

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 19 September 2018

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

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:16): I lay upon the table the 7th report of the Legislative Review Committee 2018.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

GENE TECHNOLOGY

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:17): I seek leave to add to an answer that I gave yesterday to the Hon. Mark Parnell in relation to gene technology.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: As I advised yesterday, I can confirm that I am the South Australian member of the Legislative and Governance Forum on Gene Technology. The gene technology forum was scheduled to meet on 31 August to discuss two significant items: the review of the gene technology scheme; and the technical review of the commonwealth Gene Technology Regulations 2001. However, the meeting was rescheduled for October 2018. The review of the national gene technology scheme commenced in 2017 to assess the ongoing achievement of the policy objectives of the scheme, taking into account the rapidly developing and innovative area of gene technology. The final report will be presented for consideration at the 11 October meeting.

In 2016 the Gene Technology Regulator instigated a technical review of the Gene Technology Regulations 2001. During preparation of the draft regulations, significant public and targeted consultation took place, including preparation of the regulatory impact statement and the consideration of trade and market access implications.

The draft regulations generally provide greater technical clarity and provisions to adjust the level of regulation of some contained dealing with genetically modified organisms to be more commensurate with risk, and minor administrative matters.

It was anticipated that the approval of these draft regulations would have been discussed at a gene technology forum meeting, but due to the rescheduling of the meeting, and to meet commonwealth parliamentary time frames, an out-of-session decision was sought. On behalf of the South Australian government I responded in support of the draft regulations.

I am advised that the proposed changes to the commonwealth Gene Technology Regulations will provide an interim solution to deal with current uncertainty for operators, and ensure that the scheme continues to operate in accordance with its primary objectives. A longer term solution to ensure that the scheme is able to more effectively and efficiently respond to scientific developments will be addressed in the overarching review of the scheme. If approved by the forum, the draft regulations will proceed directly into the commonwealth regulation-making process, requiring approval from the Governor-General and tabling in parliament. Approval by the forum is required by a two-thirds special majority.

South Australia is a signatory to the national intergovernmental Gene Technology Agreement, and is therefore committed to align with commonwealth legislation to ensure a nationally consistent scheme. Any changes to the commonwealth regulations will require subsequent mirroring in the SA Gene Technology Regulations 2017.

Question Time

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding the Housing Trust.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Rex is a Housing Trust tenant who lives in a small, one-bedroom cottage in Morphett Vale. He relies upon the age pension to make ends meet from week to week. Because of the minister's cruel decision to jack up Rex's weekly rent, he will somehow need to find hundreds of extra dollars each year that would otherwise go towards his groceries, utilities and transport costs. My question to the minister is: can the minister explain to Rex—and the many, many other Housing Trust tenants in the community, some of whom are here today in Parliament House—why he most forgo some of life's basic necessities to try to pay for this government rent increase?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. The honourable member did say 'a one-bedroom cottage'. If he is referring to a freestanding dwelling, then Rex—sorry, you didn't say his last name otherwise I would call him Mr Smith, X, whatever—would already be paying 25 per cent.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Supplementary: are there any Housing Trust renters who will see increases in their rent as a result of this budget?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:21): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary. That is correct; that is those people who reside in bedsit cottage flats or one-bedroom cottage flats who currently are paying 19 per cent and 21 per cent respectively. Their rents were increased by the previous Labor government in 2011 from previous levels. Of course, people—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: What levels?

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you have asked your question. Let the minister answer. You can ask another question in a moment.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President. I would like to continue to respond. Of course, those people who reside in two-bedroom cottage flats are already paying 25 per cent as a result of the same policy change—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —are paying 25 per cent from 2011. Can I just remind members opposite that interjections are disorderly.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I'm answering—

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, please, I do not need your commentary. I would like to listen to the minister's answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am responding to the original question. I am happy to respond to any supplementaries. The stated policy of the former government was that people who live in public housing pay 25 per cent of their household income. That has been the situation for many—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —for many, many years. It is not—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You need to be accurate.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I don't need to be reminded by an incompetent former minister—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, through me. Ignore—

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I'm sorry, Mr President. The members opposite are quite disorderly.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Hunter, please, the minister does not require your advice.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: She needs someone's advice.

The PRESIDENT: Not yours.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: They don't like to be reminded of the facts. In fact, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Croydon, when he said that Labor never, ever increased rents was telling a porky, but set that aside.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Let the minister answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President. I do like to be heard in silence so I can actually respond and I can actually think about what I'm saying. The policy has not been that households pay according to dwelling type. For instance, people are not charged more for living in a three or four-bedroom house. It is 25 per cent of income or market value, whichever is the lower.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary arising from the answer: will the minister inform the house whether there are people in one-bedroom accommodation who will face increases because of her decisions in this budget? What does she say to those people? Does she really think they are going to enjoy her partisan diatribe that she has given today, or does she have an answer about what—

The PRESIDENT: It is a supplementary question. Leader of the Opposition, the second half of the question is totally inappropriate and out of order. The first question is reasonable. It goes to the minister. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:25): The answer is yes and no. People who live in one-bedroom units are paying 25 per cent. People who live in one-bedroom cottage flats are currently paying 21 per cent, so there is an inequity between those who are paying 25 per cent and those who are paying less.

In fact, we have had some inquiries via the call centre and to my office from people who may or may not have been misled by the Labor Party talking about people being charged a whole lot extra. When they have called us and it has been explained to them, they have said that's perfectly reasonable.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: They have.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): Supplementary arising from the answer: what does the minister say to people who currently are going to have their rent increased by \$10 a week at least, \$500 a year, and who are struggling to afford the basic necessities? What does she say to them? We will make sure they see what you have said on *Hansard*.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, that is totally out of order.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I invite the minister to say what she wants—

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I am ruling the whole question out of order. You have spoken over me. You are not getting another question today, Leader of the Opposition. I will not be spoken over. The Hon. Ms Scriven.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:26): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services about Housing Trust rents.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Tim is a Housing Trust tenant living on a disability support pension in Naracoorte. He often goes without food and medicine just to get by. Tim is incredibly frustrated that he already abstains from family events, and sometimes medical appointments, as he can't justify the travel cost over buying food. An increase in Tim's Housing Trust rent will mean that he has to forego more necessities and social opportunities just to get by. My question to the minister is: can the minister explain to Tim how he is expected to pay for the government's rent increase on his property?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:27): I would need to double-check this, but I think that if Tim is living in Naracoorte, he is living in a property that is managed by community housing providers, not the South Australian Housing Trust.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:27): Supplementary: so you are saying that you will refuse to answer the question because you think maybe it's community housing and not yourself?

The PRESIDENT: The phrasing of the question is out of order. The Hon. Ms Bourke.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like to hear the question from the Labor member. If the members of the Labor bench would like to show some respect for the Hon. Ms Bourke. The Hon. Bourke, please deliver your question.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:28): Thank you, Mr President. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding Housing Trust rents.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Felicity, a 69-year-old Housing Trust tenant who lives in a one-bedroom cottage at Noarlunga Downs, recently contacted her local member of parliament with a message for the government:

Can you please ask what should I do?

Become homeless, stop eating or not buy my medication in order to avoid paying the increase in my Housing SA rent?

I do not have heating or cooling, so cannot save money that way. I do not smoke or drink either. I already live below the poverty line.

My question is: can the minister justify to Felicity how she is expected to pay for the government's rent increases?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:28): I am not worried about that.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, through me.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am sorry, Mr President. I am not worried about Labor Party rhetoric. I mean, really, there are a number of people who are in exactly the same circumstances who are paying 25 per cent of household rent. Once again, the honourable member in her question referred to a one-bedroom cottage, so it's not clear whether Felicity is within the scope of the change to rents or not.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Felicity is. That's why she contacted her MP.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Well, she may well not be.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Just answer the question. How will she pay for this increase?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I thank the honourable member for her advice on how to answer the question. But can I say this: the most vulnerable people are not the people who have Housing Trust properties. The most vulnerable people are the people who are living in cars, sleeping rough in the city on our streets, and a number of people who are in crisis and transitional accommodation.

Those people cannot get into public housing. Why is that? Because the Labor Party, that great bastion of underprivileged people who can't provide for themselves, sold thousands and thousands of Housing Trust properties to prop up its budget. I am amazed that the Labor Party, having done what they did to the Housing Trust asset base, would even dare to raise the topic of public housing in South Australia after they sold Housing Trust properties for vanity projects—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —after years and years and years. Three things—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: A mean-spirited, cold-hearted, lack of empathy.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Back at you, Ian.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, restrain yourself. You are on the verge of being unparliamentary. Minister, continue your answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Three things members opposite in government did when they wanted money from the Housing Trust: they sold assets, and we are dealing with the legacy of 16 years of your failure.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, sit down. The Hon. Mr Dawkins, you have the call.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:31): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on the state government's progress towards reactivating the Repat and the recent public consultation on the future of the Repat site?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for his question. At the election, the Liberal Party committed to reactivate the Repat as a genuine health precinct. I am pleased to update the council on progress being made to deliver on our commitment.

As honourable members know, this government stopped the sale of the Repat site. I terminated the contract on 2 May. The Repat is remembered particularly for its link with the veterans community, and I want to highlight the government's commitment to this history. We have ensured that the Repat Memorial Chapel remains a place for the community to honour our veterans

community. A commemorative service was held at the chapel on ANZAC Day and an event is planned for Remembrance Day.

We have reopened the hydrotherapy pool: on 28 May, a phased approach to reactivation of the pool commenced. We have undertaken a consultation process on the reactivation of the Repat site. In April, we engaged both SA Health and community stakeholders in identifying and testing options and these ideas were brought together in an issues guide.

On 15 August, we launched public consultations on the future of the Repat. This consultative approach was in stark contrast to the previous Labor government's approach to Transforming Health. On 1 September, a second consultation event was held. Described as a speed dialogue event, it provided guests with an opportunity to discuss the proposal concepts with clinicians, SA Health and stakeholders.

The government invited an expression of interest from private and non-government organisations, which closed last Friday 14 September. Over 30 expressions of interest have been received. We also asked the community to participate and tell us what services they wanted to see on the site.

In total, almost 1,500 members of the community participated, with 1,325 online poll results and approximately 100 submissions via letter and email. The community consultation phase closed last Sunday 16 September. The public response has been outstanding. We already saw, on 17 March, how much the community value this site and the community engagement with the process to date has only confirmed that.

Some of the statistics: 165 people attended the public launch, 50 people participated in the speed-dialogue public consultation event, 180 people attended a local community forum arranged by local MPs, and more than 6,000 people viewed the YouTube video which was created at the launch event. The YourSAy website has had over 11,000 page views in total, with a record 1,200 page views in one day, on 15 August, the day it was launched. Social media posts have reached more than 120,000 people in total.

I would like to thank everyone who has taken the opportunity to have their say on how they think the Repat site should be used and what should be located there. From here, SA Health will shortlist potential partners from the EOI process and begin negotiations with those shortlisted organisations. The government will also develop a fully costed conceptual master plan based on the feedback from the public and other input. The final master plan is expected to be released for public comment either late this year or early next, with the next stage of the site's activation commencing next year.

MOUNT BARKER DISTRICT SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Earlier this year, I asked the minister a question about the need for a much-needed renal dialysis unit at Mount Barker hospital and if the government had any plans to fund its operation. The minister's response at the time was unfairly critical of our Centre Alliance colleague and member for Mayo, Rebekha Sharkie, who the minister said—and I paraphrase—in my view has a very poor record of standing up for the health services in the Adelaide Hills'.

Rebekha is a strong, passionate and vocal advocate for her community, as was highlighted by her emphatic by-election victory in Mayo recently, her securing of funding for 24-hour doctors in Mount Barker from the previous government and her ongoing fight to secure the renal dialysis unit for the local hospital. Unfortunately for the people of the Adelaide Hills, I note in this year's budget papers that there is no funding for the renal dialysis unit at Mount Barker hospital.

That said, I have been heartened by an article in today's *Mount Barker Courier* which reveals the future priorities and needs for Mount Barker hospital, including a dialysis unit to be incorporated as part of a master plan the minister has just announced. However, the article also stated that no

definitive time frame had been given on when the dialysis unit would be available. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why hasn't the government provided funding in this year's budget for a much-needed renal dialysis unit at Mount Barker hospital?
2. What criteria was used by the government to commit \$1.5 million in this year's budget for a renal dialysis unit at Mount Gambier hospital over Mount Barker hospital?
3. How much money has been committed to funding the master plan, and has that money come from this year's budget, noting the previous Labor government last year announced it would invest \$6.7 million in Mount Barker hospital's emergency services over four years: \$859,000 in 2017-18, \$1.89 million in 2018-19, \$1.949 million in 2019-20 and \$2.1 million in 2020-21.
4. When can the people of the Adelaide Hills expect a final decision to be made on whether a renal dialysis unit will be introduced in Mount Barker hospital?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:38): I thank the honourable member for his question, through you, Mr President. My recollection was that the services plan for Mount Barker and districts was done in 2017 and identified three particular priorities: the emergency department, paediatric services and renal services. In relation to the emergency department, as the honourable member says, there was progress made at the end of last year, beginning of this. In this most recent budget, the government has committed to increasing paediatric services at Mount Barker hospital, with a commitment in this financial year of \$79,000, growing by 2021-22 to \$87,000. The three priorities in the plan were the ED, as I recall, paediatric services and renal, so the first two issues are in the process of being addressed.

In terms of the renal services, as the honourable member rightly highlights, having visited the hospital last week, I was speaking with a *Courier* journalist and advised that the government is at least looking at the business case for the renal dialysis service. There is a significant number of people from Mount Barker who are going in each direction. Some people were getting their renal services at Murray Bridge and some of them will be getting their services in the city. That work is being done to assess the budgetary requirements and the viability of the impact on different units. In terms of time frame, I would certainly expect that the business case would be finalised by early next year, if not by the end of this year. Of course, then that needs to be assessed and considered by government.

In terms of where the costs for the master planning process are coming from, I will take that on notice. The master planning process, as it was described to me by the gentleman who is undertaking it, relates to what the hospital site will look like for the next 20 years. It doesn't relate, shall we say, to the ED expansion, so it may well come out of general capital works for Country Health SA. I will take that question on notice and get back to the honourable member.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, that was not a brief explanation. Can you please watch yourself going forward. You could have asked those questions of the minister without the explanation. It's not appropriate for your political polemic ahead of your questions.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I apologise.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:41): No political polemic from me. My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

An honourable member: Human Services.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Human Services. I apologise, Mr President. When diligently writing my question, I wrote down the wrong name.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: It starts with an H.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Thank you; so do I. Can the minister identify where, in any of the Liberal Party's pre-election documents, it was stated that a Marshall Liberal government would increase Housing Trust rents?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for his question. No, I can't, because the stated policy has always been that Housing Trust tenants are charged 25 per cent of household income or market rent, whichever is the lower. I was actually unaware that there were people in Housing Trust properties who weren't paying 25 per cent. But this gives me great opportunity, before we all were called to order for being disorderly, to remind members about the situation that we are in where public housing in South Australia has been made unsustainable by the actions and raiding of the former Labor administration.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear the minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I shouldn't respond to interjections, but I did hear the Leader of the Opposition say that what I had said wasn't true. I actually tabled a ministerial statement in relation to—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos, you have a point of order.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: Relevance, sir, in terms of the question that was put.

The PRESIDENT: I take the point, but the minister has some latitude under Erskine May. But I am attentive to your point of order. Minister, continue.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President, I appreciate the sensitivities of the members of the opposition in not liking the truth.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, do not descend to their level, please.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You are a party of liars.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, that's unparliamentary. Can you please withdraw it and we will move on?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr President, I don't believe calling the party liars is unparliamentary—

The PRESIDENT: No, but it's unparliamentary so—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: —but if I have offended you, sir, I do withdraw it.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Point of order, Mr President. I remember the Hon. Ms Lensink calling this minister a liar, and this house endorsed it. They actually endorsed the subject, so there is a bit of inconsistency there.

The PRESIDENT: Thank you for your history. I have invited the Hon. Ian Hunter to respond to what I consider unparliamentary language. I am not sure it is a point of order, the Hon. Mr Wortley; his historical reflections to the chamber were a completely different point of order because that was around a question of liar and liars, and that was a decision by the chamber. Have I sufficiently distinguished it for you, the Hon. Mr Wortley? Thank you, the Hon. Mr Hunter for your apology. Minister, can you please continue.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, sir. I didn't apologise: I withdrew.

The PRESIDENT: No, you apologised to me, though.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I did to you, of course, always.

The PRESIDENT: That's why I was thanking you. Minister, continue with your answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I will try not to provoke those opposite, which is not that difficult. It is very, very sensitive about this issue, which well they should be.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, please continue with your answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear the minister speaking.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The triennial review, which was commissioned by the previous government under the act, which was tabled in this place, quite clearly painted the picture of the situation that we find ourselves in in government. The three things—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: To solve the problem, you are going to increase rents—

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —that the Labor Party did—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: —for the most vulnerable Housing Trust tenants.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —to solve the problem of their reckless budgets were—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: That's what you do: drive up the prices and the costs for these most vulnerable people.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —raid the Housing Trust, raid the assets, sell properties by the thousands.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You're not going to go anywhere else; you go straight to the most vulnerable and you jack up their rents. That's the Liberal reaction.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, I cannot hear. It is one of your own party's questions. I cannot hear the response.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Seven and a half thousand properties in 10 years; \$10 billion; they cut the cash from the Housing Trust; in the last financial year \$70 million to prop up Labor's reckless spending pre-election budget. They cut the maintenance budget and they never did any asset review since 2003.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: One-bedroom studio apartments; 19 per cent and you are jacking it up.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, the question was not directed to you: it was directed to the minister, and the Hon. Mr Hanson is having difficulty hearing the response to his own question. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The budget decision is to ask all Housing Trust tenants to be on the same level policy, which is 25 per cent of household income or market rent, whichever is the lower.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Your decision or the budget decision? Supplementary.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. K.J. Maher: I am allowed supplementaries.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson was to his feet before you, the Leader of the Opposition. The Hon. Mr Hanson.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:47): Supplementary, Mr President.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Shut him down, you will get the call up. Everybody else has had the call. You are a very naughty boy.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, you are not helping. Your commentary is descending to the same level as the Leader of the Opposition. You are now on the government benches. A higher standard of behaviour is expected. The Hon. Mr Hanson.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: The Hon. Mr Ridgway is not here, otherwise he would be telling him to chuck him out.

The PRESIDENT: Do not reflect on a member who is not in the chamber, the Hon. Mr Hanson.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Supplementary, Mr President, if I can get back to business. Given that the minister has admitted that the \$10 increase to some of the most vulnerable members of our

community in regard to their rents was not actually mentioned in any Liberal Party documents in the lead-up to the March election, can she also confirm that no economic analysis has been done by the Liberal Party in how this will affect those most vulnerable in our community?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:48): Part of the honourable member's supplementary is incorrect because it is not \$10—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: What is it? Go on, what is it?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Alright, I can run through these for you.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: It's up to \$50 a week, is it?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: No, it's not—

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, allow the minister to answer the Hon. Mr Hanson's question.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: It would be good if the honourable members opposite would actually read the budget papers.

The PRESIDENT: Minister, don't descend to their level, just answer the question.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am sorry, Mr President, but I do need to explain this. Where the \$50 a week comes from is a separate policy where people who are on modest incomes are going to be asked in future to pay—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: That's a different rent increase, is it?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Correct—to pay additional rent. So 25 per cent to 30 per cent in consultation with the South Australian Council of Social Services, etc.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: This is question time, not a conversation.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Sorry, Mr President, was I talking over you?

The PRESIDENT: No, I can't hear. Start again, minister, because I didn't hear that.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That is a separate policy decision. There have been issues raised. There was a story, I think in April or May this year, where the matter of people who—

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Point of order, Mr President: what I asked was in relation to economic analysis. Whether or not the start of my question was factually correct or not is actually irrelevant to the eventual question.

The PRESIDENT: I take the point of order.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: The eventual question goes to economic analysis.

The PRESIDENT: The minister has some latitude and I'm allowing the minister to get to the point. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I wish the members opposite would work out which of them I should respond to first, because I was—

The PRESIDENT: I would prefer if you responded to the supplementary by the Hon. Mr Hanson.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: To the supplementary.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, say that on the footsteps of parliament. I don't need to listen to it.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: As to the question of the impact on people who are on low incomes, there are many people, and the lowest-paid, of course, are Newstart recipients who will be asked to pay \$67 per week for their properties. There are a number of people, my figures say

approximately 4,000 Newstart recipients, who are in other types of dwellings who have been paying 25 per cent for many, many years.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:50): Mr President, I hate to repeat myself: what economic analysis was performed so that the minister could come to the conclusion that anybody would actually be paying any more money in regard to Housing Trust rents full stop?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, I am allowing the supplementary.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:51): Yes, Mr President. I'm not sure that that is any different. Those who are in bedsit cottage flats will pay approximately \$4 a week in the first two years and \$2.68 extra until 2021. By the end of the increase they will be paying an additional \$16.06 per week per year and that is before taking into account the CPI changes that will take place over time.

There are people who are in one-bedroom cottage flats who, again depending on their individual circumstances—this is just Newstart allowees, so these are the lowest Centrelink recipients—are paying \$4.25 per week extra in the first two years and \$2.83 per week until 2020. By the end of the exercise—no, I will leave that bit out because I'm not sure that it tallies up. The Housing Authority has calculated how much additional people will be paying. I can run through the other types of recipients, but I can also provide that information for the member if he is interested in a breakdown of those figures.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary question: now that the minister has finally conceded that her—

The PRESIDENT: Stop the inflection. It's a simple, crisp question since you are on a short leash today, the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Very short leash.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Some of the most vulnerable in our community—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, I don't need you adding into this conversation.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —will have significantly raised rents. Will the minister now concede and own her decision to increase these rents for some of the most vulnerable in the community—yes or no?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:52): I remind the Leader of the Opposition that the most vulnerable people are not people living—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you have asked your question. I would like to hear, as would everyone else in this chamber, the minister's response. Ask your question and listen to the answer in silence.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The most vulnerable people are not living in public housing in that sense, in the financial sense.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: They are people who are sleeping rough and living in cars, and there is an additional cohort who need to be considered who are Centrelink recipients who are in rental stress in the private sector.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, go on.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: So people who are living in our public housing—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: They're not interested in your answer.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We provide public housing for the most vulnerable—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Oh, you do now?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —but we don't have enough room for them all and that is because of the situation that the Labor Party has left us in. We want to be able to provide more housing for more people—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —and the Labor Party shamelessly sold all of those properties without any consideration for people who can't get into the system and who are residing in places like Catherine House, and other people can't get in, in a whole range of homelessness services because we can't get them into public housing. That is the legacy that the Labor Party have left us: people living on the street in unsafe situations, who can't get into public housing because of the mess that the Labor Party has left our public housing system in.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:54): Supplementary, Mr President: can the minister outline how charging people \$10 more gets more people into public housing?

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure that is a supplementary arising out of the original answer, to be honest. I am going to rule that one out of order; that was a bridge too far. The Hon. Mr Hunter.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:55): A supplementary from me, sir: how does the minister justify to those people who are in Housing Trust accommodation one-bedroom bedsits that they should now be paying the same amount as people who are in two-bedroom stand-alone units or homes? How does she justify that?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:55): The honourable member can try to cut these things however he likes. We can also consider the situation where people are in a one-bedroom unit paying 25 per cent in a walk-up flat, or people in a two-bedroom cottage flat who are paying 25 per cent.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Labor Party increased those ones in 2011 from 21 per cent to 25 per cent, and the Labor Party increased the rental for people in bedsits from 17 per cent to 19 per cent. There is a whole range of areas. Perhaps the honourable member is suggesting that we should be charging people who live in three or four-bedroom dwellings more? Is that Labor Party policy? More than 25 per cent?

The PRESIDENT: Through me, minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: More than 25 per cent?

The PRESIDENT: Through me, minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: So, it is Labor Party policy now that public housing should be charged on the meterage of the dwelling? Well, that is an interesting proposition, isn't it, Mr President? We will see how we go with that one.

The PRESIDENT: Hon. Mr Hood, a supplementary?

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:56): A supplementary to the minister: would the situation be as it is if Labor hadn't sold off all of the Housing Trust properties in the previous term of government?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: It might be a very good question, but it is actually hypothetical; I'm ruling it out of order. The Hon. Ms Lee.

UNITY HOUSING

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:57): Mr President, I have a very important question to ask to the Minister for Human Services about community housing. Can the minister please update the chamber about the work of Unity Housing in the western region of Adelaide, and the importance of community housing providers in the South Australian social housing system? Thank you, minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for her question. Community housing providers have been operating in South Australia for some time. It has been a bipartisan policy that community housing providers—in fact I think it was in 2009 that there was a national decision that up to 35 per cent of public housing stock would be transferred to the non-government sector.

In South Australia, we have some 5,000 properties under two tranches that have been transferred to the community housing sector. According to all their KPIs, they are doing a terrific job. Unity Housing recently opened a new office, which I was privileged to attend. It is in Port Adelaide, to service their clients in the western region. It's one of the five tier 1 organisations that operate in South Australia, and it is the largest community housing provider in South Australia in terms of property portfolio, management and development. As part of the September 2017 Renewing Our Streets and Suburbs (ROSAS) property transfers, Unity received close to 1,100 properties located in western Adelaide (Seaton, Findon, Grange, Woodville West and surrounds) and the Limestone Coast.

Currently managing around 3,000 properties across South Australia, Unity were founded in 2008 following the merging of several community housing providers. Along with the transfer of 1,100 ROSAS properties, Unity also has 779 South Australian Community Housing Authority (debentured) funded properties, 245 affordable properties, and 129 funded through the stimulus program. They lease 402 properties from the South Australian Housing Trust for a range of purposes, including transitional housing, boarding houses and disability housing.

Unity has a tenant-focused culture, seeking to provide safe, appropriate and affordable homes for people who are living on low incomes, particularly those living with disabilities and/or experiencing homelessness or are at risk of being homeless. Unity's culture reflects their role as a social landlord, building on the 25 years of service provided by Unity and founding organisations.

They manage more than \$800 million worth of housing, with a staff of more than 100 operating out of seven regional offices across South Australia. To support their tenants, Unity provides a range of community development and community connect programs to encourage social and economic participation. In addition, they have memoranda of understanding in place with over 30 support agencies to enable the provision of a broad range of services.

With a growing presence in the western suburbs, Unity have made the decision to invest in a larger physical presence in Port Adelaide, and they are to be congratulated. Community housing providers are a great example of the partnerships that the new Liberal government wants to see going forward so that we can provide additional accommodation for people in our community.

WATER QUALITY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services, representing the Minister for Environment and Water, a question about drinking water quality.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: We know that one of the effects of climate change in south-eastern Australia will be lower rainfall, reduced run-off and worsening water quality. This provides major challenges for water authorities, and we already see SA Water embarking on a major program to upgrade filtration works on reservoirs servicing South Australian communities.

One of the biggest projects involves an upgrade to the Myponga water treatment plant, and the replacement of chlorine with chloramine. This will affect about 37,000 consumers across the Fleurieu Peninsula. Apparently the Myponga township will be the first affected, and the other communities progressively brought online over the next two years.

I have received some correspondence from a retired scientist with a keen interest in water quality and chemical use. He raises some concerns about the project, which I will raise separately with the minister. However, he also points out that SA Water no longer publishes a comprehensive annual drinking water quality report, and instead publishes only a fraction of that data as appendices to the SA Water Corporation annual report.

My question of the minister is: is SA Water still collecting the same water quality data now as in previous years and, if so, what steps will the minister take to ensure that all water quality data collected is made readily available to the community online without the need for freedom of information requests?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will take it on notice and refer it to the minister in another place and bring back a response.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Does the minister acknowledge that any increase for the most vulnerable people living in one-bedroom bedsits will cause unreasonable hardship? How does any increase for the most vulnerable help provide more social housing for homeless people? Since the fact that the government kept this quiet before the election, what consultation took place with housing stakeholders, community groups and tenants ahead of your decision to increase Housing Trust rents?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:03): In response to the last part of the honourable member's question, I have already responded to that in response to a previous question.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: What consultation?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: It is hard to consult on something when you're not aware that the policy isn't the way that the government has published it and stated it. I have already addressed this.

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: What about doing it after you realised that?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I have already addressed this.

The PRESIDENT: Through me.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In relation to those who are in bedsits, well, the previous government saw fit to increase them themselves, so I guess they can ask themselves that question.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:03): A supplementary: first of all, that was quite an incoherent sort of answer. I didn't understand what you were getting at.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, I do not need commentary. A supplementary has to be short and crisp.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: I asked the question: what consultation, despite the fact that this was kept quiet from vulnerable Housing Trust tenants—

The PRESIDENT: That's an inference and a statement.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: It's not an inference. It was kept quiet. It's not an inference: it's a fact of life.

The PRESIDENT: Mr Wortley, it's not a court of law. Just ask the simple, crisp supplementary, please.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Thank you very much for your guidance, Mr President. What consultation took place with housing stakeholders, community groups and tenants ahead of your decision to increase rents for Housing Trust tenants? Just answer the question.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:04): I have already responded to this question.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): A further supplementary: did any consultation at all take place with Housing Trust tenants or stakeholders before the minister decided to increase rent for some of the most vulnerable in our community?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:04): I have responded to this question. The honourable member may like to reflect on the *Hansard* and ask me some more coherent questions tomorrow.

PUBLIC SERVICE ASSOCIATION

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:05): My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, what response have you had with regard to the Public Service Association and correctional services officers' protest and behaviour last week?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:05): I thank the member for his question, because I think the widespread response has been one of absolute condemnation—

An honourable member: Horror.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —horror and condemnation of the behaviour of members of the Public Service Association and correctional services officers in relation to some of their activities. The bullying, intimidation and harassment of a long-serving correctional services officer at the Adelaide Remand Centre has been widely condemned by almost everybody in the community with the exception, of course, of the Leader of the Opposition in another place, Mr Malinauskas, and indeed others.

Those same officers were escorted into Parliament House as part of their campaign by the Leader of the Opposition in another place. They were seen inside the Parliament House corridors being actively egged on by the Leader of the Opposition in terms of their protest against this decision, and it was that sort of behaviour that led to these same officers' shameful bullying and intimidation of that officer. That officer, I am informed, had had a 33-year career in Corrections. He had started off as a correctional services officer.

Because of the decision taken in the Employment Tribunal—an order that minimal levels of staffing had to be maintained in terms of community safety—he took that action, together with others, to allow those who did want to protest to go about their lawful right to protest. He certainly didn't deserve the bullying and intimidation from correctional services officers and members of the PSA—union bosses, similar to the union boss who leads, the Leader of the Opposition. That is the sort of bullying and intimidation that has been widely condemned by all and sundry.

I am advised that there is considerable unrest within the Public Service Association about the activities that ensued over the last couple of weeks. I am told by two people who attended a PSA council meeting this week that Mr Nev Kitchin told that PSA council meeting that 10 correctional services officers had resigned in protest at the actions of the union bosses and the bullying, intimidation and harassment that had gone on as a result of that campaign, which, as I said, had been actively egged on by the activities of the Leader of the Opposition by inviting them in here to Parliament House and, indeed, through sympathetic statements that he had made leading up to those protest actions.

I am also advised by these two people who attended the PSA council meeting—and we thank them for their public service in terms of providing to the parliament, through me, the results of those particular discussions—that Mr Nev Kitchin said that he had then spoken to four—well, I think he had spoken to all of the 10 correctional services officers, but that he had managed to convince four of the correctional services officers to renew their membership after they had resigned. The

council meeting was told by Mr Nev Kitchin that 10 correctional services officers had resigned, and he had managed to convince four of them to renew their membership of the PSA.

That is an indication of the disharmony and discontent within the PSA about the bullying and intimidation—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Because of your budget.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —and if the Hon. Ms Scriven wants to support the bullying and intimidation of long-serving public servants, who through no fault of their own had acted in accordance with an order from the Employment Tribunal (Commissioner McMahan) that minimum guaranteed levels of staffing had to continue in the interests of community safety—if members opposite, like the Hon. Ms Scriven and others, want to stand up and support that sort of bullying and intimidation, then shame on them—shame on them!

I would invite the Hon. Ms Scriven and others to join with me in condemning thuggish, loutish behaviour by union bosses in terms of bullying and intimidation of long-serving public servants who through no fault of their own complied with an industrial order for guaranteed levels of staffing to allow those other members of the PSA their lawful right to protest as they would wish.

Indeed, as I said all along, I accept the fact that members of the Public Service Association, and indeed anybody else who wants to go about their lawful right to protest decisions, should be entitled to do so. I have. We never sought to stop their lawful right to protest. All we sought to do was to allow community safety to be assured through guaranteed minimum levels of staffing. This public servant, and others, did that to allow those who wanted to protest. I invite the Hon. Ms Scriven, and all those on the opposition benches, to join with me and with the government in condemning the thuggish, loutish behaviour.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: The Leader of the Opposition has already made some comments about this and you're ignoring them.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Hunter can interject if he wants to.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You're ignoring them for political purposes. Shame on you!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Let him defend the thuggish, loutish behaviour of union bosses, because I can assure the Hon. Mr Hunter, the Hon. Ms Scriven and the Hon. Mr Maher that the overwhelming view of the majority of South Australians is that they don't support that sort of bullying and intimidation of long-serving public servants.

It will only be members of the Labor Party, because they represent the union bosses. They will defend the union bosses to the end of their days, but that's a call for them. They have to answer to their own consciences. I, on behalf of the government, will stand up for those long-serving servants, like that public servant who had 33 years of service. I, on behalf of the government, will defend them.

What I am saying is that it's not just the community who are outraged and appalled; there are clearly members of the PSA, members of the union movement themselves, who are appalled, who are outraged, who are so disgusted that they have resigned their membership of the PSA as a result of that sort of behaviour. I congratulate them, and I thank the two members of the PSA who in the public interest shared the discussions that went on this week at that PSA council meeting.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson had the call first.

FEDERAL LIBERAL PARTY

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:13): Supplementary—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson, it's your own side. The Hon. Mr Hanson.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: —relating to the initial answer: will the minister now similarly condemn the thuggish and loutish behaviour of his own federal party, which led to the resignation of

Ms Julia Banks for what she referred to in her resignation from parliament as 'bullying and harassment'—of his own party?

The PRESIDENT: That is not a question arising out of that material in the original answer, the Hon. Mr Hanson. The Hon. Mr Wortley, let this be a better supplementary.

PUBLIC SERVICE ASSOCIATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:14): Does the honourable Treasurer acknowledge that the vast majority of members of the Public Service Association did not support the actions of a very small group of people?

The PRESIDENT: Is this the first supplementary?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Yes.

The PRESIDENT: That is your supplementary; you have asked it.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: No, I have—

The PRESIDENT: You can ask another supplementary in a minute. I'm not allowing triple-barrelled supplementaries.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:14): I am delighted that all the ex-union bosses within the Labor Party—one, two, three—are lining up to defend the other union bosses. Back the Bully movement; it's a Me Too movement in here—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It's a Me Too movement, Back the Bully movement in this particular area.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: All I can say is that I saw the vision, the shocking, appalling vision of I don't know how many people bullying and intimidating that poor correctional services officer. I wasn't there, but I saw the vision. I'm not sure how many people were there, but it was shocking, it was appalling. It doesn't matter whether it was 50, 100, 150 or 200—the numbers are inconsequential. If the union bosses are leading and inflaming that sort of behaviour—

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Mr Wortley, what is your point of order?

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: The question I asked was: did he acknowledge that the vast majority of members of the Public Service Association did not support the actions of the few? What we got in return was an absolute rant, an anti-union rant, which did not answer the question.

The PRESIDENT: The minister is allowed some leeway under the standing orders. I do not accept it's a rant. Treasurer, please continue your answer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: My answer was and remains that I am unaware of the numbers of people who were at the Adelaide Remand Centre because I wasn't there. I was just shocked at the numbers I saw on television. Can I say that in relation to the broader PSA, I would hope, on my experience with the broader PSA, that the majority of them would be similar to the 10 correctional services officers who, evidently, according to Mr Nev Kitchin, resigned as a result of the action.

Certainly, in my experience dealing with the PSA generally and my knowledge of public servants who are members of unions, I don't—that is why I am very careful in the language I use. I am talking about the thuggish behaviour of the union bosses in relation to this and those who led this particular movement. Whilst I don't know the actual numbers that were there, I would broadly agree with the honourable member's question.

My past experience with the PSA and its membership has been generally cordial and will continue to be so. I would be very disappointed if the majority of those members with whom I have enjoyed cordial relations over many years would be anything other than supportive of the statements

that I have made—that is, they would condemn that sort of thuggish and loutish behaviour by the union bosses.

The PRESIDENT: Mr Wortley, your next supplementary.

PUBLIC SERVICE ASSOCIATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:18): Thank you, Mr President. Does the honourable Treasurer acknowledge that the head of the Public Service Association, Mr Nev Kitchin, has apologised to the people of South Australia for the behaviour of that small group of people?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:18): I welcome the fact that eventually Mr Nev Kitchin, as a result of the widespread condemnation and outrage that had been expressed late on that particular afternoon, did issue a public apology for the behaviour of those particular members. I welcome the fact, but the challenge for Mr Kitchin, and indeed others, in terms of the leadership of that particular movement, is to manage protests in a responsible way.

This government, as I said, accepts the fact that every employee has the right to lawful protest against actions of a particular government. If we wanted to be churlish, we might say that some of the privatisation decisions of the former government might have been responded to in the same way, but I won't. We accept the fact that employees have the right to lawful protest. But the challenge for Mr Kitchin is to ensure that his members respond in a responsible way in terms of their protest and don't bully and intimidate public servants who want to go about their task and may well have a slightly different view.

HOUSING TRUST RENT

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Can the minister advise how the new Housing Trust rentals compare with rentals of comparable properties in the private sector; and what rates and taxes are Housing Trust tenants required to pay in addition to their rent?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:20): I thank the honourable member for his question. In relation to the second part, which is, what are the rates and taxes Housing Trust tenants pay? They do pay water rates and other utility costs. They obviously do not pay taxes on their properties which homeowner-occupiers do not either—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Private renters don't either.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes, that's correct. People in private rental don't pay land tax either so it is just utilities costs.

The Hon. J.A. Darley: Comparable rents.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Comparable rents. Rents in the private sector are a lot higher so the majority of our tenants in relation to the policy of 25 per cent or market rent, whichever is the lesser, are paying 25 per cent of their household income rather than the market rates. In country areas, that is not necessarily the case because property values aren't as high. The market rates are set by the Valuer-General but, generally speaking, there is a large number of people who are in rental stress in South Australia.

I think that figures have gone up from memory from 22 per cent to 39 per cent of people who are finding themselves in that rental stress situation, and those people are in the private sector. Those include people who are entirely dependent on Centrelink benefits. For them, they can be one or two pays away from falling into difficulty and then they require assistance through the homelessness scheme.

A lot of that is to do with utilities costs, particularly electricity. Foodbank, when I met with them, have explained to me that when people receive their utility bills, they often see more people coming into their facilities for assistance through that service. But there is a large cohort of people who are in the private rental system who are not in public or social housing, who are in a great deal of difficulty, who also need to be considered in this whole debate.

*Matters of Interest***CLUB SAFE**

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:23): Recently, South Australian pubs and clubs have signalled their intent to install an automated system to alert gaming staff when pokies players are at risk. This flawed system presupposes that staff at gaming venues will actually approach problem gamblers, which we know, from a decision by the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner in 2016 regarding the South Australian Jockey Club's application for a social effect certificate, they do not.

That decision revealed the inadequacy of industry self-regulation in the provision of training in harm minimisation and monitoring, specifically referring to Club Safe, a model that was found to be significantly deficient during the proceedings. Nick Xenophon, in his capacity as a senator at the time, was an objector to the application and participated in the proceedings after which the application for the certificate was refused.

Club Safe and Gaming Care are meant to provide accredited training in responsible gambling and to minimise the harm caused by problem gambling behaviour associated with gaming machines in South Australian clubs and hotels. During the hearing it was revealed that the Club Safe training manuals are prepared by former gaming managers, and not specialists in the field of harm minimisation or, indeed, even trained counsellors.

The findings in the SAJC case highlight the significant issues with the quality of the training and lack of efficacy of the Club Safe model. Former SAJC CEO Brenton Wilkinson, referring to the venue the SAJC currently operates, gave evidence that only two people per week were spoken to out of the total of 840 people who played at the venue each week. Two interactions per week was the average for the 60 clubs that Club Safe is responsible for.

Frankly, the figures are pathetic, given that a 2010 Productivity Commission report into gambling found that around 4 per cent of the adult population—this is a very conservative estimate—plays pokies at least weekly and that 15 per cent of these players are problem gamblers, with their share of total spending on poker machines estimated to be between 40 and 60 per cent. Again, I reiterate that the figures I have just quoted are very conservative figures.

Mr Wilkinson also acknowledged that once Club Safe had provided training to gaming staff there was no follow-up by Club Safe compliance and regulation officers, something which is woefully inadequate. Professor Delfabbro of the University of Adelaide gave evidence that the content of training material provided by Club Safe was fairly cursory, and the training itself would not turn a staff member into an effective venue staff member in dealing with problem gamblers. More alarmingly, Professor Delfabbro gave evidence that he had received feedback from staff in gaming venues that:

Although they had done the training, they were told not to take it too seriously, and that the venue was really more interested in profits.

This is why the industry is hellbent on preventing any meaningful changes being made to assist problem gamblers. They prioritise profit over people. The compelling evidence presented during the hearing should be of great concern to the government. It is an indication of the failure of the poker machine industry in SA to appropriately train staff in harm minimisation.

Those in the parliament who are comfortable in receiving donations from poker machine barons would do well to meet gambling addicts and their families to witness for themselves the absolute devastation these machines are capable of. The government continues to be conflicted by both receiving revenue from poker machines and regulating the machines that cause such devastation to so many South Australians. The net gambling revenue for 2016 to 2017 was \$680.27 million, which delivered the government \$264.87 million in taxes derived from poker machines.

Two leading experts in gambling harm, Professor Delfabbro and Dr Charles Livingstone, have now made significant and pertinent recommendations for change to credibly assist problem gamblers, including lower bet sizes, reducing the number of machines, reducing jackpots, reducing the machine-generated reinforcements for winning and having appropriately qualified trainers. It is time we started listening to the experts and not the poker machine barons.

COMMEMORATIVE SERVICES

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:27): I rise today to highlight two significant commemoration services that I attended over the last week. I was honoured to be asked to represent the Premier and the government of South Australia by laying a wreath at both ceremonies. The first of these was the RAAF's Battle of Britain Commemorative Service at the Torrens Parade Ground on Saturday 15 September, remembering in particular the sacrifices of South Australia's members of 'the few': the Australian airmen who fought to defend Britain from advancing German forces.

The Battle of Britain was fought for three months during July and October 1940. The German army had recently defeated France after moving through countries such as Belgium and the Netherlands. It now turned its attention to its largest remaining foe in western Europe, namely, Great Britain. An invasion or surrender of the island nation could have signalled defeat for the allies in western Europe, with the United States yet to enter the war. Following the daring and successful evacuation at Dunkirk, a small glimmer of hope remained with British forces that they could prevent an invasion, yet their air force was facing superior German numbers.

The battle was primarily fought using each nation's air force and is viewed as the first major campaign to do so. RAF strategy on the ground, however, was just as important as the bravery of the men in the air. The use of radar systems by the RAF would play a pivotal role in intelligence, handing its forces in the air a significant advantage.

Unable to break the RAF, the Luftwaffe turned its sights on breaking the will of the British people through bombing London in what is referred to as the Blitz. This move signalled the beginning of the end of the German invasion of Great Britain. Unable to gain superiority in the air, the Germans were thus denied the ability to send ground forces across the channel. It would not be long before they turned their focus to the east and the vast desolate expanses of the Soviet Union.

Although the RAAF did not participate in the battle, Australians and South Australians bravely fought to stop the German advance. The men were part of Britain's Royal Air Force and although they have sadly passed, eight were from South Australia. This figure accounts for a quarter of the total number of Australians to take part in the battle. The 'fabulous few' included South Australians Flying Officer Robert Bungey DFC, Pilot Officer Charles Bennett, Flying Officer John Cock DFC, Sergeant Desmond Fopp AFC, Pilot Officer Alexander Hamilton, Pilot Officer Bill Millington DFC, Flight Lieutenant Richard Reynell, and Squadron Leader Ron Lees KBE CBE DFC and Bar. This service was a commemoration of their achievements and the legacy they forged, which continues to this day within the RAAF. They were the 'magnificent few'.

On Sunday 16 September, I joined the South Australian Peacekeepers RSL Sub-Branch at their annual Peacekeeping Commemorative Service. The service commemorates Australia's participation in peacekeeping and humanitarian operations. Australians have played an important role in peacekeeping and humanitarian operations and continue to do so. Our largest involvement has come in our own region, where we have participated in a number of operations, particularly in recent years. These include peacekeepers from the Australian Federal Police and Australian Defence Force, who all carried out roles in the Solomon Islands.

Our defence force, in particular, has had a strong role as peacekeeper in the Asia-Pacific region and across the globe. The most well-known example of this is Australia's involvement in East Timor. Australian troops, led by our current Governor-General, Sir Peter Cosgrove AK MC, helped in the formation of one of the world's youngest nations. However, the Australian Defence Force's role in this sphere does not end there. For over 50 years they have participated in operations from areas such as Kashmir in the fifties and sixties, to Somalia and Bougainville in the nineties. In total, Australians have commanded six multinational operations—a commendable achievement.

I wish to thank all those Australians, and, in particular, South Australians, who have fought, worked and given their lives in war zones overseas, not just for the protection of our own way of life but so that others can live in peace as well.

GREECE, WILDFIRES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:32): I recently rose in parliament to speak on the Hon. Connie Bonaros' motion regarding the Mati wildfires and to applaud the initial initiatives made

by the local community groups. I rise today to update the chamber about the tremendous amount of continuing hard work being done in our community to raise awareness and support on this issue.

The horrendous wildfires that occurred in July were heartbreaking for so many, especially those who are now left to rebuild their lives and community. In true South Australian spirit, the initiatives that are transpiring all over the state are unifying many for a common purpose. We have seen heroes like Dr John Greenwood, who flew to Greece to generously share his expertise and provide expert medical treatment to burns victims, as well as personally contribute financially for the equipment.

We have also seen heroes who have been working hard in our community, as individuals or collectively, to raise funds and direct efforts to ensure maximum resources reach the people in need. Time and time again, the Greek community has played a generous role to help build our state and to assist other communities who have experienced natural disaster. The Mati wildfires are no exception. The Greek Orthodox Archdiocese has launched initiatives with their parishioners and have raised an outstanding \$650,000 nationally, with \$68,000 being raised locally. Their reach spans across all South Australia and is unifying people to participate in those initiatives.

The Cyprus community has fundraised both as an entity and in conjunction with other community groups for fundraisers such as the Australian Hellenic Medical Charity, which was able to raise \$62,000 to cover Dr Greenwood's expenses and equipment. The Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia has also raised a significant amount, both as an entity and in conjunction with other organisations, and it is continuing with its fundraising initiatives. Their fundraiser in Woodville this Friday promises to be one that will contribute to the overall fundraising effort. These are just a few examples of the tremendous work being done in South Australia.

In speaking to and hearing from the communities, I have received numerous requests for an update on what is going on with the state government's pledge to provide support for the fires. The Premier made a commitment of support and funding at a public forum hosted by the Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia in July. In parliament on 1 August, the Treasurer reaffirmed that commitment. Six weeks and one budget later we are still yet to hear more about what the state government will be contributing. I very much look forward to receiving an update from the government to ensure that the community is updated and informed on this matter.

R U OK? DAY

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:36): I rise today to speak about R U OK? Day that was commemorated last Thursday 13 September. I am very pleased about the increased popularity of this day and I acknowledge its importance in suicide prevention. R U OK? Day reminds us of the importance of reaching out to others and starting a conversation. It encourages people to make meaningful connections with others and to support anyone struggling with life's challenges. Importantly, it also recognises that you do not have to be a trained professional to make a difference. An important conversation can be started with a simple question.

These conversations about mental health can be difficult but they are important discussions to have and can have a significant effect on a person who is struggling with their mental health. Whilst it is important to start a conversation, it is equally as important to know what to do if a person responds that they are not okay. The R U OK? organisation provides resources to inform people about how to ask someone if they are okay and what to do after asking this. Without this knowledge, people may avoid starting a conversation for fear that they will say the wrong thing and make the situation worse. Today, my focus is on what to do after asking the initial question.

When asking the question, 'Are you okay?' early intervention is always best rather than waiting for a person to be in crisis. It is important to allow plenty of time and to choose a setting where the person will be comfortable. It is important to listen carefully and without judgement to everything they have to say. This step may seem very straightforward, but people often underestimate the power of listening. Instinctively, people want to interrupt to push someone's worries away. They think this is helpful because they are being positive but it can often make a person feel like what they are going through is not important.

It can also be tempting to interrupt moments of silence; although silence can be uncomfortable, it is crucial to allow the person enough time to gather their thoughts to express what they are going through. A person's willingness to listen can help restore hope. Once the person has finished what they would like to share, collaboratively address how to get help by suggesting talking to a trained health professional, a friend or family member. Sometimes people need encouragement to do this, so it helps to let them know that you will support them during this process.

It is often helpful to offer to accompany the person to find help as this can be very overwhelming. It is important to check in on them to let them know that you have been thinking of them and to see how they have been. This demonstrates genuine care and interest in the person's wellbeing. We are all capable of starting a conversation, and this is something that can change a life. 'Are you okay?' is more than a question; it is an act of compassion that demonstrates a willingness to support someone. I implore everyone to make meaningful connections with the people around them and to start a conversation by asking, 'Are you okay?'

PEACE RUN

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:39): It is a great honour for me to rise and speak about the Peace Run in parliament today. The Peace Run is also known as the World Harmony Run. Each year, the Peace Run involves millions of people and children in over 140 nations in a global torch relay. Honourable members may be interested to know that participants and patrons of the Peace Run have included Pope John Paul II, Mother Teresa, President Nelson Mandela, President Mikhail Gorbachev, sports legends like Carl Lewis and Muhammad Ali, and a host of international leaders and luminaries from around the world.

The Peace Run was founded by Sri Chinmoy in 1987 as a way to bring people together in a global yet grassroots event. Sri Chinmoy was an athlete, author, poet and spiritual leader who taught meditation in the west after moving to New York City in 1964. He devoted his life to the pursuit of harmony and oneness between people and between different cultures. Sri Chinmoy saw sport as a powerful vehicle to promote global harmony. The first Peace Torch was lit on 27 April 1987 in New York City for the Peace Run Opening Ceremony. By 1989, for the first time, the Peace Run took place in all seven continents, including Antarctica.

Historic relays have included linking Egypt with Israel and Syria, crossing from Russia to China, running across all 50 states of the United States of America, connecting all European countries in one continuous route, and a continuous run from Japan to Europe. The Peace Run is an expression of Sri Chinmoy's enduring message: that we are all torchbearers for a better world.

2018 marks the 31st anniversary of the Sri Chinmoy Oneness-Home Peace Run in Australia. The torch travelled from Wentworth, at the junction of Australia's two longest rivers (the Murray and the Darling), ran along the River Murray, through the Barossa Valley and finished in Adelaide. It is truly wonderful to see that the running team visited 10 schools in the Riverland and the Barossa, sharing the peace message with children, teachers, principals and local mayors, providing the opportunity for so many to hold the Peace Torch and make a wish for peace.

On behalf of the government of South Australia, the Premier Hon. Steven Marshall and the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing (the Hon. Corey Wingard), I had the great honour to hold the Peace Torch and welcome the Australian running team on the steps of Parliament House on a cold, windy day on Saturday 15 September 2018. Despite the freezing cold weather that day, the peace runners arrived on time and in great spirits, with big smiles as I greeted them.

I would like to place my special thanks to the South Australian Coordinator, Mr Ivan Marek, and the following peace runners: Abhinandan John Willis from Melbourne; Alexandr Sascha Nikiforov from Russia; Rathin Boulton from Canberra; Prabuddha Nicol from Perth; Grahak Cunningham from Perth; Ivan Padmanandana Marek from Adelaide; Helen Padmalaya Marek from Adelaide; Januja Reynolds from Adelaide; and Chris Reynolds from Adelaide.

I especially mention Grahak Cunningham, who is the Australian champion in the world's longest foot race and participated in the Sri Chinmoy Self-Transcendence 3,100 Mile Race, which was described by *The New York Times* as the 'Mount Everest of ultramarathons'. Congratulations to Mr Cunningham for making Australia proud.

I was incredibly grateful to have had the opportunity to hold the Peace Torch and join thousands of participants from over 140 countries to promote harmony and a better future for humanity. I would like to pay tribute to the legacy of Sri Chinmoy and the organisers of the Peace Run here in South Australia and around the world for providing this platform for people from all walks of life to have the opportunity to hold the symbolic torch, to give people the opportunity to reflect on what is happening around us and to wish for a better, brighter future.

Passing the Peace Torch from one person to the next, from one nation to another nation, helps to foster reconciliation that unites people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. The motto of the Peace Run is, 'Peace begins with me,' stressing the importance of how each individual can make a positive contribution to creating a better world.

SEXUAL HEALTH SERVICES FUNDING

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:44): We know that the state Liberal government's first budget is made up of cruel cuts impacting our community's most vulnerable people. The Premier, who promised more jobs, lower costs and better services, is slashing public sector jobs, jacking up Housing Trust rents and cutting vital services. This is a budget of cuts, closures and privatisations.

One of the most important roles of government is to support the most vulnerable in our community, provide help in time of need and ensure that no-one is left behind. That was a key test for the new Liberal government, one that they failed most spectacularly. Would they support the most vulnerable in our community? Clearly they have failed that test.

The budget was handed down on 4 September, also known as World Sexual Health Day, ironically as it turns out. On this day, jurisdictions around the world were reflecting on how they could do more to promote sexual health and support those grappling with sexually transmitted diseases. On that day the Queensland Labor government announced that it had removed AIDS from its list of notifiable conditions. This important moment was a culmination of decades of work and advocacy. Government funding and community activism had made AIDS less transmissible than ever before, and continuing government funding and support in Queensland made this possible. That, of course, makes what happened in South Australia look even more shameful.

On World Sexual Health Day the Liberal government unveiled brutal cuts to HIV prevention and support programs in our state. Funding for SHine SA sexual health programs was slashed; funding for blood-borne virus and STI prevention programs was slashed; and, funding for the Cheltenham Place HIV refuge was also slashed. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing even touted these cuts in his media release as being signs of sustainable, efficient health services. That is code that could have been written by George Orwell's ministry of truth, I submit. Simply put, this government is abandoning South Australians with HIV and AIDS just to save a few dollars, and making thin excuses to justify it.

We have made a lot of progress toward the elimination of HIV in this country, in our state and in the world, and people living with HIV and AIDS today have a better chance of living a full life than ever before. The former Labor government made huge progress on the prevention and treatment of HIV and on educating the wider community on the impacts of HIV for people living with that virus.

That does not mean that the fight is over. That does not mean that people living with HIV and AIDS still do not face huge challenges every day. They need our support and they need their government to not cut the services they rely on. In an article headlined, 'HIV advocates condemn the SA budget decision to cut funding to STI services', the ABC gives a voice to the HIV sufferer Steven Dewhirst. He tells of the 32 tablets he takes daily, of the social stigma that he continues to face and the abandonment he feels from this state Liberal government.

These cuts have also been condemned by Centacare, the providers of the Cheltenham Place HIV refuge. Cheltenham Place provides vital support and community for people suffering not only from HIV but also the stigma that surrounds it. It provides support and residential respite for many people in our community in a non-discriminatory way. Yet, this government has cut \$411,000 in annual funding to Centacare for Cheltenham Place, and attempted to palm off responsibility to more appropriate agencies.

Well, minister, Cheltenham Place is the most appropriate agency to provide these vital services, services that save your government money in fewer emergency department admissions or more expensive health interventions. People living with HIV and other sexual health conditions need this support. They are calling for our help, but this government has abandoned them.

This is the Liberal Party government that has attacked and then axed the Safe Schools program right around this country. This is the Liberal Party government that subjected the LGBTI community to a divisive national vote on our civil rights at the federal level, and now this is a Liberal government that is slashing funding for HIV services—services heavily relied upon by the LGBTI community and others living with HIV in South Australia.

Of all the cuts in this Liberal budget, these are the most shameful. The Liberal government is failing in its duty to vulnerable South Australians, and the bitter irony, as I said earlier, is that the paltry savings achieved to the health budget will end up costing many times—multiple times—the amount that has been saved in more expensive medical interventions, in hospitals and in emergency departments.

ADELAIDE PARKLANDS

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:49): We are often told that the only two certainties in life are death and taxes. However, in South Australia we can add to that list the certainty that at any point in time someone has an agenda to develop and privatise vast tracts of Adelaide's iconic Parklands. As certain as night follows day, the Parklands are under constant threat, and the only reason why they still exist today is the vigilance and hard work of generations of Parklands defenders. In their most recent newsletter, the Adelaide Park Lands Preservation Association identifies a range of worrying and often secret proposals to further alienate public open space. According to the association:

Repeated Park Lands losses were once characterised as like 'mice nibbling away at cheese'. However the recent attacks seem more like a debauched feast with participants devouring whatever is available, while it lasts.

The rate of Park Lands loss seems set to ratchet up exponentially unless the public can be alerted to save what's really precious and priceless.

Attempting to emulate the infrastructure of other cities by discarding parts of our priceless and world-unique asset is a short-sighted and self-defeating exercise.

The Adelaide Park Lands Preservation Association is not a partisan political organisation. Without fear or favour, they name the threats and they seek to shame the culprits. No government has survived their vigilance, whether Mike Rann's plan for Victoria Park or Jay Weatherill's alienation of Parklands for infrastructure, medical precincts, schools or new facilities for private sporting organisations.

Now the spotlight is on the current government and what it will do, particularly in relation to the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site and also those parts of the Riverbank Precinct that have not already been handed over to the Walker Corporation, the Casino and other developers. One thing that is alarming Parklands defenders is the type of advice that the new government is seeking. Recently, the minister established the Riverbank Entertainment Precinct Advisory Committee (REPAC). According to the Park Lands Preservation Association:

Very little of Tarntanya Wama (Park 26) remains as Park Lands after decades of attacks by successive Governments, alienating land for commercial [and] private uses...Now, it appears, this Park has not been disappearing fast enough for the newly-[elected] State Government.

The association points out that:

REPAC includes a representative each from the institutions which have taken over most of Park 26: SkyCity Casino, the InterContinental Hotel, Adelaide Convention Centre, Adelaide Festival Centre, and the Adelaide Oval Stadium Management Authority, as well as a representative each from the Adelaide City Council and Renewal SA.

I have to say that it is remarkable that those with the greatest stake in taking over public land are given a seat at the table whilst dedicated Parklands defenders are not. Until recently, I would have said that the Adelaide city council could fulfil that role because history has shown them to provide an important brake on the excesses of state government. I would go so far as to say that they have overwhelmingly been a force for the protection of the Parklands; however, now I am not so sure.

I was disappointed to read that the Adelaide city council is now spruiking new development opportunities in the Parklands to overseas investors. My attention has been drawn to a glossy 32-page 'Adelaide investments prospectus', bearing the City of Adelaide logo, which was apparently used by the Lord Mayor during a mission to Singapore in July. Included in that prospectus is a proposed 27-storey hotel on the Parklands.

Hot on the heels of their failure over the commercial helipad on Park 27 near the Morphett Street bridge, the council is now spruiking the same site as the location of a 27-storey riverbank hotel. Rather than looking at degraded and underutilised sections of the Parklands and working out how best to protect and activate them for community use, the council now seems intent on joining the rush to privatise.

At the state government level, plans to move the Entertainment Centre and the nearby soccer stadium from Hindmarsh into the Parklands are causing alarm about the potential further loss of publicly accessible open space. Despite assurances from the tourism minister that no formal business case has been presented to him on the viability of a new stadium or arena for the Parklands, the fact that the push is coming from former Liberal premier John Olsen means that it is likely to get serious consideration. At the end of the day, my plea to the government and to the Adelaide city council is to reflect on the legacy of public open space that you have inherited and make decisions that preserve this legacy into the future for the benefit of the generations that will follow.

Motions

NATIONAL CHILD PROTECTION WEEK

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:54): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises National Child Protection Week was held from 2 until 8 September;
2. Acknowledges that Child Protection Week is a wonderful opportunity for everyone in the community to think about how we can work together to keep all children safe; and
3. Acknowledges and thanks all individuals, organisations, agencies and service providers working in our community to support children and families impacted by child abuse.

In speaking to my motion, I would like to provide the chamber initially with a very important number. That number is 45,714. I will say it again: 45,714. That is the number of Australian children who had substantiated notifications of abuse between 2015 and 2016. Quite frankly, that number is horrendous.

The National Association for Prevention of Child Abuse and Neglect (NAPCAN) was established as a peak body through the formation of the NAPCAN Foundation in 1990. They began coordinating National Child Protection Week across Australia in an effort to engage and educate all Australians about the part we all play in keeping our children and young people safe. This foundation was established by Rosemary Sinclair in 1987 to address the culture surrounding child protection. She acknowledged that the abuse and neglect of children is often seen to be a taboo topic. I could not agree more.

As a result, we do not talk about this uncomfortable topic often enough. We have let children slip through the cracks. This foundation works hard to change the perception surrounding the abuse and neglect of children, encourage discussion, increase awareness and work towards eradicating the problem.

Leesa Waters, NAPCAN deputy CEO, urges Australians to think about child abuse as something that can be prevented rather than a problem to be fixed after the fact. National Child Protection Week provides an opportunity for all of us, and the community as a whole, to focus on the role each of us plays in creating safe and nurturing environments for children, where they are free from abuse and neglect. It is a strong belief of this government that all children of South Australia, in fact all children, deserve the very best start in life.

There are considered to be four types of harm: emotional abuse, neglect, physical abuse and sexual abuse. In order, the most common form of abuse between 2015 and 2016 was emotional abuse, followed by neglect, followed by physical abuse and then sexual abuse. It is concerning that

the statistics gathered from the Australian Institute of Family Studies between 2011 and 2012, and 2015 to 2016, show a steady and consistent level of abuse and neglect.

What is even more concerning is that there has been an alarming increase in the prevalence of child abuse. This increase is indeed alarming, given the amount of time and effort that has been put into the subject. It saddens me that one in 32 children is the victim of substantiated child abuse each and every year in Australia. The Australian Institute of Family Studies considers a substantiation of notification to be when an investigation has concluded that there is reasonable cause to believe that the child had been, was being, or was likely to be abused, neglected or otherwise harmed.

Ms Waters stated that these children are just the ones who are severe enough to reach the high threshold required to be picked up by the statutory child protection system. Hundreds of thousands more children have less than optimal lives, but are not counted in these alarming statistics. This impacts children of all ages. Sadly, however, children aged less than one year are the most likely to be subject to substantiation, with statistics revealing 16.1 per 1,000 infants. This is followed by children aged one to four years, with nine children per 1,000 children.

I would like to share some other numbers with you. Between 2015 and 2016, there was a staggering total of 225,487 Australian children suspected of being harmed or at risk of harm from abuse and/or neglect. Some 355,925 notifications of allegations of child abuse or neglect, child maltreatment or harm to a child were made to an authorised department. This is an increase of 11.2 per cent from the previous year, with the rate of notifications being 42 per 1,000 children.

In 2015 and 2016, there were 60,989 substantiations of notifications that involved a massive 45,714 children, with the number on the rise. That is 45,714 children too many. These children are not just numbers on a page; each number represents a child whose life has been changed forever at the hands of those who should have protected them—harm which has occurred at a time when these children were most vulnerable.

According to the Australian Federal Police, when a child is abused, the physical and mental pain can last a lifetime, which I believe is understated. This abuse does last a lifetime. If you think it does not impact us, you are wrong. In South Australia alone, there are some 3,680 children and young people living in out-of-home care.

In 2012, state, territory and federal governments established the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. The report contained recommendations in relation to the establishment, funding and operation of a single National Redress Scheme, which our government has since opted into. The scheme aims to provide acknowledgement and support to people who experienced institutional child sexual abuse.

It is vital that we all work together to create a safer environment for all South Australians, but particularly, that we care for our most vulnerable: our youth. We as a government acknowledge the unforgiveable crimes committed against South Australia's innocent children and are seeking to address the legacy of child sexual abuse. We must not forget or be blind to the impact of the monstrosity of these events that children have endured.

Unfortunately, abuse is far more common than we would like to let ourselves believe. Between 2015 and 2016, there were 5,559 Australian children who were found to be victims of sexual abuse, and 152 of these children were from South Australia. This figure is appalling. As a society, we must do better. What happens to these children impacts them greatly.

It is important that we remember that these children are not just a number and that we realise that each number in these statistics represents a life and a family that is impacted. The abuse a child suffers does not solely impact the victim but the family and support network of the child as well. All too often, we do not stop to think about the suffering of the victim and how their lives have been impacted.

The royal commission found that of the survivors who provided information in private sessions about the impacts of being sexually abused, 95 per cent suffered from mental health issues. Some of these issues include depression, anxiety and post-traumatic disorder; other symptoms of mental distress, such as nightmares and sleeping difficulties; and emotional issues, such as feelings of shame, guilt and low self-esteem. Issues faced by survivors are not limited to mental health issues.

They expand to different aspects of their lives, such as relationship issues, financial issues and the list goes on.

What is so troubling about child sexual abuse is that our children are the most vulnerable members of our society. We have a responsibility to protect each and every one of our children. I want to recount an experience that I have recently had that has really brought this extremely close to home for me. I recently met with a very brave person—a friend and somebody who I hold in the highest regard—a man who I thought had it all together. He is an incredibly competent, professional person doing wonderful things to improve people's lives.

Recently, on a Saturday, this very good man asked to see me urgently, which was really quite unusual. Without hesitation, I made time to make sure that I could catch up with this gentleman. Sadly, he shared with me the horrific and chilling experience suffered by himself and his brother, which really caught me by surprise. Again, I had seen no signs at all that he was holding on to another horrific part of his life. As a very young man, he and his brother were part of a very good family in Victor Harbor who were part of a strong religious group. Sadly, in a trusting environment, this man and his brother were abused. It is something that he has had to live with his whole entire life.

It took enormous courage for this man to tell me about the events that had occurred and the extensive impact that it had both on his life and that of his brother. This survivor told me something that has powerfully resonated with me: that the child sexual abuse he endured affects his life every day and will be with him for the rest of his life. In his own words, he has been given a life sentence. He also informed me about his and his brother's involvement in the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. I thank him and his brother for their bravery in coming forward and sharing their story.

I acknowledge the courage that it has taken for these victims of child sexual abuse to come forward in this royal commission and how difficult it would have been to relive these horrific events and share these highly personal and raw experiences. This is something that would have taken enormous courage and strength. As a society, we are often focused on the perpetrator. We often talk about how a perpetrator has changed and learnt their lesson or how a sentence is too harsh or too lenient. We seldom stop to consider the life sentence a victim carries. This is what this brave constituent has enforced with me. Every day, for the rest of these victims' lives, they carry with them the weight of these horrific actions, how through no fault of their own their lives were changed forever by the disgusting cowardice and unforgivable actions of the perpetrator.

He explained to me in very clear terms how he considered himself at the time, if you can imagine a champagne glass: clean, smooth lines, very functional, something to be savoured. After the events of the perpetrator, he described himself as someone who has managed to pick up the pieces of that smashed glass and actually managed to get them together. It will never be that exact vessel that it was before, and he accepts that, but he has done an enormous job in putting those pieces back together. That analogy really rocked me and reminded me again of his words, that he has been given a life sentence by this animal.

Vivian Frederick Deboo was found guilty and gaoled in April 1996 for six years, with a two-year non-parole period for child sex offences against three boys aged between 14 and 16. His sentence at the time was backdated to commence from the date of his arrest. He was released in 1997. For the young victims and their families, this sentence must have been insulting, humiliating and brought enormous heartache. This paedophile ran a catering company named Portersfield Catering, which was used at campsites.

His despicable actions were discussed in the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, in particular the Church of England Boys' Society and Anglican Diocese of Adelaide in relation to youth camps and activities. Deboo has been in court again. Over a three-year period he denied further allegations and, at the time of trial, he pleaded guilty. So, after putting his victims through another three years of misery and agony recounting those events—and, again, I can only offer my admiration for their strength and courage because it would have been very easy to fall away and not pursue this gross indecency—this man has pleaded guilty and is yet to be sentenced.

There is another side to this story. My friend, the man whom I admire immensely, told me that, after expecting to go to court and expecting an extremely harrowing period of time, there was

some relief in the fact that Mr Deboo pleaded guilty. However, upon leaving the court and trying to absorb all that, a man whom he did not know and did not recognise approached him, introduced himself and said, 'You may not remember me, but as young boys we were friends together in Victor Harbor. In fact, we were friends and my brother was also one of our friends.' The man went on to tell my hero that he had not in fact been abused by Deboo but that, sadly, his brother had. His brother never quite managed to deal with it and finished up taking his own life.

The relief and gratitude that this man expressed to my hero was quite immense. Again, I can only reiterate that these people, the victims, received a sentence for life. If we can do anything as a parliament and as members of parliament—you know that I have enormous respect for you all—we should never, ever forget that in all of this the victims carry their sentences for life. I move the motion standing in my name and thank the chamber for its indulgence.

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

WHITE BALLOON DAY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:12): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that White Balloon Day is on 7 September and is a day that raises awareness about protecting children from sexual assault;
2. Acknowledges that White Balloon Day is Australia's largest and longest running child protection campaign dedicated to the prevention of child sexual assault;
3. Congratulates Bravehearts and White Balloon Day on their work that has helped to educate over 800,000 children across Australia about personal safety; and
4. Recognises that this is the 22nd year that White Balloon Day has been running and uniting communities to break the silence on child sexual assault.

In this motion, this council would recognise that White Balloon Day was held on 7 September and that it was a day that raised awareness about protecting children from sexual assault. I acknowledge that all members of this council who were present in this chamber that day did indeed wear the same badge that I am wearing today in honour of and as a tribute to the work of White Balloon Day. We also congratulate Bravehearts and White Balloon Day on their work that has helped to educate over 800,000 children across Australia about personal safety. We recognise that this is the 22nd year that White Balloon Day has been running and uniting communities to break the silence on child sexual assault.

I certainly know that that is something that many members of this council not only feel passionate about but are also committed to working together to combat. The invaluable work of Bravehearts is one part of this. I introduced this motion while recognising that last week was also National Child Protection Week. I know that members in both houses acknowledge the importance of that as well.

Bravehearts is an extraordinary organisation that uses education to empower and protect our children. It has been Australia's lead organisation in child protection for 22 years and is the only organisation responsible for White Balloon Day. It is Australia's only national awareness and fundraising campaign dedicated to preventing child sexual assault through generating awareness. It helps to educate children and their parents and adults of the need to do more to protect children from a crime that affects more than 60,000 children in our nation every single year. Bravehearts employs a dedicated team of some 64 people who work to prevent child sexual assault and provide education and training programs, specialist counselling and support services, as well as research, advocacy and lobbying, while also undertaking their reform campaigns.

The white balloon was adopted as the symbol of Bravehearts following a public demonstration in Belgium in 1996, where 300,000 people gathered with white balloons in solidarity for the parents of those children who were the victims of a previously convicted and released paedophile. Bravehearts continued the tradition the following year and has done so every year since, hence White Balloon Day.

Now, after 22 years, the white balloon represents a symbol of hope for survivors of child sexual assault, and encourages them to break the silence by speaking out. In Australia, a child is sexually assaulted every 90 minutes, which is appalling. This is a deeply confronting statistic. That is one in five children who are sexually harmed in some way before their 18th birthdays. This is entirely unacceptable. Child protection is everybody's business. State governments are amongst the most important stakeholders in child protection.

Following the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, recommendation 6.12 calls on all levels of government nationally to help protect children in their communities. We, here in this place, have passed legislation just this very week addressing this issue. With those few words, I note that we have much more to do, and I hope we will all, in support of this motion, which I commend the members of the council, recommit ourselves to that task ahead.

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

NEWSTART ALLOWANCE

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

That this council—

1. Notes that Newstart, at \$269.40 per week for a single person with no children, is significantly below the poverty line of \$426.30 a week, as defined by the ACOSS Poverty in Australia Report, 2016;
2. Acknowledges the 13 South Australian councils that have called for Newstart to be raised: Port Adelaide Enfield, Streaky Bay, Salisbury, Playford, Onkaparinga, Mount Gambier, Kangaroo Island, Elliston, Copper Coast, Clare Valley, Prospect, Tea Tree Gully and the Adelaide City Council;
3. Commends the work of the Anti-Poverty Network in raising these issues at all levels of government, it not being just a federal issue; and
4. Calls on the federal government to increase the level of Newstart as a matter of urgency.

I would like to acknowledge that there are members of the Anti-Poverty Network with us, watching from the gallery today. The Anti-Poverty Network has shown considerable and remarkable leadership in spearheading a campaign and raising the issue of poverty to all levels of government. I would also like to acknowledge those 13 South Australian councils that have called for Newstart to be raised, doing what councils should do and standing up for their communities.

It is now time that the federal government took leadership in raising the level of Newstart to ensure that Australians need no longer live below the poverty line. Hard times can befall any of us and every South Australian should have the real support that they need, when they need it—the support they need to pay the rent on time, to be able to afford to put food on the table and to keep the lights on. This is the kind of support that an income support scheme such as Newstart should provide, but instead of real support, the current levels simply condemn our most disadvantaged to live in poverty.

It is true that only the federal government can raise Newstart, but in the absence of leadership at a national level, the duty to speak up for those suffering disadvantage falls to all of us. Local councils have started to pick up this slack, speaking up for their residents and taking a stand for those in desperate need of financial relief. For those who would say that the councils should stick to the Rs (the rates and the rubbish), I should point out that it is not just roads, rates and rubbish, but it is, indeed, residents that those councils are there to represent—two more Rs for those councils.

This is not the first time I have brought such a motion before this parliament, but I certainly would hope that it could be the last because it would become redundant. We like to think of ourselves as a lucky or a wealthy country but that luck and that wealth is not distributed fairly. We still find ourselves with over 800,000 people, including parents, carers, people with disability, and other people locked out of paid work as well as students, all struggling daily to afford the very basic essentials like a roof over their heads and food on their tables.

Our politicians like to boast about our many years of economic growth; yet along with this the gap between the rich and the poor has widened and Newstart has not increased in real terms for over 24 years. Beyond the rising cost of living and the failure to raise Newstart we know that people

living in poverty end up having to pay what is called a poverty premium. It has been documented by the South Australian Council of Social Services most recently.

For example, let's look at the cost of Internet data, something that is vital for participation in society today. It is particularly necessary of course for those looking for work. Internet data is more affordable if you have a home Internet plan; however, if you are homeless your only Internet connection might be via your phone which is a 328 per cent poverty premium price to you. Or, let's look at bank dishonour fees which are much more likely to apply and accumulate for those on low incomes, or household bills and electricity prices. Most energy companies offer discounts for customers who pay on time. If you do not have the money upfront then you can pay up to 28 per cent extra on your power bills. I am sure it is not hard to see how these extra costs disproportionately affect those living below the poverty line.

Australia's social safety net is something most of us contribute to and most of us benefit from at different times in our lives. This safety net should allow people to afford a roof over their head and food on the table, but that current rate does not even cover the costs of basic essentials, and every day people are making tough choices: do they pay for rent, their food, their bills or their medication?

For Newstart recipients, who account for 84 per cent of recipients of all those allowances, a \$75 a week increase would be a 27 per cent increase in the current base rate. That sounds like a large increase but given the last real increase in Newstart was more than 20 years ago and it was then only \$2.95 a week, a substantial increase is well overdue. Such an increase would be roughly equivalent to the real increase in the average wage in South Australia over the last two decades and it would still be much less than increases in the age pension which have been necessary to keep many of our older Australians out of poverty.

Of course, for those who are unconvinced by the social arguments, perhaps let us talk about numbers. A recent study undertaken by Deloitte on behalf of SACOSS found that South Australia's disposable income would increase by \$208 million if the federal government's Newstart and Youth Allowance income support payments were raised by that \$75 a week. Consumption would increase by \$330 million, and economic output would increase by \$123 million in 2018-19. It should come as no surprise that that is indeed why the Committee for Economic Development of Australia (CEDA) has recently also come out in support of the 'raise the rate' campaign stating that parliament needs to catch up to community expectations, and that CEDA is supporting that \$75 a week increase as well.

If none of the stories that we have all heard no doubt of the impossibility of surviving on Newstart payments is enough to convince members in this place that we must lobby our federal colleagues and the federal government, then surely those economic arguments might be heard. It is disgusting that we continue to punish those who cannot work or want to work but cannot find a job or need more work than they have, with the absurd ideas that there are 'deserving' and 'undeserving' poor. It demonstrates an appalling lack of compassion and understanding for those in our community. However, 55 per cent of those on Newstart are living below the poverty line.

Brendan Runn, who is now the KPMG Chief Economist, previously stated that the low level of Newstart is actually forming a barrier to employment as it is insufficient to allow unemployed people to actively search for jobs. We punish people when they are not in work, and yet there is only one job available for every eight people looking for paid work or more hours. The failure of successive federal governments to address the inadequacy of these payments is a national shame and it is our responsibility as state parliamentarians.

There is no doubt that we need to raise the rate of Newstart. We need to look beyond the current status quo and forget the idea that this is a dog-eat-dog society where people are pushed into poverty by necessity. We need to do better and aim higher. The goal should be for every Australian to live with dignity in a state we would be proud to have our friends and family also live—in a state that we here represent. With those few words, I commend the motion.

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

WAGE THEFT

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:25): I move:

1. That this council establish a select committee of the Legislative Council to inquire into and report on wage theft in South Australia, with particular reference to—
 - (a) the prevalence and incidence of wage theft in South Australia, with acknowledgement to evidence of wage theft from other parts of Australia;
 - (b) the impact of wage theft on workers, families, law-abiding citizens, the economy and community;
 - (c) the various forms that wage theft can take, including through unpaid superannuation and any other statutory entitlements, the misuse of ABNs and sham contracting arrangements;
 - (d) the reasons why wage theft is occurring, including whether the current regulatory framework and practices are effective for deterrence;
 - (e) the sectors in which wage theft is prevalent, including industries, occupations, parts of the state, or among cohorts of workers;
 - (f) the effectiveness of the current regulatory framework at state and federal level in dealing with wage theft and supporting affected workers, including whether conditions preventing prosecution of white collar fraud are fundamental towards supporting the legality of wage theft;
 - (g) measures to ensure support services are in place to ensure accessible and cost-effective justice to expedite claims;
 - (h) options for ensuring wage theft is eradicated, including consideration of regulatory and other measures either implemented or proposed in other jurisdictions interstate, nationally or internationally and the role of industrial organisations, including unions and employer registered bodies in addressing and preventing wage theft; and
 - (i) any other related matter.
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 committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to any such evidence being reported to the council.
4. That standing order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

Today I rise to move the private member's motion standing in my name because I believe that the confronting information regarding the prevalence of wage theft in Australia can no longer be ignored. For too long, we have heard about workers being taken advantage of through sham contracting, unpaid superannuation, misuse of ABNs, and other statutory entitlements. The fraudulent behaviour of some businesses is impacting on workers and their families, on the community and on the economy.

Before entering parliament, my professional and community work was centred on supporting and achieving results for workers and disadvantaged individuals in South Australia. I have represented workers and assisted them in navigating the judicial system to recover their wages, and I can tell you one thing: it is costly and difficult for workers to recover their entitlements. It is estimated that one in three eligible Australian workers are underpaid; that is, 2.4 million workers in Australia, with approximately \$3.6 billion stolen each year.

It is naive and irresponsible for the government to ignore the issue, and to pretend that wage theft is not happening in our state and that our workers and law-abiding businesses are not suffering. Workers in South Australia have a right to have accessible and cost-effective justice, and our government should be proactive and investigate the prevalence of this issue in our state.

As recently as last week, I was advised of concerns surrounding an employer who had not paid some of their employees for the work they had undertaken over the past two months. Due to the connections the business has with the local community, these employees are facing barriers to justice that are not adequately addressed through the current regulatory framework.

The matter is complex. There is a real fear of the repercussions of seeking fairness, not just from a financial standpoint but also of the implications they will face in the local community. I would

like our government to stand up and commit to working Australians by investigating the occurrence of wage theft in South Australia so that we can constructively end the malaise. We have a responsibility as a government to ensure that the regulatory frameworks in place are effectively supporting South Australian workers. They deserve justice and this motion will be the first step we take.

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

ANIMALS OF WAR

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:31): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises the extraordinary and inspiring service of Digger the war dog—the devoted companion of Sergeant James Harold Martin, a South Australian soldier who spent 3½ years fighting with the Australian Imperial Force in World War I;
2. Appreciates and respects the unique place Digger has in the hearts of South Australians; and
3. Praises the distinguished international award bestowed on Digger and Bill the Bastard, a horse in the Light Horse Brigade, this year in recognition of their outstanding service to the war effort.

In war, animals can be heroes, too. Today I salute Australia's bravest dog of war, Digger, a boxer cross who served king and country for 3½ years in one of the bloodiest campaigns of World War I. I also salute Australia's greatest war horse, Bill the Bastard, so named because of his cantankerous nature. But, like Digger, he served with bravery and distinction in the Gallipoli campaign and then with the Light Horse in a famous victory against the Turks, the Battle of Romani.

They have just been honoured with a Blue Cross for their valour by the UK-based animal charity of the same name, founded in 1897. It is the animal equivalent of the Victoria Cross. The heroism of Digger and Bill the Bastard are of epic proportions. Both were at Gallipoli at the same time. Digger went on to the Western Front, while Bill went on to gallop to glory in the Middle East.

Digger hailed from Broadmeadows in Victoria, but had a very strong Adelaide connection. I stumbled across Digger's remarkable story while researching material for an ANZAC centenary feature I was preparing for Channel 7's *Today Tonight* in 2015. With a backdrop of the horrors of war and human sacrifice, I decided on an uplifting simple piece that focused on the dog and his unbreakable bond with his master, Sergeant James Martin, an electrician from Hindmarsh who was South Australia's very first Great War volunteer in 1914. Mr Martin was a signaller with the 1st Australian Division Signals Company. Digger was a stray who followed Mr Martin and a group of fellow soldiers back to the barracks in Williamstown, Victoria, and became their mascot.

Digger was smuggled aboard their troop ship bound for Egypt, and then the fatal shores of Gallipoli. Signallers were among the first in line in battles because they were needed to roll out the vital communications lines. At 6am on 25 April 1915, the 1st Australian Division Signals Company was among the very first on Anzac Cove. There is a famous picture of the unit in their longboat at the Australian War Memorial.

While you cannot see Digger, he was on board as a never-ending torrent of bullets sprayed around them. As the ANZACs dug in for the nine-month campaign, Digger was in the trenches with them, running messages or going over the top to check on the wounded or ferry food and medical supplies. He was at Lone Pine, where a bullet shattered his jaw. It later had to be removed while he was under chloroform.

Packhorse Bill the Bastard was also dodging bullets at Gallipoli. His fractious behaviour made him unrideable, and legend has it that troops placed bets on whether Bill or his rider would survive a suicidal seven-kilometre gallop to Anzac Cove to deliver the post. Tragically, the rider lost, but the horse's courage was noticed by Major Michael Shanahan, a skilled horse whisperer who adopted Bill and tamed him on a diet of affection and licorice allsorts.

Digger and Sergeant Martin, and Bill and Major Shanahan, were inseparable to the very end. In the Battle of Romani on 5 August 1916, 100,000 horses took part in an attack by the Light Horse to capture two vital wells from the Turks. In the ensuing fight, Major Shanahan rescued four Tasmanian troopers, who were all placed on Bill's back and ridden back to safety. Major Shanahan

was shot in the leg and collapsed on his horse but, showing enormous stamina, Bill took him three kilometres to medics. His leg had to be amputated, but the horse had saved his life.

Around the same time, Digger and Sergeant Martin were on the Western Front, first at Pozieres and then at Ypres. They were the worst theatres of war, with huge casualties on all sides. With artillery shells containing mustard gas constantly raining down on them, Digger would sound the alarm in the trenches for soldiers to don their masks. They also had one for him. Digger went over the top and cheated death countless times to check on the wounded until he, too, became a casualty, suffering burns from the mustard gas.

There is a famous postcard showing Digger sitting on a Union Jack, which was sold to raise money for the ointment to treat his wounds. Sergeant Martin was also gassed and, with Digger, convalesced in Britain, but you can never keep a good dog down. Digger soon took to the skies with the AIF in a Gipsy Moth. Digger's heroic exploits were humorously recorded in the Adelaide *Register* newspaper in December 1918, almost 100 years ago. The report read in part:

Digger has the wounds of battle. A hole in the top jaw, three teeth gone, blind in the right eye, deaf in the left ear.

He always was a venturesome dog, but he was invalided home a couple of months ago and now has to lead a more or less hum-drum life. However, so his present keeper says, he could not be kept in on the day of the news of the Armistice. He caught a train to Sydney to knock around with the boys and, several days later, had to be bailed out of the Dogs' Home for half a crown. He had the reputation of being a hard drinker 'over the other side.'

Digger was given a silver collar with his medals for 3½ years of service. Digger marched proudly with his unit and Sergeant Martin for the last time in Sydney on Empire Day, May 1919. That night, fireworks celebrations spooked Digger. Perhaps thinking he was back in the trenches, he made a dash for a fence but burst a blood vessel trying to leap it. He crawled back to Sergeant Martin's room, where he died at the foot of his bed, loyal to the very last. Digger's hide was tanned and, along with his medals collar, is an exhibit at the Australian War Memorial in Canberra.

Sergeant Martin lost two brothers and a sister in active service. He returned to Adelaide, where he married Frances, the girl he met in Britain. Like so many World War I veterans, he battled PTSD in silence and had one functioning lung because of the mustard gas poisoning. He died in 1963 aged 71. His family is rightly proud of his exemplary service and that of Digger, who has been immortalised in a striking memorial unveiled a year ago on the front lawn of the Croydon RSL, where the annual ANZAC service is held.

If members are interested, you can view my short film by searching 'Digger the war dog' on YouTube. As for Bill the Bastard, he was retired after the Battle of Romani. Major Shanahan found him a new home with the villagers in Gallipoli. He too is remembered in Major Shanahan's home town of Murrumburrah in New South Wales. There is a life-size bronze sculpture of Bill carrying Major Shanahan and those four troopers from the battlefield.

Eight million horses, mules and donkeys, and one million dogs died on both sides during the Great War. While the Blue Cross medals were awarded to people who helped rescue animals, medals were awarded in 1918 to honour several horses which had served in the First World War. Medals were then given out between 1940 and 1951 to a number of dogs, including Juliana, who reportedly extinguished an incendiary bomb by urinating on it. In 2006, Jake, a police explosives dog, was given the honour after helping to clear out the London Underground following the 7 July 2005 London bombings.

The Australian War Memorial will formally commemorate Bill the Bastard and Digger's Blue Cross later this year. I commend this motion to members. My plan is to bring it to a vote on 7 November, four days before the commemoration of the 100th anniversary of Armistice Day.

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

SOUTH PARA RESERVOIR

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the 60th anniversary of the South Para Reservoir, which is the most recent and largest of the reservoirs in the South Para system;
2. Highlights the importance of water storage to supply urban and industrial areas;
3. Takes note of the 60th anniversary to be celebrated with a book launch, bus tours and barbecue to be held at the Senior Citizens/RSL Hall, Williamstown, on Saturday 13 and Sunday 14 October 2018 from 11am;
4. Recognises the enormous contribution to the construction of the reservoir by migrants from other countries and the community feeling, which quickly developed amongst the families which lived on site; and
5. Acknowledges the work of the organising committee and the sponsors of the event SA Water, Williamstown Hotel, Williamstown Post Office and Smith Bros.

(Continued from 5 September 2018.)

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:41): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Insert after paragraph 2 a new paragraph 2(a) as follows:

2. (a) Acknowledges the health risks of opening up drinking water reservoirs for recreational activities.

One of the Liberal Party election commitments was to open a number of South Australia's reservoirs for recreational activities. I have some serious concerns about the health risks associated with this policy. Even the Liberals in their own election documents say, 'We will ensure that the opening of each reservoir is undertaken with great care to prevent any possible adverse impacts on the quality and security of our drinking water supplies.' However, it is not clear how this will be achieved.

I understand that a multiagency task force is now looking at 12 reservoirs around the state. So far, we have received no updates in regard to what the task force has learned or what they are planning to do to ensure the water quality is not affected. The Liberals want to open the gates to the Happy Valley Reservoir, the Tod and the Barossa reservoirs, as well as the Myponga, South Para and Hope Valley reservoirs, but there is research that shows that these reservoirs, which provide our state with drinking water, should not be used for recreational activities.

In South Australia, we entrust water treatment facilities with the responsibility of providing safe drinking water. There are several ways contamination risks can also enter the waterways, and already SA Water has said that the move could cost somewhere between \$25 million and \$200 million to ensure all concerns are addressed and public safety is assured.

Giardia and other harmful parasites are very easily spread via drinking water that is not properly managed, and we have seen the devastation of poor water management in other countries, particularly in the US town of Flint, Michigan. As I am sure members would be aware, residents there have been using bottled water since 2016 after their water supply was contaminated with lead.

Although reservoirs are often open in other states, there have been significant issues and enormous financial cost. While opening up the reservoirs may seem like a good idea, there are real and significant risks associated with this policy.

We all have a responsibility to influence the management of water to achieve the better outcomes. We must protect our aquatic ecosystems with the intention of ensuring their sustainability and their protection for future generations. We must reject opportunism, eliminate mismanagement and reduce pollution of our essential, life-sustaining water resources, which are so valuable to this state. For that reason, I commend this motion and the amendment to the chamber.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:45): Let me just say at the outset that when the Hon. John Dawkins said he was bringing this motion to a vote, my view was that it would have been fairly straightforward; it is a motion acknowledging an historical event, recognising people who were involved and acknowledging an organising committee that is involved with an historic occasion.

Normally motions like this, which we do every Wednesday in state parliament, where we recognise things that are happening or have happened, go through without too much fuss. We now have an amendment to the motion, which I think I will just address in two ways. The first thing is that

my personal practice is not to amend other people's motions if they are not political. That tends to be my approach.

There are always grey areas and, as the Hon. Justin Hanson pointed out, this motion raises the issue of reservoirs. Before the election, there was the issue of whether we should boat in reservoirs or use reservoirs for recreation, so there is a connection.

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: It's a very long bow.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: The Hon. John Dawkins says it is a long bow and I will accept that it is a long bow. Before the election, the Liberal Party put on the agenda that reservoirs might be opened up for recreation. The Hon. Justin Hanson has taken this opportunity and added an extra line to the motion. The line reads that the Legislative Council:

2 (a) Acknowledges the health risks of opening up drinking water reservoirs for recreational activities.

Looking purely at the merit of the words, I agree absolutely. There are risks associated with opening up reservoirs for recreational activities. I am very nervous about opening up reservoirs for recreational activities, especially if they are our sources of drinking water.

The words are not exceptionable; there are risks. I think even the government would have to admit that there are risks, which is why in their pre-election statements they talked about how it would be managed—they would not allow every form of recreation, only some. At face value, it is stating the obvious: there are health risks with opening up reservoirs.

So, I separate the two issues out. In some ways, it might be regarded as poor form to have attached this issue to a motion which related to something entirely different, but we are in politics, we are in parliament, and if I had a dollar for every time someone has messed with a Greens motion, I would be wealthy. They tend to be the more political ones. We know, for example, that if a motion before this council ends with the words, '...and this council condemns the government for (insert failing here)', then, of course, the government is going to come back and say, 'Replace that line with "...that this council congratulates the government on doing a wonderful job on (insert topic here)".'

Whilst my original thought was, 'Well, let's just let this motion go through unamended,' because it did not really relate to the issue that the Hon. Justin Hanson has now added to it, the point is that he has added it and it is an important issue. From a Greens perspective—my colleague may have some additional remarks to make—we need the record to show that we are concerned about the risks of opening up reservoirs for recreational activities. Leaving aside whether this is the right location for it, it is on the agenda and the Greens therefore will be supporting the amendment moved by the Hon. Justin Hanson.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:49): I do want to speak on this particular motion. I rise in support of this motion and have a few short words about the South Para Reservoir. The South Para Reservoir is the second largest reservoir in South Australia, and whilst it has a capacity of about 45,330 megalitres, it only fills completely about every five years due to its size and location in the catchment area. Together with Kangaroo Creek and Myponga, it is one of the last three major reservoirs constructed in this state.

Construction on the South Para Reservoir began in 1949 in response to the increase in population as a result of migration following the Second World War. As such, as the Hon. John Dawkins outlined in his motion, there was a lot of input from migrants on the construction of the reservoir. Construction was not completed until 1958 due to the increase in demand on resources and limited funding in the post-war boom.

I remember the reservoir fondly because I made several trips to see the progression of this major project from 1954 to 1958 when I was working as a junior draftsman in the design branch of the engineering and water supply department. I also remember visiting the construction sites of the Mannum-Adelaide Pipeline at this time and witnessing the early stage of the development of what was known as the new city north of Adelaide, later to be named Elizabeth.

In addition to the many others who contributed to the construction of the South Para Reservoir we should acknowledge the work done by the then engineering chief, Mr Julian Dridan; the engineer for construction, Mr Gilbert Poole; the engineer for design, Mr Harold Beaney; and the

resident engineer in charge of the project, Mr Len Burnett. I thank the Hon. John Dawkins for moving this motion and wish every success for the 60th anniversary celebrations.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:51): I rise on behalf of the Greens as the portfolio holder to address this motion, and give our support for this motion, and indeed for the amendment, which I think is actually not controversial in that it acknowledges the health risks of opening up drinking water reservoirs for recreational activities. It is merely a statement of fact and, in that, we are happy to both note the extensive work that was done by the WA parliament with significant warnings about the opening up of reservoirs for recreational activities and draw the council's and, indeed, the Liberal government's attention to that WA report, 'Effects of recreational activities on source water protection areas' and the literature that is available through that extensive inquiry.

As my colleague has as much to say on behalf of the Greens, we reiterate our support for both the motion and the amendment, and with those few words, look forward to collegiate and hopefully consensual acknowledgement of the science.

The PRESIDENT: Does any other honourable member wish to make a contribution before I ask the Hon. Mr Pangallo?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:52): Thank you, Mr President. I was not listed to speak about this—

The PRESIDENT: That's fine.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: —but my intention is to now, actually.

The PRESIDENT: I gathered that.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you. I am supporting the Hon. John Dawkins' motion, and I will not be supporting the Hon. Justin Hanson's motion. The reason for that is that I do not think that this is the appropriate place for that debate at this point. Interestingly enough, I raised this matter earlier this week in a Budget and Finance Committee meeting because, like Mr Hanson, I do have concerns about that policy by the Liberal Party, but I think that needs to be debated at another time, when and if any legislation does come before the Legislative Council. What I wanted to add, though, is my own personal reflections of the South Para Reservoir. As a grade 7 student at Thebarton Primary School—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins: 20 years ago.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: —no, not 20 years, it was 1966—one of our excursions for the day was a bus trip to seven Adelaide dams and reservoirs. I have to say, looking back on it now, it was probably one of the most boring excursions I have ever encountered because if you have seen one reservoir, you have seen them all. But the South Para Reservoir was the first one we visited and I remember it fondly because our teacher at the time spoke about the construction phase, how important it was for South Australia, what it would do, and also the contributions that had been made by many people in South Australia, including, actually, some relatives of mine who worked in the construction phase.

I found it quite an impressive place to visit. The fact that it is now 60 years old and still going strong is an indicator of the quality of work that was carried out there. In fact, in my time at Channel 7, I happened across some lost black-and-white footage of the building phase and the opening of the South Para Reservoir that had been taken by an Adelaide archivist. It was actually quite interesting to see this project from the beginning and then through to the end with the governor of the time, who I believe may have officiated at the opening of it all.

In closing, I think there are certainly concerns about the Liberal government's policy of opening up the reservoirs to all sorts of public activity, but that needs to be addressed when the matter comes before parliament, and I think that we will leave that for another time. In the meantime, I think we stick with convention. I will not be supporting the motion of the Hon. Justin Hanson. I speak on behalf of the Hon. Connie Bonaros, my colleague, as well.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (16:56): I thank the honourable members—Mr Darley, Mr Parnell, Mr Hanson, Ms Franks and Mr Pangallo—for their contributions to a debate that I probably did not anticipate when I brought this motion to the chamber. However, I would like to make

some brief comments about the actual celebration that this motion is about. The celebration will take place, as the motion says, on Saturday 13 October and Sunday 14 October. I will be pleased to attend on the 13th.

At 11 in the morning in Williamstown there will be some speeches and a special welcome to visitors. There will be the launch of the book by Martin Johnson, who is the chair of the organising committee, called *Twenty Houses: An Anecdotal History of the Building of the South Para Reservoir 1948-1958*, as well as a talk by Shauna Gejas and a photographic display depicting former residents and the work sites of the reservoir. Cathy Young will put on display some wonderful historic bottles and jars from the work campsites of the South Para. That is the sort of voluntary effort that has gone into this event—an event that has been supported in its long-term planning by both the member for Light, Mr Piccolo, and myself.

I think that we need to concentrate on the fact that this motion is about the celebration of a significant milestone in South Australia's history. It is worth going back to the fact that the planning for the South Para Reservoir meant that an area of at least 405 hectares would be needed to accommodate an estimated 45,460 megalitres of water. Considerable farming, grazing and orchard land, together with some marginal land, was acquired to meet this large volume. It also meant that it was necessary to completely demolish the Gilberts' winery and homestead (called Wongalere), clear a large amount of native scrub and deviate the Kersbrook-Williamstown road onto a higher level bridge, which those of us who have visited the site are well aware of.

It is also interesting to note that during the late 1940s and early 1950s, when full-scale clearing of the scrubland was in progress, the timber mills at Williamstown were producing fence posts out of the logs taken from the large hardwoods, leaving the twisted heavy-limbed tops to firewood contractors. That is something I remember from my youth. The timber mills were a very big industry in Williamstown.

I will not go into any more of the details of the day, but there is no doubt that there has been an enormous amount of effort, put on totally by volunteers, to celebrate this particular 60th anniversary. I am pleased that on 13 October the Minister for Environment and Water, the Hon. David Speirs, will be there and will be speaking, as will the member for Light, the Hon. Tony Piccolo, as he has supported this project right the way through. They will be showing their support for the organising committee.

To sum up a couple of the comments made, the Hon. Mr Hanson, in moving his amendment, then proceeded to make significant reference to water quality in the details of his amendment. I kept waiting for any reference to the South Para Reservoir and its 60th anniversary, and, sadly, it did not come. I think that is a great shame. I acknowledge his right and that of the Labor Party—although no-one in the Labor Party has told me who has actually initiated this amendment and no-one is taking ownership of it—but I think it would have been appropriate, at least in moving an amendment, to address the topic, and the topic is the 60th anniversary of the South Para Reservoir.

The Hon. Mark Parnell, in his comments, which I respect, did I think put into perspective his views about why the Greens are supporting the amendment. He said that we are in politics and we are in parliament and so these are the sorts of things that do happen. All I can say is that the people organising this event, who have put hundreds and probably thousands of hours into it, are not in politics and are not in parliament. They were very pleased about this motion being in the parliament and so, really, it is a pity that they have had this attempt to add a political comment to what is a congratulatory motion.

Very briefly, the Hon. Mr Pangallo used the words 'fond memories' and the Hon. Mr Darley gave us a unique set of personal memories that no-one else in this place could have provided, and I think that was very valuable. Fond memories and personal memories are what this motion is about. That is what this celebration is about. These people are the family of the workers who built that dam and built a very valuable reservoir for South Australia. They have fabulous memories of living in that little community outside of Williamstown in fairly ordinary accommodation. I could have read out some descriptions of the standard of the single men's quarters. I will not, but it was not too flash.

I think the reality is, in indicating that I do not support the amendment, the motion, as it stands, is here to highlight those memories, to highlight the celebration of a valuable piece of South

Australian history and the contribution of obviously the many workers and their families to the project overall but of their children and grandchildren and many other people who want to just have that recognised as a very valuable part of South Australian history. I commend the motion as it stands to the council.

The PRESIDENT: For the benefit of honourable members, the question I am going to put is that the new paragraph 2(a) as proposed to be inserted by the Hon. J.E. Hanson be so inserted.

Amendment negatived; motion carried.

MULTICULTURALISM

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:06): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that our identity as South Australians is made up of the threads of many stories woven into one intricate tapestry made richer and more vibrant by the contributions of our First Peoples and the migrants who chose to make Australia home;
2. Repudiates racism in all its forms and any retreat from a policy of multiculturalism; and
3. Gives its unambiguous and unqualified commitment to the principle that whatever criteria are applied by Australian governments in exercising their sovereign right to determine the composition of the immigration intake, race, faith or ethnic origin shall never, explicitly or implicitly, be among them.

It was with much indignation that in August I heard and read the maiden speech of Queensland Senator Fraser Anning of Katter's Australian Party and formerly of One Nation. It reads like a typical Queensland redneck's lecture of Australian history that we have become accustomed to hearing from the likes of Pauline Hanson and a host of extreme right wing conservative commentators and media identities intent on inciting division among us with their inflammatory remarks.

He was ignorant and dismissive of our Indigenous heritage, their history and their cultures and grossly insulted our immigration program, singling out Muslims and Africans. He spoke of 'final solutions' to the immigration program, a term that harks back to the Nazi holocaust era, although Senator Anning rejects that he meant any such link. His xenophobic comments reminded me of the period when I was growing up in this state in the 1950s and sixties. The effects of World War II were still raw in Australia. There had been a rush of migrants from postwar Europe, a mix of Britons, Italians, Greeks, Poles, Czechs and many other nationalities.

The first time I had ever heard the term 'White Australia Policy' openly spoken about and taught—yes, taught—was in my primary school classroom. I was shocked and horrified when I learned what it really meant. Of course, being referred to as 'new Australians' by even our teachers, even though I was born here and spoke English fluently, we—the children of migrants—initially copped vile racist abuse. However, within a decade or so the integration and acceptance of migrants in our communities was swift, thanks to visionary political figures like Don Dunstan and Gough Whitlam, who embraced the concept and benefits of multiculturalism, where it flourished to the point where we are now regarded as the model for the world.

Our society is much richer for the toil and contributions of our migrant population. Their input can be seen everywhere. This wondrous palette of cultures has been further enriched by the diaspora from Asia and the Indian subcontinent. How lucky we are to have the best of all worlds harmoniously here among us. We have become a more tolerant nation and I am pleased that we have also continued to warmly embrace, celebrate and recognise our Indigenous heritage. Eddie Mabo's historic land rights fight and Sorry Day stand out as quite significant chapters in our history and are milestones in the unification and healing process with our first inhabitants.

We should be celebrating what we have and the freedoms we all enjoy. We should condemn attempts by those who would want to impose restrictions on our immigration intake, race, faith or ethnic origins. I do not want to see Australia head down the bigoted path taken by American President Donald Trump. Banning people from Islamic countries of his choosing and building walls on borders to lock out refugees looking for a better way of life is not what the Australia of today is about or stands for.

Like Australia, the United States was and still is a melting pot of cultures. However, unlike Australia, America still grapples to get the balance right, with civil rights activism and racism not seen since the equal rights movement of the 1960s. Recently, a friend of mine told me that racists often do not know they are racists. One of the ugly developments of the socially revolutionary internet is the rise of cowardly and often invisible keyboard warriors and malevolent malcontents who are given far more relevance and oxygen on social media networks than they deserve.

My friend and I were discussing the controversy caused in the United States by a Melbourne newspaper cartoon of Serena Williams throwing a tantrum at the US Open. A picture can tell a thousand words, and you will get a thousand different interpretations from a thousand different sets of eyes. As a one-time daily newspaper editor who dealt with cartoonists, I did not read anything sinister into Mark Knight's depiction, and I am sure he meant no offence to the greatest female tennis player of all time.

I have seen caricatures of Serena and other African-American celebrities that are much worse than that, and they did not even raise a single eyebrow. Where was the outrage from those same critics about the depictions of Muslims and their prophet in the satirical publication *Charlie Hebdo*, which was later subjected to a murderous attack by terrorists? I have also seen unflattering cartoons of white-skinned personalities and political figures. It should never have descended into a debate about race; this was essentially a comment about her behaviour.

Cartoonists, by their style as artists, do exaggerate features. Nonetheless, Australian society has once again come under scrutiny because of this. An article by Australian-based author Max Barry, published yesterday in the *Philadelphia Tribune*, painted Australia this way:

Australia is the nicest racist country you will ever see. It is racist in a blithe, jokey kind of way, where nobody is supposed to take anything too seriously, and nobody is too aware of historical or cultural contexts.

There is racial violence in Australia's history, but not a lot of it, compared with many other countries, and it's not very recent. The racism you get in Australia is mostly of the blindness to privilege variety, where a person may make fun of another for their distinguishing characteristics without realizing that doing so is far more comfortable from within the demographic majority.

As my friend said, he seems to be describing racism without knowing it. He may be right, but I would like to think that the clear majority of Australians abhor racism and inequality of any kind, as proven by the historic vote last year to allow same-sex marriage. We have come a long way since the disgraceful White Australia policy was abolished, but we can and should be doing more.

While we do need to protect and respect the fundamental right of freedom of speech from all sides of the political and social spectrum, including Senator Anning and Senator Hanson, we must reject hate speech and guard against action that serves to incite violence and intolerance. I commend this motion to members.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

NEWSTART ALLOWANCE

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:16): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that all Australian jobseekers deserve adequate income support to maintain a decent standard of living and have access to resources to look for work, which enables and supports recipients to transition to paid work as soon as possible;
2. Supports a root and branch review and measures which seek to increase and enhance Newstart and other related welfare payments, which adequately addresses the current level of poverty among Australian jobseekers;
3. Acknowledges the work of the Anti-Poverty Network South Australia, for its advocacy in this policy area;
4. Recognises that the Turnbull Liberal government, in its most recent federal budget, failed to address this issue and calls on it to immediately undertake a root and branch review; and
5. Recognises the last rise in Newstart occurred in 1994 under the Keating Labor government.

I rise to move this motion, which I put on the *Notice Paper* a few months ago after my meeting with the Anti-Poverty Network. I also spoke in this house about this very matter earlier in the year.

In doing so, I once again put on the record my support for a rise in the Newstart allowance. Newstart's fortnightly payments to single people without children total \$545.80. The cost of essentials, such as housing, groceries, energy, transport and clothing, is a minimum of \$866 per fortnight according to the Australian Council of Social Service.

The Newstart payment rises a mere \$45 for single parents with children. Newstart is now less than 18 per cent of the average wage and less than 41 per cent of the minimum wage. The Anti-Poverty Network SA is a grassroots community alliance of people with direct, lived experience of poverty and unemployment, including sole parents, carers, aged and disability pensioners, students, jobseekers and others receiving welfare payments.

The Anti-Poverty Network has been running a very public campaign since 2013, trying to raise awareness of the need for an immediate rise in Newstart. It is their belief that current payments operate around \$160 below the poverty line.

I ask whether any honourable members in this chamber truly believe that they could live on roughly \$40 a day. It is unfortunate, as I have stated previously, that the media's continued focus on the so-called dole bludger has done a lot of political damage, as it seems federally that there are too few who have the courage to advocate for any increase in Newstart.

Many of the unemployed have difficulties finding work, through no fault of their own. Considering this, there are roughly 200,000 job vacancies nationwide. Those competing for that small number of vacancies include around 700,000 unemployed and 1.3 million underemployed people. It does not take an economist to understand that there is a shortage of supply compared with demand.

Likewise, as the economy continues to transform, it is an unfortunate fact that many workers who are losing their jobs in the old industries will find it increasingly difficult to be re-employed and will need time to reskill. I believe that it is time for all major political parties in the federal parliament to come together and make it a priority to raise the level of Newstart. It has been more than 24 years—yes, that's right, 24 years—since the last rise in Newstart by the then Keating government.

Former prime minister Malcolm Turnbull failed to do anything for Newstart recipients in his previous budgets. Julia Banks MP, like other members of the federal Liberal government, has previously said that she could live on \$40 a day. I hope that the new Prime Minister, Mr Scott Morrison, who is trying to establish himself as a moderate and caring PM, can do something to assist these vulnerable people. So far, at least, Mr Shorten is more sensitive to the plight of jobseekers. He has recently stated:

I do think there's a real problem for the government payments for the people at the very bottom of our society.

That is why Labor has proposed having a root and branch review of Newstart and like-minded allowances and payments.

Who on earth amongst the government or anyone in the parliament could live on the Newstart allowance?

At this moment, 13 local councils are supporting the Anti-Poverty Network's campaign for a rise in Newstart. They are the City of Adelaide, Clare and Gilbert Valleys, Copper Coast, Kangaroo Island, Mount Gambier, Onkaparinga, Playford, Port Adelaide Enfield, Salisbury, Streaky Bay, Prospect, Elliston and Tea Tree Gully. Support has also been received from numerous community organisations such as ACOSS, Uniting Communities, Anglicare, St Vincent de Paul and the Salvation Army.

These organisations have called for an increase in Newstart of at least \$75 per week, along with the Australian Council of Trade Unions, noting the impact of the very low payments on physical and mental wellbeing and social connectedness. According to a 2015 survey by ACOSS, 40 per cent of recipients are unable to pay their bills on time or see a dentist, 46 per cent are only able to afford second-hand clothes most of the time and 50 per cent are unable to raise \$2,000 in the event of an emergency.

Further, 44 per cent report having an unsustainable level of debt, owing more than they can afford, with a majority reporting turning off heating and cooling to save money; 32 per cent skipped

meals over the past year; 25 per cent are suffering from a housing crisis, spending more than 50 per cent of their income on housing; 20 per cent report not having enough money for essentials like housing, food and electricity; and 63 per cent report that their income had fallen behind the cost of living over the past two years.

Last Monday 17 September 2018, a report by Deloitte Access Economics was released. It was commissioned by ACOSS with support from SACOSS and the other state and territory councils of social service. The report states that South Australia's total disposable income would increase by \$288 million if the federal government raised Newstart, Youth Allowance and related payments by \$75 per week. The report also states that 12,000 new jobs would be created, wages would increase, corporate profits would increase and federal government revenue would increase by \$1 billion, with the total growth in Australia's economy increasing by \$4 billion. This evidence demonstrates that there are broader economic benefits in implementing a rise in Newstart.

While support from community organisations and trade unions for a rise in Newstart is not really that surprising, there have been voices of support that have been much more unexpected. These voices include the former prime minister John Howard, who has stated that there should be a rise in Newstart.

As I have stated in this place previously, leading economist Chris Richardson from Deloitte Access Economics believes there should be a \$50 a week increase in Newstart. He believes that fixing the unnecessarily cruel dole payments is a more urgent priority than budget repair. He stated: 'We make trouble for ourselves if we let the poorest of the poor get poorer.' The Business Council of Australia is also supportive of raising Newstart, with the chief executive, Jennifer Westacott, stating:

You can not live on \$39 a day.

We really have to get our head around this, but not just in terms of tinkering with the allowance. We've got to make sure that allowance is adequate...we've got to make sure the programs are there, the literacy programs, the numeracy programs, that the jobs services networks are doing their jobs properly.

A lot of these people are shockingly disadvantaged.

The National Centre for Social and Economic Modelling released an analysis this week showing recipients of Newstart are five times more likely to be living in poverty than other fellow Australians. I offer the chamber a couple of testimonies from Newstart recipients, who wrote to my former council, the Port Adelaide Enfield council, recently about their difficulties living on Newstart. First, there is a resident known as Brendan. Brendan writes:

It [Newstart] is simply too low to live on. For the individual, the low rate of Newstart creates a serious hindrance to finding work and remaining ready for work, while for the economy as a whole, it is a needless brake on consumer demand.

We have fallen victim to the delusion that unemployment payments need to be punitively low in order to motivate people into work, and people are hurting because of it.

Finally, Brendan adds this:

As unemployed workers our health, our dignity, our ability to be and remain part of a community, our ability to find employment, all of these things are slowly eroded by the drastic inadequacy of Newstart, making unemployment a much greater blight on an affected area, and increasing the risks of homelessness and crime.

Then there is Catherine, who writes:

My rent costs \$230 per week, I get \$40 per week rent relief leaving only \$77.00 for food, bills and other living costs. Obviously, I cannot cover my basic living costs with only \$77 and resort to utilising my credit cards in order to get by. This is a vicious cycle.

When I do get employment, I try to pay off the credit cards, however as you are well aware the interest rates, the ever increasing power and gas costs, insurance, car registration, phone and wi-fi costs, along with the sporadic nature of work opportunities, I find this impossible.

I rarely buy new clothes or even second-hand clothes. I avoid using my gas heater in winter. I have skipped meals, and I utilise my credit card to pay medical bills and dentist costs. Occasionally I lash out and join my friends for a meal out (using my credit card) knowing that it will only add to my increasing debt. However, I figure this is important for my mental health, networking, social health and ultimately my ability to be in good mind and spirit for job seeking.

I take this opportunity to thank the Anti-Poverty Network for its advocacy in this area. Its chief spokesperson, Mr Pas Forgione, has been doing a great job getting out to various local councils and community groups to promote this very important area of public policy. I commend this motion to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

STATE ELECTION CAMPAIGN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on—
 - (a) all aspects of the 2018 state election and matters related thereto, with particular reference to—
 - (i) the operation of the funding, expenditure and disclosure scheme as outlined in the Electoral Act 1985 (the act);
 - (ii) the operation of changes to the voting provisions of the act;
 - (iii) the application of provisions requiring authorisation of electoral material to all forms of communication to voters;
 - (iv) the influence of advertising by associated entities and/or third parties who are not registered political parties during the campaign targeting candidates and political parties;
 - (v) the need for 'truth in advertising' provisions to communication to voters including third party communications;
 - (vi) the regulation of associated entities and/or third parties undertaking campaign activities; and
 - (vii) the potential application of new technology to voting, scrutiny and counting.
 - (b) the regulatory regime regarding donations and contributions from persons and entities to political parties, associated entities and other third parties and entities undertaking campaign activities;
 - (c) the extent to which fundraising and expenditure by associated entities and/or third parties is conducted in concert with registered political parties and the applicability and utilisation of tax deductibility by entities involved in campaign activities; and
 - (d) any related 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 1 August 2018.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:31): I rise today to expand on my earlier comments in this place, calling for the establishment of a select committee inquiry into the results of the 2018 state election. To again borrow a phrase from revered ABC election analyst, Antony Green, the 2018 election was 'a bit like a First World War battlefield'. Political operatives inside all of the party war rooms, regardless of their political persuasions, would attest to the same description. Like any war, it was fierce, harsh and confronting, but it was also bitter, it was vitriolic, it was nasty, it was deceitful and, for much of the time, it was personal.

As campaign director for SA-Best at the time, I had a unique, raw, front-row and, I must say, disturbing view of how low some political operatives are prepared to stoop in a blatant attempt to grab votes. All of this in an environment where little regard is given to the individual under personal attack and the impact those vitriolic attacks might have on their wellbeing and the wellbeing of their loved ones.

Perhaps the worst example I know of is that involving a text message sent at the time to Nick Xenophon from an individual in the gambling lobby, which threatened to 'kill him off'. What have we become when we consider that sort of behaviour appropriate? Are we really that desperate to win that we deem it acceptable behaviour?

I have certainly been at the receiving end of some mean-spirited scheming and underhanded attempts to sully my reputation, my personal reputation, so I know how ugly that sort of behaviour can get. As I said during my maiden speech in this place, my skin has certainly thickened a lot over the years and it would take a lot more than that sort of desperate gutter tactics to deter me from course.

I know I am not alone; in fact, one need not look further than our federal colleagues in Canberra at the moment and the numerous and ongoing claims of harassment, bullying and unprovoked personal attacks, some of which have led to MPs resigning and/or choosing not to stand at the next federal election. Frankly, today's question time in this place was not a lot better, and it is little wonder that politicians get such a bad rap.

As politicians in a position of power to bring about change, we must do better to ensure that the gutter tactics used by some political parties during the 2018 state election are never allowed to happen again. When I first moved for the establishment of the select committee of inquiry into the results of the election, I described the state election as being the most targeted and bitter campaign I have ever been involved with. I am afraid time has not sullied that view.

SA-Best and specifically Nick Xenophon, our leader at the time, copped the brunt of it and much of it was personal. While I am fully cognisant of the fact that there is little sympathy for politicians in the community, that does not excuse the behaviour of our politicians, party members and staff. Generally speaking, and as far as the general population is concerned, most elections, state and federal, are a battle between the major parties, Labor and Liberal.

Using the war euphemism, again the combatants can see their enemies coming over the trenches straight ahead of them and mount their attacks accordingly. Traditionally, nothing much else distracts either party on their chosen (war) pathway to victory. That was not the case in the 2018 election, and that is when we entered the battleground. We set out to position ourselves—and I know I have said this before—as a genuine alternative political party and, in doing so, seriously challenged and threatened to undermine the privileged positions of power that major parties have enjoyed in this state for decades.

We wanted to strike some common ground with voters who were disenchanted with the major parties and seeking to vote for a party who could make a difference. We went into the election seeking to win enough seats to hold the balance of power and to ensure that we held whichever party ultimately won to account. Our strategy, and the threat we represented, clearly sent shock waves through both major parties and prompted them to change their traditional battle plans. Both parties and their vested interest groups unleashed a tsunami of lies, mistruths, slurs and downright gutter politics against us, the likes of which we have never seen before in South Australian politics.

As we said at the time, 'Labor says SA-Best will support the Liberals. The Liberals say we'll support Labor. They can't both be right.' Unlike the Liberals and Labor, we fought a war on all fronts. It was win at all costs for the Liberals and ALP, regardless of the fallout. The Liberals jumped into bed with the rich poker machine barons who control the AHA, the Australian Hotels Association, which, coincidentally, we estimate invested at least \$250,000 in its advertising campaign that expressly told lie after lie about SA-Best and the impact our gambling policy would have in SA.

I might add that our policy was not the same as the Greens' policy. The Greens' policy could arguably be construed as much more radical than ours at the time, but they did not rate a mention in those advertising campaigns. Labor and the powerful union movement that controls and dictates who should represent the party in parliament unleashed a disgusting scare campaign of its own. Anything was on the agenda to ensure SA-Best did not gain a foothold in the South Australian parliament. It was an election fought on a scale never before seen, with huge amounts of money spent by the AHA and SA Unions urging people to vote, not against each of the major parties but against SA-Best.

It was unheralded in South Australia's political history and it was motivated to undermine Nick and keep us out of parliament. As we know, the AHA is a powerful vested interest group which had unprecedented influence on the outcome of the election. It saw SA-Best as the main threat to its livelihood and the insidious pokie dens that have infiltrated nearly every pub and hotel in SA. It had everything to lose and nothing to win if SA-Best achieved what it set out to achieve. If the status quo remained and poker machine numbers in SA remained at current levels, their members would continue to make huge profits on the back of gambling addicts' misery.

As a result, pubs across the city were plastered—absolutely plastered—with posters urging people to vote against us as though we were public enemy No. 1 and, on a personal note, to vote against Nick as though he were public enemy No. 1. This was one of the many complaints that I made to the Electoral Commission on behalf of SA-Best. On election day, polling booths were strewn with corflutes picturing Nick in bed with Jay Weatherill.

The response I got from the Electoral Commission was absolutely astounding. The commission found that the corflutes picturing Nick and Jay in bed with the slogan 'Don't risk it' were not in breach of the Electoral Act because the phrase 'could be considered a possible future implication' and as such would not be considered misleading to a material extent. On the other hand, the very same posters with the same image of Nick and Jay in bed together, containing the slogan 'A vote for either of them is a vote for both of them', were found to be in breach of the act to the extent that they were deemed to be misleading and based on inaccurate information.

My complaint was made first thing in the morning on election day at 9.36—I checked the email. Of course, by the time the matter was considered and a determination was handed down by the Electoral Commission that the signs be removed, the damage had been done. They were literally everywhere. What is obvious is that the legislation regarding such advertising is so narrow in scope that the Electoral Commission was forced to seek Crown law advice to determine what could be deemed a hypothetical situation as opposed to a real-life situation.

There were many other similar examples that were blatant, misleading mistruths, but because of the limitations of our electoral laws—laws clearly intended to favour the two major parties—there was absolutely nothing that I, as campaign director, or SA-Best could do to address them and, believe me, I tried. I sent complaint after complaint, and many of those complaints remain outstanding, which is astonishing.

I know that a lot of this will fall on deaf ears in this place, but I believe that the general public would agree that, if we truly believe this institution is governed not by those elected to this place but rather by vested interests and we not only do nothing about it but accept it as perfectly normal, we have a real problem. Again, reflect on the unedifying events that transpired in Canberra in recent weeks and try explaining to the general public how that had anything at all to do with the good of the nation rather than the might of the factions. Explain to decent, hardworking Australian voters how our ever-revolving door of prime ministers is good for our nation.

SA-Best paid the ultimate price at the election, but at least we can hold our heads up high knowing that we did not jump into bed with lobby groups, we did not jump into bed with vested interest groups, we did not put our personal interests ahead of South Australian voters and we did not stoop to gutter politics. The election landscape is changing, and changing rapidly. So, too, are the tactics used by political parties during election campaigns, some of which are nothing more than sheer lies and skulduggery designed to scare voters—think medicare.

It is for these reasons that I seek to establish the select committee of inquiry into the results of the 2018 election. Let's not wait until the eve of the next state election to canvass what is working and what is not working with our electoral laws. Let's ensure, well in advance of the next election, that we have in place strong mechanisms to appropriately deal with desperate—and some would argue immoral—political tactics like those that were experienced during the 2018 state election. In closing, I foreshadow my intention to bring this matter to a vote on the next Wednesday of sitting.

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

*Bills***OFFICE FOR THE AGEING (ADULT SAFEGUARDING) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 September 2018.)

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:44): The Greens are pleased to support the second reading of the bill, which implements a number of the recommendations from a parliamentary joint committee that reported back in October 2017. In particular, the bill gives effect to recommendation No. 4, which I will take a moment to read on to the record. Recommendation No. 4 of the report of the Joint Committee on Matters Relating to Elder Abuse states:

The Committee calls on the South Australian Government to introduce a Bill to develop a new South Australian Adult Protection Act, a key recommendation of the Closing the Gaps Report of 2011 and recommended in evidence to the Committee by Professor Wendy Lacey. The Bill to be developed in consultation with Professor Lacey; South Australia's Public Advocate; the Public Trustee; the South Australian Legal Services Commission; and other stakeholders as invited by the South Australian Government.

We are pleased to see that the bill has, in fact, been prepared in consultation. We note that the government worked with Professor Wendy Lacey, who is one of the state's most authoritative experts on elder abuse and, more importantly, on legislative responses to elder abuse. The bill establishes an adult safeguarding unit within the Office for the Ageing in the Department of Health and Wellbeing. The unit has a range of powers and responsibilities for responding to reports of abuse, neglect or mistreatment of vulnerable adults. We note that the opposition has a number of amendments on file, which go to the independence of the unit, but we will have a look at those amendments and decide whether or not to support them when we get into committee. We do not have a view on them at this early stage.

The importance of the bill was reinforced as recently as Monday night, when the ABC's *Four Corners* program went to air. I understand it was the first of the two-part series. I expect we will see the second part next Monday night. What the *Four Corners* report showed was that South Australia is not the only jurisdiction to have had problems with its aged-care system. Certainly, words like 'Oakden' have become part of the common language of South Australia. When you say that word, everyone knows what you mean and that we are talking about some horrendous abuse in a state-run facility, but South Australia is not the only state. That does not excuse anything that has happened and it does not relieve us of our responsibility to fix the situation, but it just shows that this is in fact a national problem, and I commend the ABC for raising it to a national audience.

We also had the announcement on the weekend by the Prime Minister that there will be a royal commission into aged care in Australia. If previous royal commissions are anything to go by, there will no doubt be many more exposes and scandals as a result of that inquiry and that those incidents will shock and appal us and they will invite even more legislative intervention. That raises the issue of the bill before us, and I am pleased that the bill does have a review clause embedded in it. If there had not been one then there are a number of members of this chamber who regularly insert review clauses into legislation, but I know the act is to be reviewed in three years. My guess is that that timing might be just about right in terms of the royal commission.

When we think of how long it will take to establish, I understand the terms of reference are not even finalised, but it will take some time to establish. We are talking about a nationwide issue that affects millions of Australians, so I expect the evidence will take some time to hear. My expectation is that around the time that the parliament is reviewing this legislation we will probably also have available to us recommendations from the national royal commission into aged care. I expect that further reforms will be required then.

The fact of there being a national inquiry underway is no reason for us to delay action now, so the Greens are supportive of the bill. We look forward to the unit being established. We look forward to the speedy passage of the bill and we will deal with the amendments when we get into committee.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. C.M. Scriven.

LIMITATION OF ACTIONS (CHILD ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL*Final Stages*

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

APPROPRIATION BILL 2018*Estimates Committees*

The House of Assembly requested that the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway), the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink) and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade), members of the Legislative Council, attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:51): I move:

That the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas), the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway), the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink) and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade) have leave to attend and give evidence before the estimates committees of the House of Assembly on the Appropriation Bill, if they think fit.

Motion carried.

At 17:52 the council adjourned until Thursday 20 September 2018 at 11:00.