were the first to liberalise access, a woman needs two doctors. The provisions around abortion still exist in section 81 of our criminal code, right between the abduction of children and offences relating to public order, including riot, affray and terrorism. This is inappropriate. A woman who has not lived in South Australia for the previous two months is also in an invidious position. She cannot access an abortion in this state due to provisions made at the time to stop what they thought would be abortion tourism.

Again, a woman must comply with the requirements and have two medical practitioners—one of whom, according to the law, would be a male because it only refers to a 'he' of that doctor—and satisfy both physical and mental health grounds. Importantly, 'any procedure' did not anticipate

medical abortion. It only anticipated surgical abortion. That means a woman who seeks to avail herself of the new technologies, particularly a regional woman, would have to go to a hospital for that treatment. Those treatments are sometimes to take one pill one day and two days later another pill. That is not accessible for a woman living in regional South Australia; however, if she lived across the border in Mildura, she would be able to access that termination. She cannot do so in South Australia. We need to start talking about law reform to really serve all South Australians.

### VICTORIA SQUARE FOUNTAIN

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:39):** It is a great privilege today to rise to speak about the Victoria Square fountain 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary celebration. The celebration was hosted by my wonderful friend and generous philanthropist, Maria Kenda AM, the founder of the Victoria Square Fountain Club. I take this opportunity to pay special tribute to Maria Kenda for her vision in establishing the club to recognise the historical significance of the Victoria Square fountain, as well as using the club events as the fundraising platform for charities. The fundraising efforts this year will support the Hutt St Centre, Flinders University Research and Foundation Shine.

Maria, with her big heart and active involvement in giving back to the community over the last 30 years, has raised over \$7 million for deserving charities and medical research. Although Maria enjoys staying out of the limelight, it was an incredibly proud moment for her family and friends that Maria was recognised in 2010 on the Queen's Birthday honours as a member of the Order of Australia (AM) for her philanthropic service to the community.

The dinner was also attended by His Excellency the Governor of South Australia, the Hon. Hieu Van Le. He made a wonderful address that night. Other distinguished guests and great supporters included Rosemary and Vili Milisits, who kindly donated the delicious birthday cakes to be used for centrepieces on each table. I know it was delicious because I sampled some. I express my gratitude to Rosemary and Vili for their ongoing contribution and generous support to our community.

As the assistant minister to the Premier, it was a great honour to represent the Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall, and to convey his best wishes. On the night, I spoke about how the Victoria Square fountain tied in well with the Premier's portfolios in Aboriginal affairs, the arts and multicultural affairs. I highlighted how the Victoria Square fountain is a profound piece of art. The place and the sculpture have significant connections for the traditional owners of the land, the Kurna people, and how our multicultural communities have been welcomed and integrated into the vibrant landscape of Adelaide.

The Victoria Square fountain was officially launched by His Royal Highness Prince Philip on 28 May 1968 to commemorate the visit of Her Majesty Queen Elizabeth II. During Prince Philip's speech, he revealed that a plan for a fountain in Adelaide had first been proposed in 1858; however, it took 110 years for it to be installed. It is a case of better late than never.

Victoria Square is known as Tarndanyangga, meaning red kangaroo dreaming, by the Kurna people. The Victoria Square fountain is a heritage listed fountain and serves as a powerful symbol of reconciliation. The fountain is a unique art sculpture by talented artist the late John Dowie and became the first piece of South Australian public art to acknowledge Aboriginal people when it was originally built in 1968. Victoria Square was also the first public place in the world to fly the Aboriginal flag in 1971.

There was certainly a trifactor theme throughout the night. The Victoria Square fountain sculpture features three human figures carrying three birds, representing the three rivers: the Murray, the Torrens and the Onkaparinga rivers. I am pleased, through the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the fountain's celebration, that I have the opportunity to highlight the artistic and iconic fountain's proud connection with the Aboriginal people, that it is one of the most popular tourist destinations for locals and visitors and that the square itself has held many remarkable multicultural festivals organised by our wonderfully diverse communities every year.

I would like to thank all the sponsors who donated major auction prizes, including Maria Kenda's Design Jewels, Ev-Lynne Otto OAM, House of Chow, Hilton Adelaide, Chianti restaurant and a spectacular painting by renowned artist Andrew Baines. I have had the honour to attend many United Nations arts installations by Andrew and opened his exhibition in the past, so I

could not help participating in the auction and was lucky enough to bid successfully on the painting Andrew Baines generously donated for the auction. I am now the proud custodian of that beautiful painting.

Once again, thank you sincerely to Maria Kenda AM and the members of the Victoria Square Fountain Club for hosting a fantastic and meaningful dinner to celebrate the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the Victoria Square fountain. Many happy returns with the flow of prosperity from the three rivers.

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:44):** South Australia has a very proud legacy of leading the nation and the world in the transition to renewable energy. It is no accident that it is because of the strong leadership of the previous Weatherill and Rann Labor governments, who set us up as a state with a clear and ambitious framework for investment. We have more renewable energy than any other mainland state—sitting around the 50 per cent mark the last time I was privy to that information—and it was Jay Weatherill's leadership that saw the construction of Australia's first solar thermal power plant, which will secure Port Augusta's future. It was, of course, the Labor government that secured the world's largest grid-connected battery, much derided at the time by the Liberal opposition, now Liberal government.

Whilst climate change deniers and their friends, including many of those opposite and their federal Liberal colleagues, have railed against renewable energy, we have seen private companies invest directly in large-scale projects right across our state. It is great for emissions reduction. It is great for our environment. It is great for our research and development sectors and it is especially great, of course, for local jobs and employment for South Australians, especially in regional South Australia.

But last year, we saw the Minerals Council of Australia launch a bizarre and misleading television campaign aimed at promoting HELE, or high efficiency, low emission coal-fired power stations. It features an engineer talking about how great coal is. She talks about going to Japan to check out low emissions technology using 'our coal'. She then says that Tokyo has a very large number of people. That is probably the only accurate information conveyed in that advertisement. It then starts to get interesting. Even the representative from the power station that they tour in this commercial says that HELE only gets up to 40 to 45 per cent efficiency, only marginally more efficient than traditional power stations.

This, of course, is textbook Minerals Council—build a misleading narrative and back in some technology that does not work, but, by the way, requires shiploads of taxpayers' money in subsidies. They call it HELE. Some deluded people call it clean coal, but we all know that it is a con. HELE power stations have been around for decades. They are neither high efficiency nor are they low emissions. They are also incredibly expensive to build. They take years to complete and most estimates say it would cost in excess of \$4 billion for a 1,000 megawatt plant. If it was so great, why is the private sector not investing their own money in these power stations? Why are they after government or taxpayer subsidies to build them? It is because the market, investors and the community know and understand that renewable energy is our future.

It was great to see Simon Holmes à Court, senior adviser to the energy transition hub at Melbourne University, call out the myth that is high efficiency, low emission coal. On Sky News on 10 May, he highlighted that HELE plants cost more than subcritical coal, which is already expensive. He then points out that it only emits about 10 per cent less carbon than normal coal and that it is not new, cheap or low emission. It is just marketing spin.

The only people buying the HELE concept are the Minerals Council and a large contingent of the Liberal Party. Instead of focusing on the failed technology, I have a suggestion for them: back in renewable energy. It is cost effective. It is creating high skill, high wage jobs across Australia.

In April, we learnt of the Monash Forum, a cabal of coal lovers led by Tony Abbott, Eric Abetz, Kevin Andrews and Barnaby Joyce, who back in the myth that is clean coal. Rumour has it that more than 30 Liberal and National Party members have joined the Monash Forum. That is more than 30 people who do not back science or even economics. On 22 May, Tony Abbott and Barnaby Joyce, in response to the AGL process about Alinta Energy's offer to buy Liddell Power Station, said:

We are calling on the Federal Energy Minister Josh Frydenberg to either forcibly acquire the plant or build a new coal plant with taxpayers' money in the Hunter Valley.

So Tony Abbott told *The Australian* that the government should compulsorily acquire this power station for the price that Alinta were prepared to pay and then it should sell it to Alinta. Their beloved free market finally decides that coal does not make economic sense anymore and so now the Liberal Party, at the federal level, want to intervene in this so-called free market to protect a high polluting and a highly inefficient form of power generation. This, of course, would be very bad news for South Australia and our electricity prices. It would put at risk the significant renewable energy investment that AGL have said they will undertake. So, instead of new jobs, new investment and lower emissions, we are left with taxpayers liable for ageing, inefficient coal power plants—bad for the planet, and certainly bad for South Australia.

### NATIONAL REDRESS SCHEME

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:49):** I rise to speak about the National Redress Scheme. We cautiously welcome the government's decision this week to join the National Redress Scheme—a platform central to SA-Best's election campaign—for survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. It is good news. We heard a short time ago, that the Catholic Church is now opting in.

The Redress Scheme was one of the key recommendations of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, which estimated that around 20,000 survivors were sexually abused in about 4,000 state and territory government institutions—so widespread and so devastating to so many innocent lives. The South Australian government's announcement was a significant day for thousands of child sex abuse survivors who remain traumatised by what happened to them when they were children in institutionalised care. It follows a similar commitment by the Tasmanian government last week, which now leaves Western Australia as the only state that has not signed up to the agreement.

Many of these victims were under state government care and control at the time of their abuse, so it is only just and reasonable that government accepts the responsibility. Many are now elderly and will forever be affected by the trauma they endured, needing ongoing medical help and financial support. The National Redress Scheme will ensure that these people get the support they so desperately need and deserve.

However, while we welcome the decision to join the National Redress Scheme, SA-Best calls on the state government to put pressure on the federal government to stop the indexing payments made to care-leavers, some of whom received as little as \$2,000 redress from South Australian, Queensland, Western Australian and Tasmanian state schemes. Those payments will be taxed at 1.019 per cent per annum, purportedly to account for inflation, the net effect being that some survivors will get little or nothing. This is grossly unfair.

The federal government is taking from the poorest of the vulnerable abuse victims and must reconsider this recommendation, which was made by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. Care Leaver's Australasia Network (CLAN), the peak support group for people who were raised in Australian and New Zealand orphanages, children's homes, missions and foster care, has been campaigning for indexation to be dropped from the scheme.

The National Redress Scheme is only weeks away from its proposed commencement on 1 July but is yet to pass the House of Representatives, let alone the Senate, with a Senate inquiry into the current bill not due to report for another couple of weeks. The proposed national scheme provides compensation of up to \$150,000, access to psychological support for those eligible and provides six months for applicants to decide whether or not to accept the offer of redress. For many survivors, making such a decision will be overwhelming and emotionally fraught, especially given that only one application to the scheme is permitted.

The federal government also wants to place a \$150,000 compensation ceiling on survivors, rather than the \$200,000 maximum, \$65,000 average and \$10,000 minimum, as recommended by the royal commission. The Senate inquiry into the previous iteration of the bill heard that the decision to set the lower maximum cap was made by ministers before the Department of Social Services was asked to begin designing the scheme. This is shameful and unjust.

There are still many issues to be worked through in the proposed bill, and we hope the Senate inquiry into the latest version listens to the survivors and voices its concerns. No amount of money will ever fully repair the damage done to so many interrupted lives, but we as lawmakers must uphold our responsibilities to the thousands of survivors. If not, my Senate colleague, Senator Stirling Griff, will move amendments to do just that.

Unfortunately, the National Redress Scheme will only deal with survivors of institutional sexual abuse, but there are also countless survivors of severe physical beatings and psychological abuse, and we must acknowledge their suffering as well. We must also acknowledge those who were abused and for whom the continuing effects of their pain and suffering was too much to bear, and who sadly ended their lives. I solemnly thank each and every brave survivor who came forward to tell their deeply personal, and often harrowing, accounts of abuse in institutions.

### **TZU CHI FOUNDATION**

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:54):** I rise to speak about a global charitable organisation, the Buddhist compassion relief foundation known as Tzu Chi. I had the great honour of meeting the founder of Tzu Chi during a parliamentary delegation to Taiwan with the Hon. Andrew McLachlan and the Hon. Terry Stephens in 2016.

Tzu Chi was founded by Dharma Master Cheng Yen in 1966 with the simple aim of helping the poor and educating the rich. This month marks Master Cheng Yen's 81<sup>st</sup> birthday. The story goes that witnessing the death of a poor village woman was a call to action for Master Cheng Yen. Instead of collecting monthly donations, she asked 30 local housewives to pledge 50¢ a day to charity, explaining that, 'Saving 50¢ every day will train you in the habit of saving and cultivating love to give to others.'

The foundation grew exponentially from there. It was formed with four central missions: charity, medical, education and humanitarian. Acting on these doctrines, Tzu Chi provides international relief to people in need and runs free health clinics, dialysis facilities, hospitals and a bone marrow registry. Tzu Chi teaches the values of peace and compassion and promotes learning throughout the world. Community volunteers contribute to an environmental protection mission, primarily through recycling projects.

From those humble beginnings in a remote Taiwanese village, Tzu Chi has grown into an international force for good. Today, millions of members spread across the world are actively carrying out disaster relief efforts. Our country has, unfortunately, seen its fair share of natural disasters. Tzu Chi is often among the first to offer a helping hand and provide relief to Australians in their darkest hour. During the Queensland flood crisis in 2011, Tzu Chi distributed more than \$1 million in assistance to flood victims through the generosity of many of its members. In 2015, the Sampson Flat and Pinery bushfires devastated local South Australian communities and left many families suffering. I understand that, through the goodwill of the Tzu Chi Adelaide office, 157 families were given cash donations totalling \$117,750 to help them during the initial emergency period.

There is a saying compiled by Master Cheng Yen based on Buddhist teachings and life lessons, which states, 'With confidence, perseverance and courage, there is nothing in this world that cannot be accomplished.' I am amazed by the Tzu Chi volunteers who are undeterred by practical challenges and rally together to provide far-reaching support. Tzu Chi's compassionate spirit of empathising with suffering wherever it is felt in the world transcends geographical, political, cultural and religious boundaries. Master Cheng Yen wisely said, 'A fulfilling life is not preoccupied with material objects, prestige or power. It is a life that is filled with true friendship, sharing and caring for each other.' Tzu Chi volunteers live out this ideology and deliver direct relief to people from all walks of life, whether they live in war-torn countries or impoverished villages.

During a visit to Tzu Chi's headquarters in Hualien county, the Hon. Terry Stephens, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan and I were honoured to share a meal with members of Tzu Chi, participate in a cultural exchange of ideas and witness the daily activities of this remarkable organisation. I take this opportunity to express my heartfelt thanks to Master Cheng Yen and the Buddhist nuns in Hualien county for their warm and gracious welcome. I also thank members of the Tzu Chi Adelaide branch for organising our meeting with Master Cheng Yen and the humanitarian work they are currently doing.

*Motions***PALLIATIVE CARE**

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:00):** I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises Palliative Care Week was held from 20 to 26 May;
2. Recognises that access to appropriate pain and symptom management, and being surrounded by family and loved ones, are most important to people who are dying;
3. Acknowledges that the Productivity Commission's draft report into human services, released in June 2017, argued that more community-based palliative care services are needed to enable more people who wish to die at home to do so, and that end-of-life care in residential aged care needs to be better resourced and delivered by skilled staff;
4. Notes that there are just 213 palliative medical specialists across Australia, equating to one specialist for every 704 deaths each year;
5. Notes that Palliative Care Australia estimates that while 70 per cent of Australians wish to die at home, only around 14 per cent do so;
6. Recognises Palliative Care Australia's call for a national palliative care commissioner who would examine existing palliative care services and programs nationally to assess their efficiency and effectiveness in supporting terminally ill individuals and their families to live as well as possible, right to the end of life; and
7. Urges the federal government to make palliative care a health priority and appointing a national palliative care commissioner.

The motion I move today recognises Palliative Care Week, which was held last week, and the importance of raising awareness about properly resourced palliative care in our community. As the saying goes, 'nothing is certain except for death and taxes', but while taxes will always remain painful death does not need to be. Pain and symptom management, along with being surrounded by family, are most important to people who are dying. All Australians deserve to die with dignity and to be surrounded by the people they love. Sadly, the wishes of thousands of terminally ill Australians to die without pain is going unmet. Why? Because palliative care services fall severely short in Australia, and particularly in South Australia.

Families are being forced to helplessly watch someone they love die without receiving adequate care, pain relief, nursing support or information about end-of-life care options. Palliative care helps terminally ill people see out their lives as fully and comfortably as possible. It can be provided at home, in hospitals or at aged-care facilities. This specialised care includes pain and symptom management, support for families to talk about sensitive issues and psychological and spiritual support for the patient and their loved ones. Palliative care in South Australia is in the worst condition it has been since 1980 when it was first implemented in the South Australian health system.

Presently, the number of people wishing to die at home with the support of community-based palliative care services far exceeds the availability of that care, particularly for those with illnesses other than cancer. For many, access to community-based palliative care is determined by where a person lives rather than where they prefer to die. A postcode should not determine the level and quality of palliative care a dying person receives. Palliative Care Australia, the peak body, estimates that while 70 per cent of Australians wish to die at home only 14 per cent do so. That is a shocking indictment in anyone's language. Sadly, South Australia lags behind the other states with three out of four South Australians not getting access to palliative care. This is totally unacceptable.

The Productivity Commission released a draft report in June 2017 which examined reforms to human services and specifically palliative care services. It stated:

Each year, tens of thousands of people approaching the end of life are cared for and die in a place that does not reflect their choice or fully meet their needs. Most people who die do so in two of the least preferred places—hospitals and residential aged care.

The commission also said that patients' end-of-life journey will likely be punctuated with unavoidable or unwanted admissions to hospitals and the confusion, loss of dignity and loss of control that comes with it. South Australians deserve much better than this. The Productivity Commission's draft report



argued that reforms in this area should be a high priority for the government of South Australia and SA-Best could not agree more.

More community-based palliative care services are urgently needed to enable more people who wish to die in their own homes to do so. The Productivity Commission also argued that end-of-life care in residential aged care needs to be better resourced and delivered by skilled staff. There are just 213 palliative care specialists across all of Australia—213 palliative medicine specialists—that is just one specialist for every 704 deaths in Australia. That should shock everybody in this place. That is simply not good enough for a country like ours.

Inadequate funding of palliative care services only furthers the pain and stress that terminally ill patients and their families are forced to endure. Many family members feel they have to go it alone in the last few weeks and months to ensure their loved one has help to use the bathroom or wash, something that causes an enormous amount of strain at an already stressful time. It is also traumatic for families to see their loved one dying before their very eyes, without access to adequate care and support.

South Australia and other states desperately need to regenerate the investment in palliative care so that people can be supported to live, die and grieve appropriately. This government must make palliative care a top priority.

In my motion I call for this place to urge the federal government to make palliative care a national health priority and appoint a national palliative care commissioner who would address the current fragmentation of palliative care services in Australia. Further, the commissioner would be chartered to examine existing palliative care services and programs nationally to assess their efficiency and effectiveness in supporting terminally ill individuals and their families to live as well as possible right to end of life.

I end by encouraging all members of the Legislative Council, and members of the other place, to have an end-of-life conversation with their loved ones. We do not like talking about death and dying because we do not want to think about our loved ones dying or suffering. That fear explains our reluctance to talk about the issue as we should, but we actually do need to talk about it, so to that end we can help our loved ones at the end of life and vice versa.

To quote Dame Cicely Saunders, the founder of the modern hospice movement, 'How people die remains in the memory of those who live on.' We are all part of the story. We must do better. Death is inevitable, but dying unsupported should not be.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

### **POVERTY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.A. Franks:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on poverty in South Australia, and in particular—
  - (a) the extent and nature of poverty in South Australia;
  - (b) the impact of poverty on access to health, housing, education, employment, services and other opportunities;
  - (c) the practical measures that could be implemented to address the impacts of poverty;
  - (d) any other relevant matters.
2. That standing order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.
3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.
4. That standing order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the select committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

(Continued from 9 May 2018.)

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:08):** I rise to support and speak on the very commendable motion by the Hon. Tammy Franks that a select committee be established into poverty in South Australia, looking at every aspect of its impact on our society and what society can and should be providing.

It was an extremely cold night across Adelaide last night. As I warmed myself in front of the fire, I thought about the 6,000 people experiencing homelessness right now in South Australia. In the fifth most liveable city in the world I thought about the 143 people who were sleeping rough in the CBD—an 18 per cent increase from the number in the 2016 Australian Bureau of Statistics Census.

The recent survey by the Adelaide Zero Project, led by the Don Dunstan Foundation and the Hutt St Centre volunteers, identified that about 60 per cent of homeless people surveyed were aged 26 to 54. Nearly three-quarters of them reported a physical health problem, while almost half suffered from a mental health condition. Two in five had substance abuse issues.

In Australia tonight, around 116,000 people will have no place to call home and 43,500 people are aged 25. These are startling and sobering statistics that should make us all take notice and demand that, in such a rich country, something needs to be done to reverse the rate of homelessness and poverty. Homelessness and poverty are intertwined.

What are our governments doing about it? Are they doing enough? Earlier this month, New Zealand's Prime Minister, the Hon. Jacinda Ardern, prioritised her country's problem by committing \$100 million dollars to give her country's 40,000 homeless people shelter this winter. I have not as yet seen a similar pledge this side of the Tasman. Over the past nine years, \$9 billion has been spent through the National Affordable Housing Agreement. The federal government and the states are currently trying to renegotiate the deal, to be called the National Housing and Homelessness Agreement (NHHA) and to come into effect in July, that would lock in \$4.6 billion in funding for states and territories over the next three years, including \$375 million for homelessness services, which the states are required to match.

This money seems to be there, but is it enough and is it being used wisely? I grew up in an era when the Playford government and subsequent governments, until recently, proudly fostered a unique, low cost public housing program specifically for low income families. The Housing Trust worked wonderfully well until recent times, when Labor and Liberal governments began a slow dismantling of social housing by selling off stocks and not increasing the numbers of new stock to meet the obvious demand. It is incumbent on governments to look after the best interests of the most vulnerable in society, not fob off their responsibilities to non-government organisations with waiting lists that still stretch into decades for some of the most needy.

The government is also shirking its obligation to ensure these properties are maintained to a proper acceptable standard. Sometimes some of these homes do not go to those who really need and deserve them. They have become havens for criminals, drug dealers and, unfortunately, the mentally ill, who would have been better off in a proper medical facility or under some form of structured care. People, families and children are still being forced to live in cars. As Mission Australia chief executive James Toomey said, safe and secure housing provides the platform for children to attend school, adults to work, people to be healthy and communities to thrive. I believe these are some of the failures that the Hon. Tammy Franks wishes to shine a spotlight upon.

Statistics will also tell us that today 250 people were turned away from crisis centres across the country. Again, this is unacceptable in a country like ours. That brings me to the wonderful unsung work that is done here by NGOs. I want to single out the Hutt St Centre, which, over recent months, has been subjected to unjustified and harsh criticism by self-interest groups, some members of council and anonymous NIMBYs (not in my backyard-ers). There have been false and malicious allegations about what occurs there. One local even has a camera focused on the footpath outside the centre and is happy to distribute any footage that shows any unsociable behaviour, which is often not the fault of the centre. I have seen more unsociable behaviour at the Adelaide Oval during a Crows or Port Power match.

There seem to be other forces at work here in trying to get the centre either closed or moved into another part of the city. Moving what they perceive to be problem somewhere else seems to be

the solution and not the answer. Meanwhile, the southern end of the street, once earmarked for social housing projects, suddenly becomes a magnet for more upmarket development.

The Hutt St Centre has been quietly going about its pastoral work with the homeless and less fortunate in our community for an amazing and rewarding 64 years. Many South Australians would be unaware what actually goes on inside. Recently, I decided to go and see for myself. I spent two days there and it opened my eyes to the unseen, unheralded and yet important service it provides to the less fortunate who have fallen through the cracks of society.

The Hutt St Centre is such a vital safety net for them, providing meals to the hungry, inclusion programs, opportunities to find work and a meaningful purpose in life, a place where they can find someone genuinely interested in them and their lonely transient lives and also someone to talk to. I met some of the clients and heard their stories, their hopes and their aspirations to claw their way out of the situation they now find themselves in.

There is Walter, the Indigenous artist whose talent for dot paintings was discovered there; Brian, the ex-army vet who now proudly has his own home and garden, thanks to the centre, and still returns there for some camaraderie and art classes, and just to provide company for others; Craig, the lead singer of the centre's rock band, The Outsiders, whose voice can match the screeching crescendo of Jimmy Barnes; and Leo, from the Gang Greens, who quietly go up and down Hutt Street cleaning up rubbish and leaves. A lasting impression was left on me by a terminal cancer patient. His bones are wracked in pain, yet he regularly joins others for the weekly wombat walk through the Parklands, then stopping for a coffee and a chat.

I also met the staff. They have a weekly reflections meeting, where one staff member delivers an inspirational talk to remind all what their purpose there is. I would like to share with you some of the eloquent thought-provoking words that left a lasting impression on me, delivered by Huy Nguyen. This is what we spoke about that day, some excerpts from that speech:

What is it that we believe in?

What is it that keeps our common heart beating?

What is it that keeps our smiles beaming?

Is it the belief in the inherent richness of our story?

Is it our collective will to be better than we were yesterday, in the demand to be heard, in the drive for something greater?

Is it the belief in helping people to uncover choices? Where they can choose to be, if they wish, the best versions of themselves they can be. Where they can regain power and agency in their own lives.

Is it the idea that we've been getting it wrong? That maybe our beloved meritocracy is a fraudulent concept manufactured out of a convenient ignorance, built not only on bare knuckle toil but also on the strewn dreams of those unable to participate, those unable to pay the fare?

Maybe it is a false dichotomy between the deserving and the undeserving; one which fails to acknowledge the cries of the meek, and of the fallen. Theirs is but a whimper in the cacophony of greed, the clamour of desperation to simply have more.

It's all around us.

And I wonder if you can hear it.

It is the sound of the street.

It is the sound of cutting wind forcing its way through layers and layers of pre loved fabric. It is the sound of emotional impoverishment. A world populated by anger, confusion and anxiety. A world where desperate and fearful people thrust their frustration at what is near, not necessarily at what is deserving.

It is the sound of a muted forced solitude, of devastatingly low expectation and of a long cultivated mistrust. It is the sound of a frayed, jagged violence most of us will never have the displeasure of knowing.

They are the songs of a poverty that enslave us all, songs that aren't always set to music we may recognise. Music made with the beat from a beaten down heart which refuses to surrender. It, interwoven with a melancholy of loss and fractured regret, punctuated with a broken glass of a bottomless beer bottle; the piercing screech of terror wrapped in an abject loneliness and debilitating boredom.

They, they are the stories of the brave and of the resilient.

They are the tales of those who defy the woeful plot already written for them.

They are the songs of the stayers and of the fighters.

They were the words of Huy Nguyen from the Hutt St Centre. Again, I commend the Hon. Tammy Franks on her initiative.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:20):** I rise on behalf of the government to place our position on the record with respect to the select committee proposed by the Hon. Ms Franks. I will start with the most important bit first, and that is that the government will support the establishment of the select committee and will offer at least one of our members to form part of the committee. I think it is important I read the terms of reference quickly for the chamber so that members are aware exactly what the committee will set out to do. The motion is:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on poverty in South Australia, and in particular—
  - (a) the extent and nature of poverty in South Australia;
  - (b) the impact of poverty on access to health, housing, education, employment, services and other opportunities;
  - (c) the practical measures that could be implemented to address the impacts of poverty;
  - (d) any other relevant matters.

Items two, three and four go through the usual procedural matters of how the committee will conduct itself. The government is pleased to support the committee. It is obviously an extremely important issue that our society faces, and as we get wealthier, the fact is that some are being left behind. As a government, and as a parliament, I think all members would agree that we are obliged to act in any way we can to alleviate what can be an absolutely debilitating circumstance that people find themselves in.

I would also like to point out that one thing that is significant here is that this government is showing in its very early days, through the minister's decision to support the establishment of this committee, that it is open to good ideas from other members. Whether they be on the crossbench or the opposition, it matters not. As a government, we recognise that we are not the only place where good ideas proliferate and we are open to other ideas from other members. I think the minister's decision to support this committee—she may not have done so—on behalf of the government is an indication of exactly that fact.

Turning to the committee itself, it is going to be a very interesting and quite complex committee, I have no doubt, because the way our society is structured the federal system funds most items that directly impact on poverty. I am thinking about things like income support, employment services and the like, most of which tend to be funded at the commonwealth level. There is some crossover at the state level but a lot of these issues are funded at the commonwealth level.

Newstart, for example, is funded at the commonwealth level. There is no question that the level at which Newstart is set will have an impact on exactly the issues that this committee will examine, so I think it is important for the committee to acknowledge at the outset that by necessity there will be time taken to examine issues which are necessarily out of this particular parliament's jurisdiction but nonetheless worthy of broad consideration.

This government's policy supports approaches based on participation, empowering people to make positive changes in their lives and overcoming entrenched disadvantage. I would like to give some background on that more generic statement. The government, through the Department of Human Services, currently provides about \$178 million in funding concessions, rebates and other programs that support people in financial stress aimed at alleviating and preventing poverty. That is \$178 million, which is no insignificant contribution.

This aligns with the government's strategy to reduce the cost-of-living pressures for individuals and families. Indeed, this is a priority in the '2036' plan that members would no doubt be aware of. Some current programs focus on the financial crisis end of the spectrum, for example, the emergency financial assistance program or support of the food relief entity commonly known as Foodbank.

Other programs provide support for individuals to generate their own income and build financial resilience. For example, the trial LaunchME microenterprise program is giving individuals the opportunity to start very small, at very low cost, in order to provide an opportunity for them ultimately to pull themselves out of poverty, if they have the appropriate ideas, etc., to be suitable for that program.

The South Australian Housing Trust also delivers a broad range of housing programs, including social housing, housing affordability measures, private rental assistance and homelessness services. These will no doubt be matters that will also be investigated by the committee. There is also considerable investment in other portfolios, including education, such as the children's centres we have dotted around the state; health and wellbeing; and the department of industry and skills as well.

Perhaps some relevant statistics need to be placed on the record for a baseline, in a sense. The benchmark for the homeless population count is done through the ABS census. The latest census data, based on the 2016 Census of Population and Housing, was released on 14 March. It found that some 6,224 people were estimated to be homeless in South Australia on census night. That is a 7 per cent increase from 2001, so trending in the wrong direction. However, I think we can take some pride in saying that this 7 per cent increase compares with an increase of some 14 per cent nationally, so South Australia is in that sense at least faring better than the rest of the nation.

Severe overcrowding was the single largest contributor to South Australia's increase, and that is consistent with the national trends. Encouragingly, though, the rate of homelessness amongst Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people has actually decreased by 24 per cent, according to the data.

One of the questions I expect the committee will examine is the issue of housing affordability. Again, South Australia fares somewhat better than average on that front because houses do tend to be—I won't say 'cheaper' because no-one would argue they are cheap, but perhaps the right phrase is 'more affordable' relative to the eastern seaboard in particular. Of course, that is then offset to some extent by the fact that wages here are lower on average compared to the eastern seaboard, so there is somewhat of an offset, which I will talk about a bit more in a moment.

The most recent figures for low income housing stress are included in the Report on Government Services released in February this year in relation to the data accrued in 2016-17. The report shows a steady increase in South Australia over the past decade: from 2007-08 where it was 22.4 per cent; 2008-09, 27.8 per cent; 2011-12, 33.6 per cent; 2013-14, 33.2 per cent; and then in 2015-16, after almost a decade, it was 39.4 per cent. So housing stress is an increasing problem for South Australians as well, and one would expect that increased housing stress has an impact on the level of poverty in our community.

Other indicators include various rental affordability indexes, and I think these are significant. Often those in poverty will not own their own home or be fortunate enough to have a roof over their head—even not have a roof at all—but many of them in this unfortunate situation will seek to rent a place, albeit on a temporary basis. The rental affordability index gives us an insight into what the real data shows. Those figures are published annually by Anglicare and Shelter SA, and show that those on the lowest income—Newstart, Youth Allowance and Parenting Payment, for example—have almost no access to homes that are affordable, which is usually interpreted as rent less than 30 per cent of income.

People who find themselves in these circumstances, according to the data that is accrued every year, have 'no access' to affordable homes, which is a very serious situation for government to address, both federally and at a state level. However, as I said, most of these income supplements are, of course, provided at the federal level.

Indices, such as I just outlined and others that examine ratios between property prices and income, have recently shown that South Australia, despite our lower housing costs, on a relative ratio, has the third most expensive rental affordability in Australia. As I indicated before, that is because, whilst our property prices and therefore rents tend to be lower than the eastern seaboard

in particular, our income levels are also lower, thus affecting the affordability index. It is very significant and something I have no doubt the committee will turn its mind to.

In terms of unemployment, obviously if one is unemployed then they are at risk of falling—if that is the right term—into poverty, or finding themselves in a situation that might be described as being in poverty; so unemployment rates are very important. The jobless rate in South Australia, in seasonally adjusted terms, has increased, as members would be aware, from 5.6 per cent in March to 5.9 per cent in April. The trend rate is 5.9 per cent.

If we look at the data across the other states, we are not faring particularly well, but we are not faring particularly badly either. We are somewhere in the middle of the pack. If Australia's average is 5.5, as I said, South Australia is now at 5.9, so we are not faring particularly well and not faring particularly badly.

I have a few other points I would like to make before closing my contribution. When one is measuring poverty, things like housing affordability must be treated with caution, noting different approaches. There is what is called absolute poverty and that is the Henderson Poverty Line, as it is known, a measurement that has been around for some time now. So-called relative poverty are households with income less than 50 per cent of equivalent median income, the indicator says.

There is also access to publicly funded services and the like, so there is a whole range of factors that need to be considered when one thinks about exactly what is poverty. I think the simple way of thinking about it is: do people have enough money to meet their basic needs? But, in fact, it can be so much more than that. I assume the committee will look at these issues as well.

The most recent major national report into poverty was produced by the Australian Council of Social Service (ACOSS) in 2016 and this was the 5<sup>th</sup> edition of the report that examines trends in poverty from 2003-04 to 2013-14 and forms part of a large series by ACOSS and the Social Policy Research Centre. This will be rich material for the committee, I am sure, which no doubt they will have access to and will, I presume, turn their mind to.

On behalf of the government, we recognise that many people struggle with affordability and therefore face falling into poverty. The government provides services that are targeted to assist those in financial stress and help them get back on their feet but recognises that this is a very real problem in the community that would be well served by a parliamentary select committee. For that reason, we support the committee.

I have one final thought on that issue and the mover of the committee may wish to make some comments on this in her summing-up, or she may not. One thing that occurred to me, as the chair of the Social Development Committee, is that these sorts of issues would be well served to be addressed in the Social Development Committee.

That said, as a former member of the crossbench myself, I can fully understand the member's desire to have a select committee. You certainly have more control over the process that the committee undertakes, if you like, so I make no criticism of the decision to adopt a select committee rather than refer it to the Social Development Committee.

But perhaps I can raise the matter for the chamber to consider in the future that I would be very keen to look into this issue. If there were other thoughts about select committees that members in the chamber had that they thought might be suitable for a particular standing committee, such as the Social Development Committee or whatever it may be, I would certainly be happy to talk with those members and see if we could accommodate them as best we can. With that, I indicate government support for what should be a very interesting committee.

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:33):** One of the great things about going last is watching everyone else talk to what you were going to say. Obviously, the opposition will support establishing the committee to investigate the impacts of poverty and the effects of poverty in regard to health, housing, education, employment, services and other opportunities. Investigating any pathways that could be used to address the impacts of poverty on South Australians is something which the opposition wholeheartedly supports.

In regard to the contributions of the other members, which mostly constituted what I was going to say, they were excellent, and I got an opportunity to note the good diversity and juxtaposition

of thought, including the macro position taken by the Hon. Tammy Franks in her original speech to this matter. I think the very localised and personalised account was an excellent contribution by the Hon. Mr Pangallo, and the statistical practicality of what is homelessness and what is poverty, given in the contribution by the Hon. Mr Hood, I also found very instructive. I do not know if the Hon. Mr Hood will be on the committee—I hope so, Dennis, if I am allowed to use your first name. I look forward to listening to all of the thoughts from people in regard to contributions to the committee. It will certainly provide me with a great deal of insight.

I think it is important to note, when we are looking at what we have before us in terms of the outline of the committee, that we are not going to solve everything in regard to poverty, homelessness, or what we are looking at. What we will be able to bring back, I think, or at least I hope, are some measures—to practically look at the measures, to make inquiries into those measures and maybe look at what might be achievable in the capacity that we have.

As the Hon. Mr Hood pointed out, there is a significant involvement by the federal government in regard to what we are doing here. I think it is worth mentioning that, at a time of great inequality and poverty in Australia, there is an unfortunate reality at the federal level that we are looking at providing \$65 billion worth of tax breaks to multinational corporations and big banks. We are hoping that these economic benefits will in some way trickle down to the rest of society, which has been comprehensively proven not to work, in practical effect, within the last 30 to 40 years throughout the world.

Nonetheless, I think it is important that, when we are looking at this area, we acknowledge the federal impact that it has had. However, it is also important to look at the local impact. I noted the Premier's comments in regard to one of the local points, which the Hon. Mr Pangallo pointed out, being the Hutt St Centre. His comments were welcomed by everyone who has some knowledge of that debate. I think it is excellent, as has been pointed out by the Hon. Mr Hood, that the minister is seeking to support the creation of this committee.

I would only go a little further and say it would be nice if the government could rule out anybody who is affiliated with any of the major political parties making comments in regard to Hutt Street and their involvement in very poor and negatively run campaigns against the Hutt St Centre. That would be good, but I think it might be a bit much to ask at this time. I go back to the Premier's comments, which were welcome, and I think that they were also well-timed.

With all that, I am not going to beat the contributions of many of the other members—they have said a lot. I will again thank the Hon. Tammy Franks for her passion and dedication to fighting for those in our community who do not have an equal voice, and look forward to working with her on this committee and on those issues.

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:37):** I rise to offer my support for this motion. I concur with the Hon. Tammy Franks on many of the remarks in her contribution, particularly that it is a great shame that we still have people living in poverty in a developed nation like Australia in 2018. It amazes me that welfare in this country is still viewed as a punitive rather than supportive measure. It is not right that 36.1 per cent of social welfare recipients are living below the poverty line, including 55 per cent of those receiving the Newstart Allowance.

I believe it is time that all major political parties in the federal parliament come together and make it a priority to raise the level of Newstart. It has been more than 20 years since the last rise in Newstart by the then Keating government. Beyond the statistics, of course, there are stories of people who have no food to put in the pantry.

I have seen poverty firsthand, having volunteered for the St Vincent de Paul's Society Home Visitation Program in the western suburbs for many years. These home visitations were not just about delivering food and leaving, they also gave clients the opportunity to sit down and tell their stories. What I came to understand is that these stories were extremely diverse and most did not fit into the typical narrative of a dole bludger gaming the system.

The media's incessant focus on the so-called dole bludger has done a lot of political damage, as it seems that federally there are too few who have the courage to advocate for any increase in Newstart. It is clear that, through this motion and the potential establishment of the committee to

investigate ways of addressing poverty, the Hon. Tammy Franks is supporting not only the poor themselves but also the community organisations that bend over backwards to support them.

I also concur with the Hon. Tammy Franks that we should be lauding the work of the Hutt St Centre. It should not sit well with all of us as Australians that 100,000 of our people are homeless every night. It has been a shame to hear a hoax letter that has been sent out to business owners and residents around the Hutt St Centre claiming that its expansion was to be much bigger than has actually been planned. I note that Mr Ross Womersley, the chief executive officer of the South Australian Council of Social Service, is on the record as stating that, by and large, most local residents and businesses are not being swayed by this scare campaign.

Whatever discussions are had about future expansion at Hutt Street, the work that the Hutt St Centre has done since moving into its premises 64 years ago should not be up for discussion. It has been heartening to see both the Premier and the minister, the Hon. Michelle Lensink, portray this sentiment. I believe there is a good deal of bipartisanship here, though. I am aware that state Labor's entire cabinet is participating in this year's CEO sleepout, which raises money to provide people experiencing homelessness with vital access to food and accommodation.

Vinnies will also be using the money to provide education, counselling, employment and health services to help people overcome poverty, hopefully in the long term. Through my own volunteering with Vinnies, I am aware of how much good these organisations can do. There are many organisations, such as the Don Dunstan Foundation, Anglicare, Uniting Communities, Catherine House and Shelter SA, that are working in a very difficult area to alleviate some of the ills that exist in our society.

As the Hon. Tammy Franks has stated in her contribution, it was once claimed by then prime minister Bob Hawke that no child would live in poverty in 30 years. We are almost at that point in time and unfortunately this is still very much an unattainable goal. Setting up a committee to investigate practical ways we can address this issue is a very good step for this council to take.

I would like to talk about what I believe is a very practical example of how we could assist the homeless. I noted some discussion recently about how public spaces are intentionally designed with the purpose of dissuading people from sleeping on benches and other resting places. This was reported in InDaily late last year. Defensive architecture can involve gating off doorways and leftover urban spaces, which provide some refuge for those who have to sleep rough in cities. More insidious is the use of small metal spikes to make surfaces impossible to sleep on.

Seats are designed to slope, dividers are used to prevent people lying down, and walls and paving are designed to be uncomfortable. Other examples have included shower rails which drench anyone using an enclave as a temporary refuge, and music to make sleeping impossible. Perhaps investigating whether these defensive design standards are implemented by our local councils could be a good place to start. It is a very practical issue which, if addressed properly, could provide the slightest bit of comfort to people who are sleeping rough. With that, I fully support this motion.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:45):** I thank all of those members who have made a contribution to this debate and all of those members who have indicated support, both in this council and outside the council, in particular the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Justin Hanson, and the Hon. Tung Ngo, as well as the Hon. Dennis Hood. In terms of the contributions, I will reflect that I really appreciate the contributions made today and the conversations that have happened outside this council with regard to this select committee.

It might seem like an unattainable task, but as I interjected to the Hon. Tung Ngo, in fact our former prime minister, Bob Hawke, when he pledged, although he stumbled on the words, that no child need live in poverty, actually did attain that goal. He set the goal and he attained it. We have lost those goals in our leadership in this country and that is something that I would say is not unattainable, and we only have to look at a prime minister like Jacinda Ardern to see that other countries are taking on this task and setting themselves these goals. But if you have a look at somewhere like Finland, they are achieving these goals because they set them.

Those who do commendable work in this sector are also some of those with whom I have had conversations about bringing this select committee to this parliament: the Hutt St Centre, of course, has been central to some of the drivers of this; the Dunstan Foundation; the Anti-Poverty



Network; and those in Ceduna who live and deal with the impact of the cashless welfare card in that town. In recent days, I have also had some contact and information from those in CAPA, the Council of Australian Postgraduate Associations, whose students are plunged into poverty by some of their circumstances.

Indeed the Greens, this very day in federal parliament, have backed a campaign to lift the minimum wage, because it is not only those who are on income supports, or without income supports through our social security system who are living in poverty, but indeed one in four people in poverty are actually working full time. That is unacceptable and I am hoping that this cross-party committee is not an exercise in virtue signalling but an exercise and an opportunity to give voice to the most vulnerable and those who are helping the most vulnerable, and to listen to that voice and to start to work out a way that we can end a world where a culture accepts poverty when it is not necessary, and it is attainable to end poverty. With those few words, I commend the motion to the council.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:48):** I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. J.E. Hanson, the Hon. F. Pangallo, the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos, the Hon. T.J. Stephens and the mover.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and to report on 5 December 2018.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **DISABILITY INCLUSION BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 May 2018.)

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:49):** I rise to make a brief contribution in support of this bill as introduced by the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Michelle Lensink. I take this opportunity to congratulate the minister on doing so. This is another example of the government being willing to consider ideas from elsewhere. We are aware that this bill was fundamentally introduced in the previous parliament and did not pass, yet the minister has seen fit to run with that in the new parliament, for which I congratulate her.

As the minister has already informed the chamber, the Marshall Liberal government committed to introducing this bill within 100 days of commencing its term in office. As members would be aware, the passage of this bill is imperative in facilitating the implementation of the National Disability Insurance Scheme in South Australia, transforming the manner in which our disability services are funded and delivered by transferring administrative responsibility from the state to the commonwealth government, in partnership with the National Disability Insurance Agency.

I note that South Australia was one of the very first states to sign up to the NDIS, and proudly it will be one of the first to complete this important transition and fully realise the practicalities of this scheme in an effort to ensure national consistency of disability support services across all jurisdictions.

One of the primary objectives of the NDIS is to promote and encourage the inclusion of those with a disability, removing barriers to their participation in all aspects of society that many of us take for granted in our daily lives. This not only comprises our daily work but also education, social, sporting and other leisure activities, but in addition also necessary day-to-day tasks that present difficulties for those faced with disability. I am personally very pleased that the Marshall Liberal government is directing energy and attention towards fostering the wellbeing of the most vulnerable in our community.

As members here would no doubt know, I have personal experience in this space as my mother is legally blind. I have therefore not only witnessed the many challenges she has had to overcome in her personal life over the years but I have also been fortunate enough to appreciate how achievable it is to enjoy a very fulfilling and rewarding life with a disability when adequate support and assistance are provided.

I am aware of a number of success stories resulting from a rollout of the NDIS, where those with disabilities have been afforded the opportunity to achieve their unique goals. Entrepreneurs with disabilities, for example, have been provided with assistance to start their own businesses, whilst enhancing their skills through relevant work experience; respite has been accessed by carers, enabling them to pursue other endeavours; people have attained appropriate housing to suit their personal needs and live independently (or more independently, as the case may be); and, parents have received early intervention support for their children—all worthwhile and valuable outcomes.

One of the key characteristics of the NDIS is its flexible approach to the provision of benefits, creating tailored packages of assistance to each of its eligible participants. Customised plans are enabling individuals to develop and pursue long-term aspirations, with the opportunity to alter their arrangements as necessary through the course of their lives: they are in control. This pragmatic approach appears to be achieving real and effective results, and I trust the 15,000-plus South Australians who are already approved participants will experience similar benefits, if they are not already.

Under this bill, I note there is a requirement for our state government to devise a disability inclusion plan every four years, which will provide the framework for departments, statutory authorities and local councils to each formulate specific disability access and inclusion plans. I understand that the development of these DAIPs (as I will call them—disability access and inclusion plans) will be undertaken in consultation with people with disabilities, their families, carers, and advocates, as well as the peak bodies relevant to the situation, which is imperative in comprehensively identifying and remedying shortcomings in current and future operations.

The review of these plans every year, culminating in a statewide annual report detailing the progress of relevant entities in aligning with the principles promoted by the NDIS, is also vital for maintaining government accountability, and ultimately community confidence in this new revamped regime. This, of course, is in line with the Marshall Liberal government's resolve to both prioritise community engagement in the process of change and to enhance transparency in the conduct of its agencies and through the process of change.

There is no doubt that Australia's disability services have been in need of reform for many years, as evidenced by the submissions received in response to the federal government's public inquiry into a national disability long-term care and support scheme. The subsequent development and implementation of the NDIS is certainly a step in the right direction, and I look forward to seeing South Australia lead the way in terms of best practice for our disability sector through the passage of this bill.

I am mindful that there are a number of amendments to this bill yet to be moved by the Minister for Human Services, as well as some that the opposition has. I therefore look forward to further debate in due course on these proposals. However, I would like to go through the amendments very briefly. I think it is important to point out that the minister has met with Kelly Vincent, formerly a member of this place who was a key driver of a number of the amendments to this bill, and had a lengthy discussion, I understand, regarding the specific amendments. I understand there has now been broad agreement reached between the minister and Kelly Vincent with respect to the amendments to be moved.

There are a number of amendments, and they are based on Kelly Vincent's amendments, as I said. The first five amendments by the minister are based on Kelly Vincent's former amendments, and I will go through them very quickly. Amendment No. 1 from [Vincent-2] removes the parenthesis around the words 'including decisions involving risk'. I am informed that the intention here is to ensure that people having the dignity of risk is a well-understood way of giving people with disabilities the right to make choices. Removing those brackets is just to highlight that fact. The government will accept that amendment, which is incorporated in Human Services amendment No. 1.

Kelly Vincent (formerly the honourable) has also expressed her opinion on the second one, and we will also adopt this amendment, which puts the emphasis on the person with a disability having the choice to associate with whom they choose. This was considered an improvement to the existing wording by Kelly Vincent. The government accepts this amendment, and it will be incorporated into Human Services amendment No. 2.

The third amendment, Human Services amendment No. 3, is also based around [Vincent-2] and specifically considers child-centredness. The phrase includes 'the need for the child to be included in decisions about them'. The government accepts this amendment, which is incorporated, as I said, in Human Services amendment No. 3.

The next amendment is Human Services amendment No. 4. The intention of the original amendment by Kelly Vincent was to strengthen the input from children themselves. Rather than 'should be respected and considered in any decisions affecting the child, taking an approach that is developmentally appropriate' the wording will now become 'will be listened to, and they should be given appropriate opportunities to participate in decisions that affect them'. The government will accept this amendment, as I said.

The fifth amendment, also from [Vincent-2], is to bring the word 'developmental' into the clause. The government also accepts this amendment, which is incorporated as Human Services amendment No. 5. There are a number of other amendments, but I will not take the chamber's time in going through them now. They are somewhat more detailed than the ones I have outlined. No doubt the minister will give the government's position at the committee stage or in her summing-up of the debate.

I think this is a worthwhile bill and one that I expect will have broad support across the chamber. As I said, it is something that did not pass in the previous parliament, but the government has seen fit to pursue it because it is indeed worthwhile.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.E. Hanson.

### **SENTENCING (RELEASE ON LICENCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

### **SUPPLY BILL 2018**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:00):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

A Supply Bill is necessary until the Budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2018 receives assent.

In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the Supply Acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill.

The amount being sought under this Bill is \$6 631 million.

This amount is based on the actual appropriations that were required for the first five months of the 2017-18 financial year plus an additional amount of \$200 million due to the change in the frequency of the past service superannuation liability payment from a single annual lump sum to monthly instalments.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides relevant definitions.

Clause 3 provides for the appropriation of up to \$6 631 million.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.E. Hanson.

At 17:01 the council adjourned until Thursday 31 May 2018 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***STATE PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION**

In reply to **the Hon. I.K. HUNTER** (3 May 2018).

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer):** The Premier has advised the following:

As the government committed before the election, legislation will be introduced within the first 100 days to establish the South Australian Productivity Commission. Immediately after the government was sworn in the Premier initiated discussions with prospective members of the commission and as soon as the legislation is passed by parliament, the membership will be announced.