

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 17 October 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 bring up the eighth report of the committee.

Report received.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:16): I bring up the report of the committee on a fact-finding visit to the South Australian Arid Lands Natural Resources Management region.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. D.W. Ridgway)—

South Australian Tourism Commission—Report, 2017-18

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer regarding privatisation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Before the 1997 election, the then Liberal leader, John Olsen, stated, 'We are not pursuing a privatisation course with ETSA.' On ABC radio on 10 October 2017, not that long before this state election, the member for Dunstan and then Liberal leader of the opposition, Steven Marshall, said, 'We don't have a privatisation agenda.' My question is to the Treasurer. Will he explain why Liberal leaders, including the now Premier, Steven Marshall, continue to lie to the people of South Australia about privatisation and selling energy assets?

The PRESIDENT: That is a series of assertions. I am going to strike them out, but the Treasurer may wish to answer it, if he chooses; otherwise I will rule it out of order. Treasurer, do you wish to answer it?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:20): I am always happy to answer the question, even when the leader uses intemperate and unparliamentary language.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, it is unparliamentary.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The last person in the world who ought to talk about, to use his phrase, that unparliamentary word that he used in relation to broken promises on privatisation, would be the Leader of the Opposition and the Labor Party.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Answer the question.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am answering the question. Prior to the 2014 election, prior to the 2010 election—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Leader of the Opposition, order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: —the leader of the party said that they wouldn't privatise. Prior to 2002—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Sit down, Treasurer, for a moment. Leader of the Opposition, he is responding to your question. Do him the courtesy of allowing him to respond to your question. I have done you the courtesy of allowing you to ask the question, even if it had inflammatory rhetoric and some additional rhetorical flourishes, which you know I do not like. Treasurer, continue.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Indeed, inflammatory rhetorical flourishes, if I might be able to use the phrase. This is a Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council that represents the party that produced tens of thousands of pledge cards, which pledged, in 2002 and every election onwards, that they would not privatise. Let's just run through the list: the Labor Party—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, restrain your language.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: He doesn't like getting his own medicine back. He is a representative of a party who pledged they would not privatise. When his Premier was elected in 2002 he then subsequently signed pledges in front of the media cameras, an edict to all CEOs, that there will be no privatisation under a Labor government.

Let's run through them: the South-East forests—our forests in the South-East. The Hon. Mr Maher, the Hon. Ms Scriven, all of us understand the importance of the forests to the South-East of South Australia and Mount Gambier. Which was the government that privatised the forests? It was the Labor government, contrary to the promises that were made. The Lotteries Commission, the Motor Accident Commission—he doesn't like it when he gets his own medicine.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order: the question was directed at what the Liberal Party has done and their lies.

The PRESIDENT: I am not upholding that point of order. You are not on high moral ground, Leader of the Opposition. Good try. The Treasurer, let's hear from you.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, as you rightly pointed out, the inflammatory rhetorical flourishes of the Leader of the Opposition open this question up. I am very happy to respond in kind. The Lotteries Commission, the Motor Accident Commission, the Lands Titles Office. With a secret report that you paid \$100,000 for, you tried to privatise SA Water. You had a secret report—\$100,000 you spent on a secret report to try to privatise SA Water.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lensink, please stop using props. You should know better as a minister.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, you are stretching my patience. Please exercise restraint; you have outdone yourself. Treasurer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Hunter was indeed a minister for water at a time in a government where secretly they commissioned a \$100,000 report as to how they could privatise

SA Water. There isn't and wasn't an asset in the state that wasn't nailed down that they didn't try to privatise. What we found hidden in the secret deal in relation to the Lands Titles Office was their intention to privatise the motor registry division in South Australia without having told the people of South Australia. They actually took—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What rubbish; absolute rubbish!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The Hon. Mr Hunter says it's absolute rubbish. They took \$80 million from the private sector consortium on the condition that they be given first mover advantage about the privatisation of the motor registry division. They took the cash and ran. They banked it. They spent it but they didn't tell the people of South Australia in relation to that particular asset.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Please restrain yourself. You are stretching my patience.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I love it when the Labor Party starts talking about privatisation and tries to pretend in some way that they are the anti-privatisation party. The people of South Australia heard that prior to the election and they threw them out of office. They threw them out of office because they heard the same rhetoric, they heard the same scare campaign about the privatisation agenda of the government, and they threw the Labor government out of office because they didn't believe the sort of rubbish that they heard prior to the election and they won't believe the same sort of rubbish after the election either.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26): Supplementary question, Mr President, arising from the answer.

The PRESIDENT: I'm going to listen very carefully to this so make sure it's a supplementary.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Can the Treasurer advise that when the Premier said on 29 November, 'It's not our intention to flog off an asset,' whether that was a lie also?

The PRESIDENT: I am going to rule that out of order. I have already warned you once about inflammatory language. You were heading in the right direction and you let yourself down near the end, Hon. Leader of the Opposition. The Hon. Ms Scriven.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:27): My question is to the Treasurer. Does the Treasurer consider that the privatisation of ETSA by the Olsen government, of which the Treasurer was the chief architect, was successful, and did it deliver cheaper power prices for South Australians?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:27): Mr President—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Good question. Go on, tell everyone how much better off they are because of what you did. Go on, try that.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, can we just restrain ourselves. We have had a well-crafted question—something you could learn from—and now I wish the Treasurer to respond.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That's a nice slap down for the Leader of the Opposition. I don't know that there is much more I can say, Mr President, after that slap down. The brutal reality is that the decisions that were taken 25 years ago were as a result of the State Bank disaster created by the Labor Party government of the day in the late 1980s and early 1990s. The only way this state could pay its way out of the financial calamity and the financial disaster—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Treasurer—Leader of the Opposition, please restrain yourself from using the term 'lie'. It's unparliamentary. Treasurer, would you like to continue.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I was just admiring you admonishing the Leader of the Opposition for his unparliamentary and inflammatory language.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Even though it's true.

The PRESIDENT: You are not helping, the Hon. Mr Hunter. You are not helping; restrain yourself.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: I tell the truth in here, mate; that's what I do.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It would be the first time for the Hon. Mr Hunter, if that was the case. The people of South Australia recognise the reasons why decisions had to be taken almost 20 or 25 years ago. If the Labor Party, as they sought to do prior to the last election, want to revisit the issues of 25 years ago, and if they think that's going to convince the people of South Australia, good luck to you. You can trot out all of the caricatures; you can trot out all of the stunts. You tried all of that before the election, and the people of South Australia looked, listened and threw you out of office. We are very happy to defend the decisions that have been taken by the current Liberal government and indeed former Liberal governments.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:29): Supplementary: given the disaster of the privatisation of ETSA, overseen by the Hon. Rob Lucas—

The PRESIDENT: There is an assumption in there. Recraft it, the Hon. Ms Scriven.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Can the Treasurer explain why the current Liberal government is once again privatising assets?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:30): I can only repeat what I have just said ad nauseam to the Leader of the Opposition. For the Hon. Ms Scriven to be critical of any party or government that makes a decision in relation to privatisation stinks and smells of rank hypocrisy.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Your hypocrisy.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: No, the hypocrisy of the Labor Party. I challenge the Hon. Ms Scriven or indeed any member of the Labor Party to stand up before the good people of Mount Gambier and tell the people of Mount Gambier that they are a party that doesn't believe in privatisation and that they didn't privatise the forests in the South-East of South Australia. Good luck!

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Your decision; your responsibility

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Good luck!

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): Supplementary—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I hate to say it, but order for the Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you. Supplementary arising from the answer: does the Treasurer feel ashamed given that, on 19 September 2016, a poll published by *The Advertiser* showed 51 per cent of South Australians blamed the sale of ETSA as a key reason behind high power prices?

The PRESIDENT: That is a new question, Leader of the Opposition. That is not by way of clarification. I am not going to rule it out of order. I am going to give the Treasurer the option of whether he wishes to answer it.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:31): I was desperately hoping you wouldn't rule it out of order.

An honourable member: Another full toss on leg stump.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Another slow full toss on leg stump from the Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: We should—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, this is not a conversation. If you want to have a conversation with the Treasurer, have one outside the chamber. You ask a question and a minister responds.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The simple answer to the question is: no, I am not ashamed of any decision that this Liberal government, or indeed a former Liberal government, has taken. But if we want to talk about percentages, I remind the honourable member to look at the numbers of people on a two-party preferred vote that turfed him out of office and the Labor Party out of office. That's the only number that really counts.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: That is the only number that really counts in relation to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The people of South Australia heard all of these bleats, squeals and complaints. They looked, they listened, they learnt, and they said, 'We've heard this rubbish before. Get rid of them, and bring in a reformist Liberal government to grow the economy and grow jobs in South Australia.'

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:33): My question is for the Treasurer.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Oh, look out; you've got him on the ropes!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Very much so. Look at him; he's quivering over there.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Give him a nice bouncer outside leg stump. See how far he can hit that.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, you are not assisting me either.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: What assurances has the Treasurer sought from his Liberal commonwealth colleagues that, beyond the transition period ending in 2026-27, South Australia will receive at least as much GST under the proposed changes as it does under the current system?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:33): As I indicated yesterday, we will await the detail of the legislative amendments that are going to be moved by the government to their own legislation, which we think will be introduced in an amended form tomorrow but certainly in the next two sitting weeks of the federal parliament.

The assurance we have been given is that no state—and as I said yesterday, it will be subject to us checking the detail of the legislative amendment; in the case of South Australia, we stand up for South Australia—South Australia will be no worse off under the deal that has been proposed.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Until when?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Until 2026-27. I said—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Is this a new way of asking supplementaries? Leader of the Opposition and Government Whip? You have an opportunity. I am very generous on supplementaries. Casual supplementaries are out of order. Treasurer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I made it quite clear yesterday in terms of the media release I put out, so I can tell the honourable members, if they are interested, that the proposal that has been advised by the commonwealth government, which is being supported by various state Liberal and Labor treasurers, so I was advised yesterday, is that the guarantee will be written into the legislation

until 2026-27 at which time there will be a Productivity Commission review. There is some discussion about some role for the commonwealth—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: There will be some discussion about a potential role for the Commonwealth Grants Commission in relation to what might be done in terms of that particular review. I would imagine that one would hope, in the interests of the people of South Australia if there is still a reforming Marshall Liberal government with a newly-minted state Treasurer at that particular time, one would hope—not one would hope, one would be absolutely certain that that Liberal Treasurer would be arguing passionately as we have done in the interests of South Australia to make sure that South Australia is no worse off under the deal compared to the current—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: You have just admitted that we could be much worse off in a decade. That's extraordinary.

The PRESIDENT: Social commentary is out of order.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: It does not take much to get the Leader of the Opposition excited if he thinks that's extraordinary, Mr President. But, then again, it is up to him what pleases him. I will leave him to his own devices. On the more important issues of federal-state financial relations, as I indicated yesterday, South Australia and the new government will be arguing, and has argued, is arguing, and will continue to argue in the interests of South Australia. We will always put South Australia first irrespective of whether there is a federal Labor government or a federal Liberal government.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can the Liberal benchers calm down, please? The Hon. Mr Wortley.

GOODS AND SERVICES TAX

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:37): It is obvious that the Treasurer is very overenthusiastically embracing this GST contest.

The PRESIDENT: This is not a supplementary, the Hon. Mr Wortley. Just get on with it.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: How can you—

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I don't require advice from my right.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: How can the Treasurer tell this chamber that we will not be worse off, when in 2027, after the transition, all extra money put on the table will no longer be there, and every state will be guaranteed at least 75 cents in the dollar of their GST, which is going to put hundreds of millions of dollars into the coffers of Western Australia, and it has to come from somewhere.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Well, that's the question. How can—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I make the rules—

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: You sit there like a little clown waving its head on a spring—

The PRESIDENT: Do not—Mr Wortley, you will get—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order on this side, on my right!

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: —and the reality is, you have jumped—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, you were going fine there for a while.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: —and this will be seen to be a pathetic deal—

The PRESIDENT: Sit down.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: —and South Australians—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, sit down. Sit down.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I do not need a commentary from you. I was being very generous and allowing it. The first half of it actually sounded intelligent. Treasurer, would you like to answer that or—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I am not sure what the question was.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I rule it out of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can the benchers on my right calm down as well? The Hon. Ms Lee.

HONG KONG AUSTRALIA BUSINESS ASSOCIATION BUSINESS AWARDS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:39): Thank you, Mr President, for your call. My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment about the recent Hong Kong Australia Business Association Business Awards. I have a long association with Hong Kong ABA and it was a pleasure to attend the Hong Kong ABA Business Awards recently with the minister. Can the minister please update the council about the recent winners at the 2018 Hong Kong Australia Business Association Business Awards, and say how the South Australian government is contributing to a new sense of confidence amongst South Australian exporters?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for her question and, as she said, her very longstanding interest in, especially, the Hong Kong Australia Business Association, but also in growing our great state's economy. I was honoured to recently attend the South Australian chapter of the Hong Kong Australia Business Association (HKABA) business awards for 2018, where a number of South Australian exporters were recognised for their outstanding business achievements.

Confidence in the South Australian economy has risen significantly since the election of the Marshall Liberal government, and I have heard countless local businesses share their excitement in the direction the Liberal government is taking this great state. There is no doubt that there is comprehensive support for the government's new policy direction for international trade, and that was the message I received loud and clear at the HKABA awards, which was hosted by president Andrew Faulkner and attended, of course, by my good friend and colleague the Hon. Jing Lee, and a number of other notable guests there on the night as well.

The awards were particularly special. There is a great feel and sense of camaraderie amongst the businesses, and everybody celebrates everybody's success. Some of the businesses that were recognised on the night were Wines by Geoff Hardy. Richard Dolon many of us would know is the export manager for Wines by Geoff Hardy: he was away, but his wife Bec Hardy received the award, and they won the export for goods and services award.

The Hahndorf Inn, Mr Andrew Holmes, was the winner of the business excellence award. They market direct to international tourists, and he has built up an enviable reputation of a must-visit attraction on Main Street, Hahndorf, and I urge members opposite to go and check out the amazing pork hock and dark stout, imported directly from Germany.

Flavio Outdoor Living Solutions: Mr Flavio Condelli, was the winner of the import of goods and services award. Quality sandstone products, pavers and pots, as well as outdoor furniture and

fencing, are the main products. He has 11 employees, plus a factory and a warehouse that he has built on Muller Road, and he is successfully combining local manufacturing with complementary imported products.

The last award went to International Tailored Solutions by Pamela Murphy, winner of a business development award and entrepreneur of the year. I have met this lady: she is very impressive, a fluent speaker of Cantonese, and she helps South Australian businesses to understand how to get the most out of their relationships with existing and prospective partners in the Asia region.

We know that South Australia's export performance has been behind the rest of Australia, and it needs to improve significantly. Our share of Australian exports in the 12 months to August 2018 was 3.7 per cent, with Western Australia, Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria accounting for 41.4 per cent, 24.5 per cent, 5.3 per cent and 8.3 respectively.

Businesses such as those recognise that the HKABA will play a huge role in growing South Australia's exports and pushing to new markets across the globe. We, as the South Australian government, will assist them with our comprehensive policy to boost South Australia's international trade and support our exporters, including our new trade offices, the South Australian Export Accelerator Program, which will increase funding, and the increased funding for the international education via StudyAdelaide funding for a more targeted approach to international engagement.

I commend again all the winners and finalists from this year's business awards night, especially the SA chapter of the HKABA, and thank president Andrew Faulkner and his committee for bringing together so many outstanding local businesses and hosting such a successful awards nights.

SCREENING CHECKS

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services a question regarding the screening system.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: Prior to 1 July 2017, the screening unit only reviewed an individual's relevant history once every three years. As of 1 July 2017, a new screening system was introduced to enable ongoing monitoring of an applicant's relevant history information. The new system is linked to South Australia Police and other databases to provide up-to-date information about offences that are relevant to an applicant's clearance status. My question to the minister is: what was the original budget and final cost of the new screening system, and how did the implementation of the new system affect staff numbers?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for his question. Yes, as he has stated the situation, we do provide continuous monitoring of screening, which commenced for employment screening on 1 July 2017. The information I have is that a total of \$5.3 million in investing expenditure was provided in the 2016-17 budget for the development of the continuous monitoring system, which included \$3.3 million to the Department of Human Services as well as \$2 million to the Department for Child Protection and the South Australia Police to develop and implement enhancements to their internal systems to support continuous monitoring. As at the end of June 2018, DHS had expended \$2.49 million of the \$3.3 million original capital budget for the continuous monitoring.

Continuous monitoring enables new relevant South Australian criminal history in child protection matters to be identified on a regular basis, which contrasts with the previous system that only provided a snapshot of a person's history at the start of the three-year lifespan of the check when the initial assessment took place. Other jurisdictions have ongoing monitoring; however, South Australia is the only jurisdiction that monitors child protection information on a regular basis as part of the working with children screening clearances.

The screening unit will revoke an individual's clearance when the SAPOL notification indicates that the person has been charged or found guilty of a high-risk offence. This will immediately result in a person being no longer cleared to work in the relevant sector. The following offences are considered high-risk offences: homicide and related offences, sexual assault and related offences,

violence in relation to a child, offences relating to child pornography, offences involving child prostitution and child abuse offences, such as criminal neglect.

In relation to the backlog, we have had a significant reduction in that. There were some 1,300 detailed assessments, for which a program began in April this year. Most of those have now been finalised, which means that people will experience much faster receipt of their approvals. The information I have is that nearly 76 per cent of new applications are finalised in under five business days. To take that up to 15 business days takes that up to 97.2 per cent. Within this financial year, the screening unit has received and finalised some 37,966 screening applications.

In relation to staffing arrangements, my understanding is that, particularly when we are aware that there will be influxes of additional cohorts, we need to scale up the system. The backlog project that I was referring to meant that additional staff were placed, and we also changed some of the systems involved in that. I think we have reached a relatively good point at the moment, but we are continuing to monitor that. Clearly, once we have the changes in the volunteer screening, we will be making provisions for that, as well as screenings which may come onstream as a result of other initiatives.

IT'S OK TO BE WHITE MOTION

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:48): My question is to the Assistant Minister to the Premier for multicultural affairs. Does the assistant minister agree with her federal colleagues that it is okay to be white?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:48): No.

HOSPITAL MANAGEMENT

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:48): My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on the management of South Australian hospitals?

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, please.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in the South Australian public health system. Yesterday, I advised this council that the threat by the ANMF to cancel elective surgery tomorrow was not in accord with the orders of the industrial tribunal. I assured South Australians that there would be no cancellations of elective surgery.

Today's announcement by the ANMF that they have abandoned their threat to disrupt elective surgery fully vindicates the government's consistent position. This is a win for patient safety. This is a win for the South Australian community. This is an embarrassing back down by the nurses' union. I am pleased that the union has finally withdrawn its threat to patient safety. I just hope that it will be the end of their political games.

The union should never have threatened patient safety for political purposes. The union should never have asked nurses to stop caring for their patients. I want to thank the Chief Nurse and the South Australia Health nurse leadership, who took the ANMF to the tribunal to protect the patients of South Australia. The nurses' union's bans have been an unhelpful distraction, but the government has continued to have a laser like focus on improving health care for all South Australians. I want to assure the nurses, paramedics—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, please!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —and doctors in our hospitals that the government is determined to work with them—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter! The Hon. Mr Hunter, please.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —to ease the pressure in our hospitals at times of peak demand. The government strategy to provide immediate relief is clear. Two weeks ago, we announced that we would activate 30 beds in country hospitals. Last week, we announced that we had secured 20 beds in the private system. Last Friday, we announced activating 11 mental health beds. I have continued to work through medium and long-term strategies with clinicians, unions and stakeholders. We will clean up Labor's mess. It won't happen overnight, but we will work through the changes in a methodical and consultative manner to improve health care in this state.

I would remind honourable members of the behaviour of the opposition, including the Hon. Ian Hunter today. Faced with a union campaign threatening patient safety, they sowed doubt that patients would get the care they need. Faced with the union's political campaign—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, I can't hear the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —they actively supported patients being used as political pawns. Faced with a choice between the union or the people of South Australia, Labor backed the union.

RADIOLOGY SERVICES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:51): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In a state budget media release issued on 4 September, the minister indicated:

Efficiencies in public imaging and diagnostic services will be pursued. Previous external reviews have highlighted inefficiencies in SA Medical Imaging Services resulting in around a 30 per cent higher net cost compared to equivalent services interstate. It is anticipated that efficiencies of \$1.1 million in 2018-19, rising to \$6.2 million from 2021-22 will be achieved. External providers already deliver radiology services at the Modbury and Noarlunga Hospitals, and some services at Lyell McEwin Hospital and country hospitals. Should efficiencies not be achieved, the option open to the Local Health Network Boards to procure services from alternative providers will be pursued;

My question to the minister is: if the requisite efficiencies in public imaging and diagnostic services are met, will the government categorically rule out the option for local health network boards to go to alternative providers?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): I will certainly provide further information to the member, because my recollection is that the Treasurer has already corresponded with stakeholders on this point, but let's be clear: in relation to both medical imaging and pathology, the concern of the government is making sure that South Australian taxpayers get value for money services that are input into their health care.

We have a situation where one of our hospitals is more than 20 per cent above the average price for hospital services. That is completely unacceptable, because that means there are millions of dollars in inefficiencies and services that could be going into providing health care. The government's commitment is to drive efficiencies in public sector services. The commitment of the government is that local health boards would be able to go to alternative providers if the efficiencies can't be achieved within the public sector.

The honourable member's question, of course, very deftly highlights the hypocrisy of the members opposite because, as she quite rightly highlights, the former Labor government, in spite of its rhetoric about privatisation, has been actively engaging private providers within the health system. In relation to medical imaging, as the honourable member says, Modbury Hospital, Noarlunga Hospital and parts of the Lyell McEwin services are already provided by private providers. They already provide it in Angaston, Bordertown, Ceduna, Gawler, Kangaroo Island, Millicent, Mount Barker, Mount Gambier, Naracoorte, Port Augusta, Port Lincoln, the South Coast, Wallaroo and Whyalla. But of course it doesn't stop there either.

In relation to hotel services, most of the hotel services to metropolitan hospitals are already provided by the private sector. Considering the hypocrisy we have been hearing from the members on the other side of the chamber, the most dramatic shift towards private services in recent decades

was under the former Labor government, when they established a \$2.4 billion private hospital at the end of North Terrace, which we'll get back in about 30 years' time, after we've spent about \$11 billion in payments to the private sector.

The fact of the matter is that we make no apology for looking at private provision as an alternative to public provision, particularly if the public sector can't achieve efficiencies. In that respect, we're no different to the Labor Party.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are we all finished? The Hon. Mr Wortley.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:56): Thank you, Mr President. I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Assistant Minister to the Premier regarding portfolio duties.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: The Assistant Minister to the Premier has previously advised this chamber that, owing to machinery of government changes, she was not able to establish an appropriate email address to conduct portfolio-related business until August 2018. Your adviser, Ms Haley Welch, had a Department of the Premier and Cabinet email account in use in May 2018. How is it then that the assistant minister did not have an appropriate email established until August 2018? Is the minister still using her parliamentary email, parliamentary office and parliamentary resources to conduct her portfolio-related business?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:56): I thank the honourable member for his many questions. I think he is pretty obsessed in many ways about my office. He could have easily knocked on my door. We could have a coffee, we'd sit down and then we could go through some of the motions, instead of wasting time in this parliament asking all these useless questions, really.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lee, do not debate the question.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Mr President—

The PRESIDENT: Do not debate the question; answer it.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Thank you. My parliamentary office is like an electorate office. For example, the Minister for Education has his office in Morialta. The member for Adelaide and other members have their ministerial offices but they also have electorate offices.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: The ministerial office is not in Morialta.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: No; I'm saying that the member for Morialta goes to his Morialta office—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lee, through me.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: I'm looking at you, sir.

The PRESIDENT: Lucky you.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: I am.

The PRESIDENT: Please do not respond to the Hon. Ms Scriven's questions.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: My concentration is right on you. I'm looking right at you, sir. You are a very distinguished President.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Flattery will get you nowhere. Let's go on to questions.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Mr President, as I was explaining, the member for Morialta has his electorate office in Morialta but he also has his ministerial office. I have my office here in parliament as my electorate office. As constituents come in, whether it is a ministerial inquiry or constituent

inquiry, I'm allowed to have a meeting wherever I choose or wherever the constituency wants to have the meeting. There is not an issue there.

In terms of parliamentary email, does it really, really, really matter? Constituents sometimes get things mixed up. They still write to me on my parliamentary email; I then direct that to my ministerial adviser in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and duties are handled accordingly. So—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: I do exactly the same thing.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Thank you.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, don't disappoint me. Make it tight.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:59): Does the Hon. Ms Lee really, really, really—

The PRESIDENT: You are trying my patience.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: —think it is appropriate to use parliamentary emails, which are not FOI-able, on portfolio business?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:59): The members on the other side already FOI all my intended emails, so it is not correct for the honourable member to say that parliamentary emails are not FOI-able. If they relate to ministerial-type duties, they are FOI-able—totally.

ADELAIDE FASHION FESTIVAL

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister please inform members of the exciting developments for the Adelaide Fashion Festival this year and how it is promoting Adelaide's incredibly creative talent on the global stage?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Show some courtesy to the Hon. Mr Hood. The Hon. Mr Hood, I did not hear that question. I would like you to ask it again.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Certainly, sir.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are you finished, Leader of the Opposition? I didn't hear this question the first time. I would like to hear the question in silence because the Hon. Mr Ridgway couldn't have heard it either. The Hon. Mr Hood.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister please inform members of the exciting developments for the Adelaide Fashion Festival this year and how it is promoting Adelaide's incredible creative talent on the global stage?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:01): Thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Who are you wearing?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: All I can say I am wearing is R.M. Williams today. I thank the honourable member for his longstanding and ongoing interest in the Adelaide fashion scene. I have just had the pleasure to be down at the Torrens Parade Ground witnessing the set-up for tonight's Adelaide Fashion Festival opening night runway. The Adelaide Fashion Festival is a true representation of art, culture and lifestyle in a progressive and energetic program.

There will be 10 runways starring more than 40 South Australian designers—the most ever—and 20 events in total over the coming five days. The festival brings together media, buyers from the major department stores and retailers and provides leadership throughout the years in terms of business planning, marketing and more. The AFF, as they call it, has supported the growth of the local fashion industry. In the past 12 months, we have seen the number of stockists, the number of staff and the number of social media followers of our local designers grow by more than 20 per cent.

On top of this great work with industry, the festival is an important part of our city's year-round events calendar. It brings Adelaide to life with vibrant colour, design, creativity and music. In 2017, the Adelaide Fashion Festival welcomed some 390,000 attendees across the runway shows, fashion events, the Vogue Festival retail activation and the Paolo Sebastian exhibition at the Art Gallery.

I am told by the festival director that ticket sales are up on last year, so I am sure that members will be very keen to hear me update the chamber at some point in the future when we have those final figures. This year, we have industry leaders from around the world attending the AFF, including Vogue China editor Angelica Cheung, Vogue Australia fashion director Christine Centenera—who was born in Adelaide and has flown in directly from New York to be here—and celebrity stylist Lana Wilkinson.

It all starts tonight with the spectacular showcase of the former Young Australian of the Year, Paul Vasileff, the designer of Paolo Sebastian. His showcase of The Nutcracker collection, with the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, will get this festival off with a bang. I have just seen the ASO warming up and have had a sneak peek at Paul's incredible collection. I encourage you all, if you get a chance to get to the AFF White Marquee Grounds, to experience a runway or one of the many fashionable events across the coming days.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:03): My question is also to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment with regard to the Adelaide 500. Can the minister inform this council:

1. What will be the financial impact on both tourists and ticket sales, being the differential between the proposed changed dates for the Adelaide 500 from March to January beginning in 2020?
2. What communications has the minister had with regard to this race?
3. Will there be any cost associated with construction in the Parklands over the January period that would be different to the March period?
4. What consultation will take place with the local residents and businesses of the city if the race is moved to January?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for her question and her ongoing keen interest in motorsport in South Australia. This was an article that was featured in *The Advertiser* just recently stating that Supercars are talking about a change of time. There has been no formal approach to the South Australian Tourism Commission from Supercars about doing it. They are just exploring options at this point.

As I said, there have been some informal discussions. There is certainly no intention at this stage for a definite change; it is just they are exploring it. From my recollection from reading the article, the Supercars want to have a winter break. They are trying to look to have a season that's late summer, autumn and then a bit of a break and then spring and early summer. Something that is pretty important to us in South Australia is to maintain the first race of the season. Clearly, any change to the timing would create some problems. I think we would all be concerned with the clash between the Tour Down Under, if that was to happen, and the Adelaide 500.

There has been a newspaper article published saying that, yes, Supercars are looking at options to refresh and modernise. I think anybody who has a big event always likes to look at ways that they can refresh them or make a different offering. It's very preliminary discussions. Certainly, with the contract in place to 2021, as members would know, the South Australian government, through the Tourism Commission and our major events arm, is having very preliminary soundings, if you like, from Supercars. We will certainly not be doing anything that puts any of our existing events

at risk. As the member is concerned about construction of the grandstands in the Parklands over Christmas, as we know, the construction starts in late November and goes right across that period. I think all members—

The Hon. T.A. Franks interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I couldn't hear that interjection. The Tourism Commission and the team are making sure that we don't compromise. I think they would be very proud of the Tour Down Under. The Tour Down Under is the largest cycling race in the Southern Hemisphere. It's a very important part of our events calendar and something that we should be very proud of.

Likewise, the Adelaide 500 is one of the leading motorsport festivals in the world and we want to make sure that that is still celebrated and enjoyed by those who enjoy it, but there are no plans at this point. It's just very preliminary soundings by Supercars to see what the appetite is to potentially change. As I said, the Tour Down Under and what we have in the first race of the season for Supercars are important, but certainly there are no decisions and no plans to have an early summer or late summer race in Adelaide.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:07): Given the quoted financial benefit of being first, what is that financial benefit in both income and ticket sales?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:08): Being the first event of the year always is the best. Certainly, the most recent one, the 2018 event, we had some 273,500 people visit it, which is an 11 per cent increase.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Thanks Labor.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thanks to the Liberal Party that actually started the event. You forget whose idea it was in the first place. You have such a short memory. Of course, you were still at school in the time, I suspect.

The PRESIDENT: Through me, the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: They were large numbers. The economic benefit was \$41.94 million to the South Australian economy. That is what we got from last year's event. It was the first event—

The Hon. T.A. Franks: What is the impact of being first rather than mid-season?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The start of any season is important, unless it is a footy season when the grand final brings the whole season to an end. The first race of the year is the one with new cars, new models, new excitement, new drivers, new engines. It is where all the excitement comes with the first one. It's the excitement around it. You can see huge numbers—a quarter of a million people and nearly a \$42 million economic benefit. Clearly, the first event of the year is much better. It is the biggest in the nation.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, they keep interjecting. I don't know why they can't help themselves.

The PRESIDENT: You were responding to the interjections, the Hon. Mr Ridgway. You were responding to them and therefore you are encouraging them.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It is the biggest event on the motor sport calendar. Clearly, it's the first one; if the others were more important there would be more people attending the other events.

The PRESIDENT: I will go to the Hon. Mr Pangallo for his supplementary and then I will go to the Hon. Ms Scriven.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:09): Can the minister reveal if a sponsor has been locked in and when will he make that announcement for the Adelaide 500?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:10): Yes, a sponsor has been locked in and an announcement will be made over the coming weeks.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:10): Can the minister advise as to what he has done personally to advocate to ensure that South Australia does not lose this first race advantage?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for her question. What I have done personally is to make sure that the Tourism Commission advocates with Supercars. I don't negotiate with Supercars. I mean, your mob may have done private deals with private support.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, we are falling into bad habits.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I don't negotiate. The Tourism Commission keeps me fully briefed. They have regular contact with the V8 Supercars. We will be keeping the first race of the season.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:10): Supplementary: what is the deadline for the decision to be made with regard to the 2020 season?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:11): That is a matter of negotiation. We have got a contract until 2021, with Supercars to deliver the event in 2021. So that would require negotiation between both parties to change the current arrangements that we have, which is the first race of the season up until 2021. That would be a matter for negotiation.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:11): Just to clarify the minister's previous answer: he is guaranteeing that we will keep the first race advantage; is that correct?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:11): I am guaranteeing that we will keep the first race advantage. The contract we have locks that in.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:11): Supplementary: does the contract guarantee the first race of the season or does the contract guarantee a race of the season?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:12): My understanding is that it guarantees the first race of the season.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:12): Supplementary: for how long is that first race advantage guaranteed in the contract?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:12): We have a contract until 2021. My understanding is that we get the first race of the season until 2021. I assume that if the member is asking how long that is guaranteed for, it is until 2021.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:12): Supplementary: how can the first race of the season be in March in 2020 if the first race of the season is going to be in January of 2020? Can the minister clarify?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:12): I answered that question earlier. This is a preliminary discussion. There have been no formal discussions at all. We have a contract until 2021 with Supercars.

ADELAIDE 500

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:12): Could the minister advise the chamber when the new contract will need to begin to be negotiated given that these things need to be done in advance and it's coming to an end in 2021?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:13): My understanding is that the discussions are always ongoing and my understanding is that it will be after the 2019 race that the negotiations will start.

SA PATHOLOGY

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister advise whether he expects there to be a negative impact on budgets when SA Pathology is privatised?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:13): The government has no plans to privatise SA Pathology.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: In relation to SA Medical Imaging and in relation to SA Pathology we are asking the private sector to achieve its efficiencies consistent with industry practice, public and private—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —in this state and interstate. If those efficiencies can't be achieved in relation to SA Pathology, the local health network boards will be allowed to consider alternative providers. We are a long way from there.

SA PATHOLOGY

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:14): Supplementary question: the minister used the phrase 'no plans'. As the leader of the house now has used that phrase in the past and then subsequently privatised, is the Minister for Health's saying 'no plans to privatise' code for 'that at some future time we will privatise'?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14): Let us consider the pledge signed by former premier Rann, which said, 'No privatisations under Labor'. Then we had hotel services at a number of our public hospitals in South Australia. In relation to radiology, three of our major hospitals have some or all of their radiology services provided by private providers. Fourteen country hospitals have their radiology services provided by private providers. And this is all in the context of Labor's pledge of, 'No privatisations under Labor'.

Then we have the NRAH, a \$2.4 billion privately built hospital; it will be a private hospital for another 30 years, over which time we will make payments to the PPP of around \$11 billion. This is a party that wants to accuse us of having plans for privatisation. I would like to make the point to Ms Pnevmatikos—

The PRESIDENT: Through me.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Through you, sir—if the former government went to a longstanding consultation with staff and the community about their plans for the NRAH? Did the former Labor government go through a longstanding consultation and independent reviews before they went to the hotel services and radiology services going out to the private sector? No.

It is this government that will not act in relation to SA Pathology until there has been an independent review, full consultation with our staff and a full opportunity for the public sector to meet

efficiencies consistent with the public sector and the private sector counterparts, both in this state and interstate.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:16): Supplementary question arising from the answer: what does the minister think the phrase 'no plans' means?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16): I would refer the honourable member to a dictionary.

PRIVATISATION

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:16): My question is to the Treasurer. Treasurer, are you concerned that the new Royal Adelaide Hospital privatisation could be a bigger debacle than the State Bank under the former Labor government?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:17): As my colleague the Minister for Health has just highlighted, for a Labor Party which claims to be anti-privatisation, the Royal Adelaide Hospital contract, which is a \$2.4 billion contract, as he pointed out, is entirely run—it is owned by private sector operators, owned by private sector operators; it is run, in terms of all of its non-clinical services, by private sector operators. So how can the former government, now opposition, with a straight face stand up in this chamber and try to pretend that it is an anti-privatisation party, when the Minister for Health has very effectively demolished that particular argument just as it applies to the health portfolio, let alone the many other portfolios that the former Labor government was privatising as well?

However, it is now well known that the new Liberal government has inherited a mess in relation to the contractual arrangements for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital contract. We are knee deep, perhaps even almost neck deep, in litigation, whether it be arbitration, mediation or any other 'ation' you can think of.

The bottom line is that it is costing the taxpayers literally tens of millions of dollars in terms of trying to resolve the problems in terms of the financial mismanagement of that particular contract at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. It, in and of itself, is a significant cause of the problems I have identified, and so has the minister, in relation to the CALHN overspending and blowout, not just for this year but for the last four years as well.

So there is no doubting that the potential financial consequences of the financial mismanagement by the former Labor government of this particular deal are indeed very significant to the people of South Australia. Whether ultimately in dollar terms they will be more significant than the State Bank, one would hope not. They are indeed significant. We are talking a total cost in terms of billions of dollars. We are talking in terms of potential risk in terms of tens of millions of dollars, potentially hundreds of millions over the 30-year life cycle of the hospital. We would hope that, with the good financial practices of the new Minister for Health and his people, we might be able to retrieve and correct some of the mess that the minister has inherited, in the interests of the taxpayers of South Australia.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:20): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, representing the Minister for Primary Industries, about drought relief.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I received an email from the Schmidt family I met recently at Worlds End, which is suffering from the drought. They pointed out that the ANZ bank is offering a 1 per cent interest rate reduction for drought-affected areas. If they were to get this, they would save \$11,000 compared to the \$2,800 if they were successful with the RIC drought loan. Banks have drought assistance measures in place but they are only available in drought declared areas of New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria.

My question to the minister is: when will he formally declare parts of South Australia drought affected so families like the Schmidts can benefit and use money for maintaining stock and other expenses?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:21): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in regional South Australia. Of course, there are parts of South Australia that are suffering terribly from the current drought. Luckily, there are a few parts that are not. It is a very important question and I will refer it to my colleague the Hon. Tim Whetstone in another chamber and bring back a reply.

Matters of Interest

ANTI-POVERTY WEEK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:21): This week is Anti-Poverty Week and today is the International Day for the Eradication of Poverty, so I think it is a great opportunity to briefly shine a light on the inequality and poverty that exists in our state. Access to high-quality food should not be a problem in a state with a proud agricultural heritage such as ours. But in South Australia there are over 117,000 people surviving on food handouts, a figure which has more than doubled in the last four years. Strangely, it is in regional South Australia, where the food is grown, that we find the problems are even worse. Foodbank SA chief, Greg Pattinson, recently stated that:

...people living in regional and remote areas are 33 per cent more likely to experience food insecurity than those living in cities.

The fact is that 7 per cent of South Australians, or one in every 15, are going hungry. The need for services like Foodbank is rising fast and it is becoming impossible for our capacity to continue to provide. Foodbank was forced to turn away over 6,000 Australians in the past 12 months alone and, as amazing as the work of Foodbank South Australia is, it is truly sad to see that more and more people are coming to rely upon their work. We have to do more than apply a bandaid; we have to look at what is causing the bleeding.

I want to draw attention to the fact that recent figures reveal that every night in South Australia around 6,000 people are homeless or sleep rough. Earlier this year, I visited the Hutt St Centre to speak to Ian Cox about two of the facilities provided there, which are helping people experiencing homelessness, addressing issues which they face and achieving enduring solutions. Each year, the Hutt St Centre serves around 50,000 meals and offers social work and support services to nearly 2,000 people. I have spoken to those who work there, those who run their programs and those who use some of their services. The centre deserves all the commendation and help we can provide but, sadly, it is simply not enough to just provide crisis care.

While it is truly great that there are centres like the Hutt St Centre providing care for people who are homeless, the statistics of homelessness in South Australia are simply not improving. It is well past time that we start looking to the causes and not just the effects. We have to do more than just apply bandages; we have to start looking for long-term solutions.

I want to draw attention to the fact that the recent research from SACOSS reveals that almost 132,000 people, including over 22,000 children, live below the poverty line in South Australia. Once again, we see regional South Australia being worse off, with those who live there being statistically twice as likely to be in poverty as those in metropolitan Adelaide.

What causes this? That is an excellent question. It seems in our state that a lot of this has to do with problems surrounding housing: 45 per cent of households in poverty are renters. In the 10 years after 2006, more than one new family was homeless every single week. Between 2003 and 2015, the lowest 20 per cent of income earners saw their income actually drop by 9 per cent. Further than just housing, I actually see it as a problem for our economy—not a success—that nationally the highest 1 per cent of the population in Australia earns as much in a fortnight as the lowest 5 per cent receives in a year. It is clearly a problem of wages or a lack of them.

The statistics say that working Australians are more productive now than we have ever been. Australian working families are delivering wealth on an unprecedented level and, at the same time, the workplace, and indeed the world, has never changed faster and been more influenced by things beyond their control.

So it should not be controversial at all to say that those who work hard deserve better pay and fairer conditions, be it because they work hard, want to work hard or because they have worked hard all their working lives, and for those same reasons it should not be controversial to say that we should raise unemployment benefits, just like Newstart. We all need a greater focus on poverty: those who are in it and those who are at risk of being so, a focus on what they earn and where they live, and their costs of living. We need to be proactive and consultative about possible solutions with those who experience poverty so that there are fewer of them.

ILLCIT DRUG USE

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:27): Members may recall that my last matter of interest contribution was on the important work done by Drug Free Australia, which was established in 2004 as the peak body for organisations and family associations around Australia advocating the prevention of illicit drug use in our nation. As I mentioned at that time, the vision of DFA (as I will refer to them) is to ensure that communities, including members of parliament, are well informed about the dangers of illicit drugs and are empowered with sufficient knowledge to inform policy formation.

Other members, like myself, may be receiving regular emails from DFA as part of its endeavour to provide us with reliable, accurate and up-to-date information concerning drug use within Australia and throughout other parts of the world.

Today, I would like to draw members' attention to some of the findings in relation to the push to decriminalise illicit substances in our nation in recent times. DFA recently highlighted what appears to be misinformation that has been disseminated by some activists to support their arguments for decriminalisation. The organisation notes that certain proponents have cited Portugal as an example of where the introduction of decriminalisation in 2001 has successfully reduced the incidence of drug use.

However, it points out that only selected data has been referenced, indeed out of context; namely, the decrease in the use of drugs post-decriminalisation among 13 to 18 year olds, between the years 2001 and 2006, is often cited. But, DFA states that they are neglecting to mention the fact that drug use by this demographic actually rose again from 2006 to 2011 to an even higher level than in 2001, and that the majority of the population experienced an increase in drug use in the period between 2001 and 2006.

Although a decline in the use of all drugs was observed in 2007, this was in line with the overall trend throughout Europe, and was an occurrence that is certainly not unique to Portugal. DFA advises that the specific figures can be obtained from Portugal's official Reitox annual national reports to the European monitoring centre. If people want the full story, that is where it can be had.

There are, of course, a few other nations that have adopted a decriminalisation model, with outcomes that also strongly indicate that it would not be in our interests to follow them. Although the Netherlands has never technically decriminalised the use of cannabis, police were instructed by the government there to refrain from intervening in its sale, under the assumption that it was a relatively harmless substance—a belief which I take issue with—and that it would deter their citizens from purchasing harder drugs if a criminal element was not involved.

By 1996, however, this policy led to a surge of drug use in the Netherlands, eclipsing the rate of drug use in all other western European countries. DFA asserts that the anticipated separation of markets was a failure, as evidenced by the use of ecstasy, speed and cocaine by high school students also becoming the highest in Europe.

Looking to the United Kingdom, members may recall that the government reclassified cannabis from a class B to a class C drug in 2002, which effectively decriminalised the substance. The very same government then reversed its decision seven years later, admitting that they had made a gross error in judgement—the same government. The DFA references a newspaper article from *The Independent*, dated 18 March 2007, which states:

In 1997, this newspaper launched a campaign to decriminalise [cannabis]. If only we had known then what we can reveal today...Record numbers of teenagers are requiring drug treatment...[and] more than 22,000 people were treated last year for cannabis addiction—and almost half of those...were under 18.

This is the key point:

The Independent has today...reversed its landmark campaign for cannabis...to be decriminalised.

We are in the fortunate position of having an opportunity to learn from the experience of other nations in the formation of our own drug laws. I commend Drug Free Australia for its continued efforts to ensure that our parliamentarians and other community leaders are aware of any misconceptions of decriminalisation and its impact in the international community and would encourage members to use it as a credible resource in their future research on the topic. They do not leave out figures. They give people who are willing to learn the full story.

AUTONOMOUS RAIL TRANSIT

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:31): A testament of any thriving, bustling city is its contemporary and efficient public transport system. Think of New York City's subway, Paris's Metro, London's famed Underground and Japan's globally recognised bullet train. What does South Australia have? An over-budget and over-time tram extension on North Terrace that cannot turn right—one this government is seriously considering wasting another \$130 million on to achieve. Seriously? There are much better ways to spend that money.

Instead of going back to the future and re-laying tram tracks we dug up decades ago, this state has a real shot at redemption and could make up for errors of the past by embracing one of the most modern and cost-effective public transport systems emerging in the world: trackless trams. Yes, trackless trams, or autonomous rail transit (ART) by another name. They have the potential to do away with conventional trams and give other forms of public transportation a real run for their money.

Typically, a standard ART system is three carriages that can carry 300 people but with the capacity to have five carriages and 500 people. No tracks are required, neither is a driver needed, as the trackless trams' train-like carriages are programmed to be optically guided with GPS and LIDAR (light detection and ranging) technologies. However, a driver is on board to oversee its operation and assume control should anything go haywire, such as a vehicle accident in front. It can simply bypass it.

Trackless trams are growing in popularity in China and in parts of Europe for many reasons, not just because the network does not require tracks. Environmentally, the trams emit less noise and emissions than buses or trains. They are powered by batteries that can be recharged in 30-second bursts at each stop or in 10 minutes at the end of the line. According to the experts, they have a speed of up to 70 km/h per hour and capacity and passenger comfort to match any other mode of public transport. Interestingly, in three years of trials in China, no impact on road surfaces has been found.

One of the greatest and most appealing attractions of trackless tram systems is their cost. As everyone in this place knows only too well, extending a tram network is a costly, time consuming and disruptive process, ripping up roads and utilities and hurting businesses where the work is undertaken. The New South Wales government is currently building a new 12-kilometre light rail network through the CBD to Sydney's inner south-eastern suburbs. At \$2.2 billion, or about \$120 million a kilometre, it is a disaster.

Similar projects in Canberra and Newcastle have been put at over \$80 million per kilometre. Here it is more like \$120 million. By comparison, a trackless tram network can be built for—wait for it—\$6 million to \$8 million per kilometre, and because tracks are not required, construction timeframes are significantly shorter.

According to transport expert Professor Peter Newman from Curtin University, who recently posted a fascinating story on YouTube about the technology, cities across the world are lining up to trial these trackless tram systems. According to Professor Newman, this includes Townsville, Hobart, Melbourne, Sydney and Perth. Here is where I believe our state can take the front running, because we already lead the way with laws for autonomous vehicles.

I am calling on the state government to join with Adelaide Airport Corporation and undertake a feasibility study to build a trackless tram service from Adelaide Airport to the CBD. While a light rail network has been long touted by various sections of the political and business worlds, its exorbitant costs make it uneconomical. Do the maths with a trackless tram system. At a cost of \$6 million to

\$8 million a kilometre, the six to seven-kilometre network from the airport to the city suddenly becomes an attractive and affordable business proposition.

Not surprisingly, the progressive owners of the airport, Adelaide Airport Ltd, revealed in a submission to the Productivity Commission that it has kept land available for a light rail project. It also said it would be willing to fund a station located at the site. I am also told the Downer Group last year lodged a bid with the former government to build, fund and operate the six-kilometre tramline between the two destinations, but Labor did not proceed—one of the smarter things it did.

An airport light rail system has not featured in any Liberal government policy. I recently spoke with the airport CEO, Mark Young, and he was enthusiastic about the concept if it would benefit travellers and consumers. Why must our politicians embrace and entertain the silly romance of century-old transport technology? We must move with the times.

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:37): Cuts, closures and privatisations: these are three words that perfectly sum up the Marshall Liberal government's first budget. Treasurer Rob Lucas, in delivering his first budget in 17 years, has let loose on our state's most vulnerable. This budget simply does not take responsibility for all South Australians and in particular punishes public transport users, Housing Trust tenants and patients in our health system. Furthermore, for every cut, closure or cancelled service, our state's social and economic stability is further diminished. With the economy on the up, now is actually the time to be investing in a future full of potential and optimism.

South Australians deserve credit for their resilience, particularly through the global and national challenges that have faced us in recent times. At this point, I will not dwell on the fact that the federal Liberal Party not only drove the car industry out of the country and engineered the naval shipbuilding valley of death; instead, I acknowledge the resilient spirit of South Australians as collectively these challenges were stared down.

South Australia always punches above its weight. Since December 2014, there have been 43 consecutive months of job growth. At the end of the past financial year, we had the third lowest unemployment rate of any state. In these current conditions, while it is important to be cautious, it is also important that we be optimistic. The Liberal government's budget is about as far away from the idea of optimism as you can get, and we could all be forgiven for thinking that we were back in 2001 when the Treasurer handed down his recent budget.

This budget has struck me as a document that has been cooked up by the Treasurer over years and years of resentment and bitterness. It is a document that is driven from the bitterness of four successive electoral defeats and resentment aimed at the people of South Australia, and, more remarkably, it is aimed even more so at South Australians who are experiencing tough times.

What the Treasurer has failed to understand while handing down a budget predicated by years of bitterness and resentment is that the world has changed since 2001. Indeed, our state has undergone huge transformations in the 16 years since the Treasurer wandered through the political wilderness. What I find most staggering is that, in all this time, the Treasurer has not come up with any new ideas. He has gone straight back to the Liberal playbook of the 1990s: privatisations, cancellations, closures and cuts.

How can the Treasurer have spent 16 years in opposition and not sought to establish a vision or plan for the future? The Treasurer has shown no interest in the state's future—in particular, in investing in our young people. Now is not the time to be closing TAFE campuses, when we need more skilled jobs than ever before. Now is not the time to cut a program that supplied free government-funded laptops for senior high school students across South Australia. We need to invest in education and help prepare our children for the jobs of the future.

Instead of imposing savage cuts on our health system, the Premier and the health minister should be talking with doctors and nurses and developing ways to improve efficiency without affecting patient care outcomes. The privatisation of SA Pathology is one of the ways in which the health system will be impacted by this budget. Privatisation could mean fewer labs, fewer clinicians and longer waiting times. The privatisation of SA Pathology might also mean higher out-of-pocket expenses for patients. Let us remember that the Premier told South Australians ahead of the last

state election that the Liberals did not have a privatisation agenda. Yet, at the first opportunity, the Treasurer has handed down a budget doing exactly that, selling off our vital services.

I was also surprised that not one dollar in the budget was set aside for farmers suffering through the drought. I note that the New South Wales government has developed a \$1 billion package for drought-affected communities. This is only the tip of the iceberg. Public transport services and routes are set to be cut, Housing Trust rents are set to be increased, Crime Stoppers has been cut, park-and-ride services have been cancelled, and the Adelaide Remand Centre is set to be privatised.

Over the past few weeks, I have joined my colleagues in campaigning against the planned closure of three busy Service SA centres. We have now gathered over 6,000 signatures from people who do not want to see their services closed. There are more than 11 million transactions at Service SA every year. We know that the waiting times at Service SA centres are long enough; closing these centres will just make life harder for everyday South Australians. It just does not make sense.

The comment that has been made several times while I have been collecting signatures for the 'Save Service SA' petition is that the Premier and Treasurer did not say anything about closing Service SA centres before the election. People are justifiably very angry that the Liberals did not come clean with their agenda ahead of the state election. The negative feedback on this issue has been overwhelming. People feel very angry and very hurt—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood): Order! Time having expired, I call the Hon. Ms Lee.

YOUTH SYMPOSIUM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:42): I am delighted to rise to speak about the Youth Symposium which took place at the Adelaide Festival Centre on Friday 21 October 2018. The Youth Symposium is a wonderful youth leadership program. Special thanks to Eugenia Tsoulis OAM, Chief Executive Officer of the Australian Migrant Resource Centre, and Helen Connolly, South Australia's Commissioner for Children and Young People, for their leadership and foresight in working together to co-host the meaningful Youth Symposium: Leading for our Future program.

It was a great honour to represent the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Steven Marshall, to officially launch the Youth Symposium and acknowledge the great work by the AMRC and the Commissioner for Children and Young People. The hardworking AMRC team did an amazing job in encouraging more than 300 young people and stakeholders to attend the symposium.

I would like to acknowledge the working group for the symposium, which included Cynthia Caird, Keith Preston, Alma Ramcilovic and Matti Spellacy, as well as Yasin Hassanyar, Chairperson of Multicultural Youth Link SA. Heartfelt congratulations to Eugenia, Helen and the team for delivering a highly inspiring and engaging symposium. I would also like to thank Major Sumner AM, Ngarrindjeri elder and world-renowned artist and cultural ambassador, for his wonderful welcome to country at the symposium. There were many exceptional speakers at the symposium, and it gives me much pleasure to highlight in parliament today two young leaders with refugee backgrounds.

The first keynote speaker I would like to highlight is a remarkable and articulate young man called Denis Yengi. Denis and his family were forced to flee the civil war in South Sudan when he was seven years old. After crossing the border into northern Uganda on foot, Denis and his family spent 13 years in a UN refugee camp. He arrived in Adelaide and completed year 12 with an award for outstanding achievement in education. He then completed his degree at Flinders University.

Here is a young man who has proven to the world that he can emerge from severe hardship as a refugee to become a qualified CPA through hard work and changing people's perception about refugee youth. Denis is currently a financial consultant with the Department of Primary Industries and Regions. What a great achievement for a young man. Denis delivered a heart-moving speech at the symposium that demonstrated his determination to overcome obstacles and his intellectual capacity to grow and become an influential young leader. Denis certainly made a great impression as the first keynote speaker.

When it was time to welcome the second keynote speaker at the Youth Symposium, the most fitting term to describe Private Kbora Ali is that she is a 'pocket rocket'. When she was introduced as an Army officer from the Australian Defence Force, she caught many by surprise. I will take this opportunity to describe Kbora Ali. She is petite, a beautiful young lady about three to four inches shorter than myself, yet she has the strength of a dragon.

Kbora arrived in Australia in 2007 as a refugee. She was nine years old at the time. Her family spent three years in a refugee camp in Pakistan after fleeing Afghanistan. Despite speaking no English when she arrived in Australia, Kbora excelled academically, receiving an ATAR of 97. Following high school, she received a job offer in real estate, a placement at Flinders University or an offer to join the Army.

Who would have guessed that she has taken the path less travelled, particularly for a young lady who is physically quite petite and also very fashionable. Kbora decided to join the Army and became the first Afghan-Australian woman to do so. She completed intense soldier training in 2016 and became a proud member of the Australian Defence Force. In 2017, Kbora was awarded the Multicultural Youth SA Spirit of Resilience Award as part of Channel 9's Young Achiever Awards.

Private Kborali reminded me of those charming young women from the *Charlie's Angels* movie. She is definitely a pocket rocket, smart, strong, beautiful and did I mention that she is also an international martial arts competitor? Yes, she was a very dynamic and inspiring keynote speaker who nobody will forget in a hurry. On the day, her words, 'I am Private Kborali, at your service,' echoed through the Youth Symposium. Congratulations to all involved at the Youth Symposium.

CONFUCIUS CLASSROOMS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:48): I rise today to talk about the Confucius Institute and the Confucius Classrooms that currently operate in our state. Tonight, I will be hosting a film screening of a documentary by Doris Liu called *In the Name of Confucius*. This documentary documents the Toronto school board's acrimonious battle over the Confucius Classrooms program there. The board in Toronto voted to oust the program after a debate split the local Chinese community.

The documentary follows Sonia Zhao, a Chinese Falun Gong practitioner who came to Canada as a Confucius Institute Mandarin teacher but later sought asylum. Falun Gong is a modern spiritual discipline that is banned in China. I met the film's maker, Doris Liu, earlier this year in this parliament. I was privileged to give her a tour of this parliament, and I am privileged to screen this film in this parliament tonight. At a screening of this film during a New South Wales parliamentary session, she is quoted as saying:

You have to think about what strings are attached, what kind of costs are coming with the free Chinese education provided by Confucius Institutes. Do you really want to sacrifice your academic freedom, human rights and fundamental values to this free education opportunity?

Confucius Institutes in Canada have had teacher contracts that have stipulated that no Falun Gong practitioners would be allowed to work for the institutes and, indeed, as shown in this film tonight that I am screening, Ms Zhao successfully challenged the contract over discrimination under Canada's Human Rights Commission.

The university, McMaster University, later closed that Confucius Institute, becoming the first one in the world to do so. It is not the only such occurrence, though. The institutes have drawn increasing criticism in recent years. About eight universities in the US and Europe have now closed the institutes on their campuses amid concerns they are designed to leverage Beijing's political agenda in western countries and stifle opposing views on issues like Tibet and Taiwan.

While hard evidence of problems around Confucius Institutes has been thin, in February the US FBI director told a Senate inquiry the agency was investigating dozens of US Confucius Institutes over concerns that they are part of covert spying and influence operations. In March, the UK's Conservative Party's Human Rights Commission launched an inquiry into the UK's Confucius Institutes.

Closer to home, we have 14 Confucius Institutes in Australian universities and 67 Confucius Classrooms in our schools. In South Australia, we have one Confucius Institute at the University of

Adelaide, two Confucius Classrooms in our state's public schools, being at Salisbury High and Plympton International College, and one Confucius Classroom in the private sector in CBC.

Many are aware of the good work that the Confucius Institutes and Classrooms do, and they do do good work, but what we are not aware of and what New South Wales has now paid great attention to—the New South Wales education department has placed the Confucius Classrooms under review at present—is what the hiring processes are and what the contracts involve with the delivery of these programs in our state public schools and state institutions.

There has been a lot of talk lately about religious freedom and our teaching staff. That freedom goes so far, but when that freedom is restricted in our public schools, I think we should be paying attention. Certainly, that has been the case in Canada. The contracts for Confucius Classrooms and Confucius Institutes so far seem to be replicated exactly and precisely around the world, so it would be naive to consider that what occurred in Canada is not occurring here.

I urge all members of this council to pay attention to what is happening in our schools and ensure that religious freedoms are defended no matter who we are talking about. That certainly includes Falun Gong practitioners, who will join me tonight for what is no doubt going to be a thought-provoking panel.

I am encouraged that this screening will go ahead in this parliament, because in other places around Australia screenings have been shut down at universities that have Confucius Institutes. I do not want to see that replicated in South Australia. I want to ensure that we do all we can to ensure that there is not such discriminatory practices going on in our state schools with regard to the religious freedoms of our teaching staff.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:53): I rise to address an important issue that has arisen recently in the national media about the building of the newly awarded submarines, which are to be the Shortfin Barracuda designed by the French company DCNS.

The Senate was originally established by our nation's founding fathers as a buffer to be used by smaller states to ensure that the House of Representatives and the majority of its members of parliament from the bigger states could not dominate the national agenda. This is why South Australia has the same number of senators as New South Wales or Victoria. While the establishment of formal political parties has blurred some of these lines, it is fair to say that across the party divide our state's senators try to work in the best interests of South Australia, and multipartisanship is normally reached on issues of strategic importance to our state.

It has been extremely disappointing to learn that we have four senators—Senator Rex Patrick, Senator Stirling Griff, Senator Cory Bernardi and Senator Tim Storer—casting doubt on the awarding of this contract back in 2016. Since then, Australia's defence department and its French counterparts have been working on a strategic partnership agreement. This agreement is to iron out the specific details of the build, including what will happen with the sustainment of the submarines.

Senator Patrick, in particular, through an opinion piece in *The Advertiser* on 2 October 2018, was vocal in his criticism of this agreement, arguing that for \$20 billion Australia could have had 20 submarines off the shelf. What this would do is deny hundreds of South Australians at Techport the work they have been expecting in building the submarines from scratch as opposed to simply attaching a few components onto an already built sub. The arguments about whether to buy off the shelf or go with a new build were already furnished before the awarding of the contract.

Why are these senators raising this issue again to the potential detriment of hundreds or thousands of jobs in South Australia? The four senators have also raised a concern about the overall cost of the project, with reports from the Australian Strategic Policy Institute inflating the total cost to \$200 billion. They claim that outside of the \$50 billion for the build, another \$50 billion will be spent in sustainment and another \$100 billion spent in constant dollars.

It is disappointing that we have South Australian senators framing these costs in these terms without considering the long-term economic benefits to South Australia, which come with many years of sustainment at the Osborne shipyards. It has also been made clear on numerous occasions and was again reported by Tory Shepherd in *The Advertiser* on 3 October that, and I quote:

Extensive investigations and multiple defence experts said there was no off-the-shelf option that would meet Australia's needs, and the modifications needed to get them up to scratch would be so extensive it would be better to get a new submarine.

The Chief Executive Officer of the Defence Teaming Centre, Ms Margot Forster, stated in response to our four senators:

Anything that delays the awarding of contracts and the beginning of the flow of work and jobs and cash is going to be a bad thing.

At the moment, industry is working to a timeline that's been advised by the government to build up their capability to deliver. If that is then delayed it throws all of those plans into chaos and could drive businesses out of business.

With Western Australia clamouring to get more of the sustainment work for the current Collins Class submarines, now is not the time for our senators to be demonstrating any weaknesses out of South Australia to Canberra.

Parliamentary Committees

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE: INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (INVESTIGATION POWERS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:59): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Investigative Powers) Amendment Bill, be noted.

As a brief summary of the basis for this inquiry, I note that on 10 May 2018 the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Investigation Powers) Amendment Bill, which I will refer to as 'the bill', was introduced in the other place and passed on 30 May without amendment.

Following debate, on 26 July 2018 it was resolved by this house to withdraw the bill and to refer it to the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee for report and recommendations. It was further resolved that it be an instruction to the committee to report by no later than 4 September this year. The House of Assembly concurred with that instruction; however, it was later amended by further resolution of this house to require the committee to report by no later than 20 September. The House of Assembly again concurred.

The bill seeks to remove the requirement for the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, known as ICAC, to conduct investigations into potential issues of serious or systemic misconduct or maladministration in public administration pursuant to the powers of an inquiry agency under the ICAC Act, which is currently defined to be the Ombudsman. The bill further seeks to provide for the ICAC to conduct such inquiries pursuant to powers to be set out by way of insertion of proposed schedule 3A into the ICAC Act. The commissioner is to be provided with the power, if satisfied that it is in the public interest to do so, to conduct public inquiries.

It is also proposed that schedule 3A is to set out the manner in which the inquiries are to be conducted and the matters of which the commissioner must be satisfied in respect of what is deemed to be public interest.

On Saturday 11 August 2018, the committee advertised the inquiry in *The Advertiser*, *The Australian*, and *The Australian Financial Review*. Correspondence was sent to 17 individuals and organisations inviting submissions to the inquiry. The committee received five submissions to the inquiry, which can be accessed via the committee's web page. Six public hearings were held by the committee, and the full transcripts of the evidence taken are also published on our web page.

The submissions and evidence raised 19 key issues, as identified by the committee, and each of those matters are addressed separately in the report, which has been tabled in this place. The committee noted that not all issues raised in the submissions and evidence are addressed directly by the bill and that not all issues raised are subject to findings or recommendations.

The committee considered that it may be more appropriate to address a number of issues, particularly those not addressed by the bill, at a later date and with the benefit of having considered further evidence. This was also considered appropriate given the limited time available to the committee in which to report in respect of the inquiry.

As a result of the submissions and evidence received, the committee made eight recommendations. I shall discuss each of them briefly. The committee sought to balance the rights of the people involved in such investigations with the capacity of the commissioner to conduct them effectively.

Recommendation one recommended that the bill be amended to state expressly that an inquiry into potential issues of serious or systemic misconduct or maladministration in public administration is to be conducted in private until it is determined that it is to be conducted in public. It was recognised that, although the bill as drafted was likely to have that effect in any case, it was preferred out of a desire for completeness to set out an express statement of this intent.

Recommendation two proposed amendments to the bill to require the commissioner, where it is intended to conduct a public hearing, to give written notification of his intention to persons that may reasonably be required to give evidence to the inquiry or any person whose rights or interests may be affected by the evidence given. It was recommended that the notice must set out the reasons for the decision to conduct the inquiry in public and must be given no later than 21 days prior to the commencement of the inquiry. The committee also recommended that, where the power of the commissioner to conduct a public inquiry is in question, specified persons may apply to the Supreme Court to determine the question.

The committee's third recommendation proposed that the provisions of the bill providing for the making of orders to suppress the publication of evidence be amended to expressly provide that applications for such orders can be made and that where any decision in relation to such orders is in question applications may also be made to the Supreme Court to determine the question.

Recommendation four recommended amending the bill to provide for persons to be entitled to legal representation during examinations, whether they be conducted in public or in private. The committee also recommended that a discretion be provided so that persons who are not giving evidence at an examination, whose rights or interests may be affected by evidence given, be entitled to appear before the examination and to be legally represented. Legal representatives should be entitled to be heard by the commissioner or the person heading the investigation regarding the decisions and processes of the investigation.

The committee's fifth recommendation proposed to amend the bill to provide that any persons required to give evidence to an examination or to produce in the course of an examination any statement, document, or other thing be afforded the privilege against self-incrimination. It was accepted that the privilege is a fundamental common law right and the committee particularly considered that it was not appropriate to abrogate the privilege in respect of inquiries into potential issues of misconduct or maladministration.

Recommendation six recommended that clause 4 of the proposed schedule 3A be amended to state clearly that the clause is not intended to displace any right to procedural fairness or natural justice. The clause proposed that a person heading an investigation into matters addressed by the bill is not to be bound by the rules or practice of any court or tribunal as to procedure or evidence. Out of an abundance of caution, the committee considered that an amendment of this nature would bring beyond doubt the applicability of these common law rights.

The seventh recommendation suggested amendment to aspects of clause 6 to proposed schedule 3A, purely for the sake of clarity. The clause proposes to set out the applicability of legal professional privilege in relation to investigations, and the committee did not take issue with the apparent intent of the clause. It was, however, considered to be insufficiently clear, and may benefit from rewording.

The final recommendation of the committee provided its support for the proposed amendments to the bill as filed by the Treasurer, the Hon. Robert Lucas, subject to consideration of the recommendations of the committee, and also the amendments filed by the Hon Mr Parnell.

In conclusion, the committee would like to thank its executive officer, Mr Ben Cranwell, who I must say did an outstanding job in a very limited amount of time that we had, including meeting at unusual times for a parliamentary committee such as 8am commencements. He certainly provided great assistance to the committee in bringing this inquiry to a conclusion in the time available.

I would also like to thank the other members of the committee for their contributions to the inquiry. It was a lot of work done in a fairly short time but, in particular, the Hon Justin Hanson; the Hon, Frank Pangallo; the member for West Torrens, the Hon Tom Koutsantonis; the member for Kavel, Mr Dan Cregan; the member for Narungga, Mr Fraser Ellis; and a former member of the committee, the member for MacKillop, Mr Nick McBride. Each member made a valuable contribution to deliberations of the committee and they have my personal thanks. I commend the report to the council.

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

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2017

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:07): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2017, be noted.

I rise to present the Legislative Review Committee's Annual Report 2017 on behalf of the committee. As with other similar parliamentary committees in Australia, a key function of the Legislative Review Committee is to undertake a technical review of regulations, rules and by-laws that are tabled in the parliament each year. The committee has adopted scrutiny principles to guide this technical review, for example, whether regulations rules and by-laws tabled in the parliament unduly trespass on rights previously established by law.

In 2017, the committee reviewed 346 regulations, 23 court rules, four other rules and 59 by-laws against these principles. The majority of these instruments tabled in the parliament in 2017 raise no issues in relation to the committee's scrutiny principles. However, the committee did identify errors in four regulations which required further legislation to fix. The committee also sought information from government agencies and others in relation to another 18 regulations. The committee's annual report provides a brief summary of issues raised by the committee in the year, and the outcome of the committee's investigations.

The committee's reviews of regulations rules and by-laws is an important check on laws made by a delegated authority. This, in turn, can and does influence the practices adopted by government agencies and others involved in the making of these instruments. For example, the committee's review of the early commencement of regulations has seen a notable reduction in the frequency of certificates for early commencement, from close to 95 per cent in the committee's 2015 annual report to 84 per cent in 2017.

While still high, the committee's report details a range of reasons why so many regulations commence earlier than four months after a regulation is made. These reasons include the annual increase of fees and charges and regulations as part of the state budget. In addition to the committee's technical review of regulations, rules and by-laws, the committee also undertakes inquiries into particular legislative matters.

On 4 July 2017, the committee was pleased to table in both houses of parliament a report of its inquiry into the operation and impact of the Graffiti Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2013 amendments to the Graffiti Control Act 2001. On 31 October 2017, the committee also tabled a report of an inquiry that reviewed the committee's 2014 report into the partial defence of provocation.

During the year, the committee also commenced an inquiry into the regulation of parking and traffic movement in South Australia. At the end of the reporting period the inquiry was ongoing. I thank the members of the committee for their work in 2017. I also thank the diligent and hardworking committee staff for their service during the year, and I commend the report to the council.

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

Condolence

KENIHAN, MR Q.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (16:11): I move:

That this council expresses its deep regret at the death of Quentin Kenihan, and pays tribute to his significant contribution to the South Australian community.

It was with shock and sadness that South Australia woke up to the news that Quentin Kenihan had passed away on the weekend of 7 October. Quentin was well known to so many of us, whether or not we had met him personally.

The Premier has described Quentin as one of South Australia's favourite sons. He was also genuinely a local Adelaide celebrity, given that most people knew him immediately by sight and, of course, need only refer to him by his first name, a la Kylie or Madonna.

My first memories of Quentin will be similar to many people: that remarkable interview he did with journalist Mike Willesee when he was aged just seven years old. Quentin's responses throughout the interview were witty, demonstrated a wisdom beyond his years, and at times were quite cheeky. His performance made him a household name.

Through his own account, his journey to adulthood was challenging, but he pulled himself out of the dark times, got a job and pursued his passion in the arts, particularly film, comedy and television. He even wrote a book about it, entitled *Not All Superheroes Wear Capes*. He appeared on the *Midday* show and *The Panel* and had his own television show *Quentin Crashes*. To celebrate his 40th birthday he put on a Fringe show, *Quentin, I'm 40...Now What?*

Many people will recall his film reviews on local radio. He developed his own rating system by awarding a certain number of 'claws', which I must admit I never quite got the grasp of, but I always enjoyed those contributions as I admired his analytical approach to the reviews and the fact that he did not hold back in any way.

The highlight of his career was his pivotal appearance as the character Corpus Colossus in the George Lucas blockbuster, *Mad Max: Fury Road*, alongside Charlize Theron. He attended the Oscars, was a personal friend of Russell Crowe and has been photographed with Angelina Jolie and Samuel L. Jackson. Not bad for a boy from Adelaide!

I have deliberately avoided referring to Quentin's disability so far. Quentin showed us that disability could not get in the way of his life. Quentin was born with a congenital condition, osteogenesis imperfecta, commonly known as brittle bone disease. He was born with eight broken bones and he was to suffer many more throughout his lifetime. He got about in a motorised wheelchair, and he was well recognised as he hooned about the streets of Adelaide.

He put up his hand for the upcoming Adelaide city council elections, and had been out campaigning in the days leading up his death. In his platform was his desire to see an inclusive playground in the city, which is something that has been embraced by both levels of government and which we look forward to progressing with the newly-elected council.

Quentin was indeed an ambassador for South Australia's first inclusive playground, the Hendrie Street playground in Parkholme. There are many elements to the playground, which took several years to come to fruition. Quentin was instrumental in the development of a wheelchair-accessible track. The park's description on the City of Marion council's website describes it rather mildly as:

A ramped and twisting 40m bike track...in the north-western corner of the playground. The ramped and hilly mounds make this circuit a more challenging-than average track.

However, I think Quentin's brief would have been more about providing for risk-taking for wheelchair users. As a state and as a community, I hope that our vision for people with disabilities will continue to extend through initiatives such as inclusive playgrounds and providing purpose-built homes for people with disability, especially as South Australia comes into the full scheme of the National Disability Insurance Scheme.

The Disability Inclusion Act, started by the former government and the first piece of legislation passed under the new government, has at its heart full citizenship for people with disabilities. Each government agency and local governments in this state will all be required to produce disability action and inclusion plans. Implementation of inclusion in all of the spaces that we share will ensure that people with disabilities are able to lead their most fulfilling lives through exercising their choices.

A commemorative service will be held on Sunday 28 October, which will be jointly hosted by the South Australian government and the Adelaide city council. In the words of Quentin's sister, Sia,

he would have wanted a big celebration. Our thoughts at this time are with his family, friends and many fans.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:16): I thank the honourable member for her contribution and for bringing this to our chamber. It was a sad day for South Australia when Quentin Kenihan passed away. We lost a true community advocate. I did not have the pleasure of knowing Quentin personally but, like other South Australians, I knew of Quentin through his appearances in public advocacy, both on and off the screen.

Quentin first came to the attention of South Australians when, as a child, he defied medical boundaries when it became clear that brittle bone disease would make life almost impossible to bear. Honourable members may have seen Mike Willesee's 1982 documentary, which introduced him to Australia. It showed that Quentin was determined, from a young age, to not let brittle bone disease define him. Many would struggle to achieve what Quentin did in his crowded 43 years, where he became not only an advocate of bringing down barriers but a change maker.

Quentin was an actor, writer, commentator, disability advocate and of course a champion for the vulnerable in our community. Quentin's wit and unique take on life was adored by Australians. It is nothing but commendable when a person can turn adversity into positive change for others. Quentin was taking on his next challenge of inspiring and taking down barriers by running as a candidate in the City of Adelaide council election. Among the many flyers filling up my letterbox, I was warmed to receive Quentin's, as I am sure were many in the community.

He highlighted the need to address safety by addressing traffic issues, pedestrian and motorist safety, homelessness, violence in nightclub areas and much more. It is a loss to the Adelaide community that Quentin's next challenge was cut short. His passing came as a shock to his close friends because he had often been in hospital and had previously been sicker than he was this time. It is important that we remember, as Quentin has taught us, that challenges are not barriers.

On behalf of the opposition in the Legislative Council, I welcome the government's endorsement of Quentin's call for an accessible play space. That is a win for Quentin, and it is also a win for vulnerable South Australians. To his friends and carers, to his parents Myles and Kerry and to his extended family, we offer our sincere condolences and our thanks for his unique wit and contribution to our community.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:19): I thank the honourable member for bringing this matter forward. I will speak just briefly, off-the-cuff, about my experiences with Quentin. I actually knew Quentin's parents, particularly his dad, who was a journalist at *The Advertiser* many years ago. He was a very smart and intelligent bloke, and a very good writer as well. He clearly passed on his talents to his son, Quentin.

When Quentin passed away, I remember feeling a sense of shock about it, because only a few weeks before I had sent him a message wishing him all the best for his candidacy for the Adelaide city council. I thought he would do a great job for it. It started to remind me about what a brave little bloke he was. In fact, he is probably the bravest person that I have met, because of what he had to endure for 43 years.

I do not think many people realise the sort of pain that Quentin had to endure because of his condition, the brittle bones condition. He was often in and out of hospital, but he would always have a very positive outlook on life when you bumped into him. If he was in the street with his wheelchair, there was always a smile on his face; he was very chirpy. He could be grumpy; I remember there were some times when he could be grumpy.

Quentin was also a bloke who, despite his disability, loved life. He lived life as if he was an ordinary person, an ordinary bloke, growing up. He loved a drink at one point, and of course he had to battle his own demons as a result of that. He certainly loved the social life, and you would often see him in the city scooting around and really enjoying himself.

I want to get back to his talents. For a guy who had to face so many challenges in his life, Quentin was able to achieve so much. He could write. He prepared a production for the Fringe, which

was quite successful. He contributed to so many things. He was very active in the disabled community, as the Hon. Michelle Lensink pointed out regarding the disability playground. I remember when we were at *Today Tonight* we were approached by Quentin and others who wanted to get some support for this. He was so passionate about ensuring that kids who had disabilities would not miss out on the fun. One thing that always strikes me about Quentin's life is that he tried to have fun.

I remember we had him in the studio. It may have been when the nominations were announced for *Mad Max*. Of course, Quentin had a bit role in that. I think you may well have read in the newspapers and in the column by Matt Abraham that he was going to be killed off so many times, but the producer decided to keep Quentin in there.

We had Quentin in the studio and we had a great little chat afterwards, and he was certainly looking forward to Hollywood and the Oscars. Then he whispered in my ear, 'I've got a secret for you.' I said, 'What's that?' He said, 'The producer of the movie is going to make another one. He is going to make another *Mad Max*.' I said, 'That's fantastic. What about you? Are you going to be in it?' He said, 'Yes, yes. He has a role for me. I am really looking forward to it.'

Of course, we saw those scenes where he made his way there. Again, it showed the spirit of the guy, that nothing could stop Quentin doing what he wanted to do in life and achieving so many things. I think he himself would admit that he was quite lucky and fortunate to get to 43 years of age, but what a life Quentin has led and what a legacy he has left for a lot of people who knew him. He will not be forgotten. I think it is great that the Premier has announced that they will find funding for the playground, and in fact that it will also be named after him.

He deserves to be feted. He has managed to do a lot of good for a lot of people in the community, particularly in the disabled community. I think he was one of the little icons of Adelaide. It is strange to think that he is not still here, because we always expected that Quentin would still be with us somehow and we would always see him. What pleases me the most is that his memory lives on, and it will continue to live on with that playground. I send his family condolences on behalf of myself and also my colleague Connie Bonaros, and I thank the member for the condolence motion today.

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

Motions

DIWALI FESTIVAL

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:25): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the Diwali festival which will run from 5 to 9 November and especially the main celebrations of the third day which will take place on 7 November;
2. Recognises the deep importance of Diwali to the Indian community of South Australia and especially those of the Hindu, Sikh and Jain faiths;
3. Recognises the importance of those of Indian descent in South Australia and their ongoing contributions to our great state;
4. Notes the important message of Diwali, which focuses on the triumph of good over evil, knowledge over ignorance and light over dark;
5. Encourages all members of parliament to take the message of Diwali to heart and to ensure they strive to enlighten the world through their works and continue their fight against evil; and
6. Wishes those celebrating this festival a happy and safe Diwali.

It is my privilege to move this motion and also recognise and acknowledge the significance of the Diwali Festival to our Indian community in South Australia. The festivities are a highlight of my social calendar, and I cannot wait to attend this year's event and enjoy the Festival of Lights. The celebration lasts for five days and is celebrated on the 13th day of the lunar month Ashvina to the second day of Karttika, acknowledging the abundance of the autumn harvest.

On the third day, the diyas (or lamps) are lit to symbolise the triumph of good over evil, which inspires the name 'Diwali', which translates into 'the festival of lights'. Diwali also celebrates the

goddesses Lakshmi, Kali and Saraswati for their gracious nature. The evening of Diwali is dedicated to Lakshmi, whose blessing is believed to be essential for a peaceful, faithful and prosperous life. The day before Diwali is dedicated to Mahakali, whose strength helps to maintain wealth. Diwali itself is dedicated to the goddess Saraswati, who assists in the battle against ignorance.

Other gods and goddesses are prayed to, depending on the region in India. Sikhs and Hindus celebrate Diwali. In northern India, the return of Rama, Sita, Lakshmana and Hanuman to the city of Ayodhya after they were exiled for 14 years is celebrated, because it marks the beginning of Rama's rule. The citizens of Ayodhya were said to have awaited the return of Rama, their beloved prince, and they lit thousands of lamps to guide Rama to the city. Thus, the darkest night of the year was transformed into a glorious morning.

In the Sikh tradition, Diwali is recognised as the time Guru Hargobind returned to Amritsar from captivity in Gwalior. Those in Amritsar are said to have lighted lamps throughout the city to celebrate the return of the guru. While known as the Festival of Lights, these are diverse celebrations, as it is a time when merchants perform religious ceremonies and open new account books. It is a time for wearing new clothes and is also a time for visiting and exchanging gifts, cleaning and decorating, feasting, and holding fireworks displays.

Our ever growing and diverse South Australian Indian community have brought wonderful benefits to our state. I believe it is important for this chamber to recognise this festival, in part as a way of acknowledging the vast contribution the Indian community has made and is making in South Australia. I encourage members of this chamber to go to their local communities and find their nearest temple or Indian association.

They will all be celebrating Diwali, and I encourage members to join in the festivities. Enjoy their food, their song, their dance and their colours. They will be only too willing to embrace you. This way, you will have a much greater appreciation of the contributions made by the South Australian Indian community. In closing, I wish the best of luck to those partaking in celebrations and wish everyone a happy and safe Diwali.

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

SA PATHOLOGY AND SA MEDICAL IMAGING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:29): I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging, with particular reference to—
 - (a) the importance of high standards of safety and quality in the provision of pathology and imaging services;
 - (b) the importance of timeliness in the provision of pathology and imaging services and the impact of delayed results on patient outcomes and the broader South Australian health system;
 - (c) the importance of South Australian-based research and teaching associated with pathology and imaging services;
 - (d) the importance of access to pathology and medical imaging services in primary health, including the role of SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging in ensuring accessibility of health care and the provision of bulk-billed services;
 - (e) staff workloads within SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging and the impact of unsafe workloads on staff health and wellbeing and the quality of service provided;
 - (f) the impact of the 2018 state budget in regard to SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging, including the impact on staff, the quality of service provision, patient outcomes, teaching and research;
 - (g) the effects of potential privatisation of SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging as foreshadowed in the 2018 state budget, including the impact on staff, the quality of service provision, patient outcomes, teaching and research; and
 - (h) any other 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.

Today, I rise to move this motion to establish a select committee to inquire into and report on SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging. In South Australia, clinicians, doctors, nurses and, most importantly, patients have access to world-class hospitals and healthcare providers. Importantly, South Australia's diverse and sophisticated network is linked to public health providers like SA Pathology, who are recognised for their high standards of medical testing and research.

SA Pathology provides our doctors with the vital information they need to assess and treat patients, handling thousands of samples a week from emergency departments, GPs, intensive care and maternity units. SA Pathology operates in public hospitals across South Australia, ensuring that vital test results are made available to patients in a timely manner. Having pathologists and doctors work as a team to manage patients reduces the risk of incorrect diagnosis and cuts the time spent by patients in hospitals.

The recent state budget is threatening to unravel this sophisticated network. The health and wellbeing of South Australians depends on services like SA Pathology. In the government's first state budget, it has cut \$105 million from SA Pathology, with plans to privatise the vital health services and SA Medical Imaging. The government is also cutting 880 SA Health jobs. There was little to no consultation with SA Pathology staff about any changes, and the Premier himself promised before the election that the Liberal Party did not have a privatisation agenda.

We need this committee to thoroughly scrutinise what is being proposed and make sure that the government is not going to put profits before patients. If the government is confident in their proposal, then they would have no fears about this scrutiny. They have promised to be an open and accountable government. Destroying the connection between SA Pathology, public hospitals and GPs through privatisation could result in tests being centralised or, worse, sent interstate. The transport of samples between sites could sometimes increase the risk of errors and delayed diagnoses.

SA Pathology undertakes the most complex pathology work in South Australia, and private labs cannot compete with this. In fact, private labs send their samples to SA Pathology to manage. Regional South Australians could see longer delays in getting results for blood and other tests as their samples might be sent interstate. Privatising vital public services could impact all South Australians, and we should never put profits before the health and wellbeing of South Australians.

The community deserves answers about what effects the potential privatisation of SA Pathology and SA Medical Imaging could have on the quality of service they provide not only to patients but through teaching and research. I feel this is a timely matter as it has the potential to impact the health and wellbeing of South Australians, and that is why I seek the chamber's support to vote on this motion to establish a select committee on Wednesday 7 November. I ask that this chamber support this motion, and I look forward to working with my honourable colleagues.

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

CHILD PROTECTION WORKERS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:34): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that child protection workers dedicate their careers to caring for our state's most vulnerable people;
2. Acknowledges that the safety of these children and young people is of paramount consideration but, to provide safe environments, child protection workers must also be safe;

3. Notes the key recommendation from the Nyland royal commission which recognised the substantial risk associated with staff working in single-handed shifts and recommended that single-handed shifts be abandoned; and
4. Calls on the government to abandon single-handed shifts to increase the safety of children in care and to improve safety for child protection workers.

The motion supports the campaign by child protection staff and the Public Service union, supporting them to highlight the need for two child protection workers to be on staff and working in a residential care setting.

SA-Best supports child protection workers in their campaign for added safety both for children and staff, and calls on the government to support this campaign. Child protection workers dedicate their careers to caring for our state's most vulnerable children. It is a tough job, and with it comes a great amount of responsibility to maintain the care and wellbeing of our most neglected, vulnerable children with complex needs.

Whilst child protection staff place the safety of children as being of paramount importance, similarly the safety of child protection workers must also be secured. Currently, staff in residential care work on a 24/7 roster with eight-hour shifts and 10-minute handovers. Ten-minute handovers are woefully inadequate. It is common for workers to be rostered on their own for a shift. What this motion is trying to address is that this is simply unacceptable. It leaves children open for exploitation and leaves the child protection officer at risk as well in certain circumstances.

We know only too well how things can go horribly wrong. The murder of outback nurse Gayle Woodford prompted legislation to protect remote nurses' safety. Known as Gayle's law, the legislation protects nurses by preventing them from working solo in remote areas. Similarly, the Child Protection Systems Royal Commission was prompted by the heinous crimes of Shannon McCoolle, who I have spoken about several times in this place now. The royal commission examined systemic failures in the child protection system that allowed McCoolle to repeatedly abuse vulnerable children in state care that he, and he alone, had access to.

Most of McCoolle's crimes are too heinous to report in detail and were described as evil, sickening and depraved by the judge who sentenced him to 35 years' jail. The royal commission resulted in the Nyland report, entitled 'The life they deserve', which made a number of important recommendations. We have seen many of those recommendations implemented. However, recommendations remain that have not been implemented.

In the 'The life they deserve' report, Commissioner Nyland stated that rotational care, where children are cared for by adults who are employees and work on a shift basis, is, and I quote:

...developmentally inappropriate for most children and is a poor substitute for the care provided in a loving family home.

And:

The risks of sexual abuse in rotational care have been well known by the Agency for many years.

Commissioner Nyland went on to report:

Children in institutional care are especially vulnerable to sexual abuse, and if they are to stay safe, this risk must be addressed. Children and infants who are too young to understand what is happening to them, or for whatever reason are unable to complain, rely on the presence of consistent and attentive caregivers who understand when they feel secure and well, and when they do not. There are difficulties in providing this security in a rotational care environment.

Single-handed shifts by residential care workers should be abandoned. This too will take time and depends on building the number and capacity of the workforce significantly.

The McCoolle case study showed up gaps in the knowledge of workers about the behaviour of child sex offenders and responses of children to sexual abuse. It highlighted a dangerous naivety about the risks to children in rotational care.

Abandoning single-handed shifts will cost significant money in building the number and capacity of staff, but when it comes to the safety and care of our most vulnerable children and the staff entrusted to protect and care for them, the government should not hesitate a moment longer.

As of August this year, there are 3,710 children in out-of-home care in South Australia; 429 of those children are in residential care. We need to look at different ways of doing things, because the status quo clearly is not working for our kids.

Last month the New South Wales government announced that it will pay specialised foster carers \$75,000 a year to temporarily look after children with complex needs through an outsourced US-developed care program. The program to be delivered by a private not-for-profit company, OzChild, will be funded for a two-year trial with \$4.87 million from the New South Wales government.

The US-developed program, Treatment Foster Care Oregon (TFCO) targets children who are experiencing multiple placement breakdowns in foster care or who are not able to be moved into foster care from residential care because of their behavioural and emotional problems, often resulting from trauma and neglect.

It is expected that about 30 children, aged between seven and 17, will go through the six to 12-month program over the two-year period with the first placed with a carer by December this year. Once a child has been placed, carers will receive 24-hour support from specialists, including child therapists, family therapists and skills coaches. At the same time case managers work with the child's birth family or a permanent carer that they will ideally return to at the end of the placement. The goal of the innovative program is to reunite children with their birth families or longer-term carers. The New South Wales Minister for Family and Community Services Pru Goward said:

...that there are some children in out of home care with incredibly complicated behaviours—these children often need intensive support so they can thrive through childhood and adolescence.

OzChild is one of the state's biggest providers of out-of-home care and has also run the TFCO program for children in Victoria for the past 18 months, while Anglicare ran it for adolescents. It will run both age groups in New South Wales. These sorts of programs are a step in the right direction. They place the best interests of the child at the forefront. A child's health and wellbeing must always be the paramount consideration.

We know that children in foster care consistently showed better experiences and outcomes than children in residential care. Children should not be raised in facilities but in homes. I think there is a recent report showing that the cost of raising children in foster care arrangements as opposed to these residential homes—there is absolutely no comparison. I think the costs of the residential homes was in excess of \$600,000 a year, whilst the cost of a foster care home was more around the \$35,000 mark. Ultimately, we can see that cost of \$600,000, especially given the numbers in South Australia, is just not sustainable.

Whilst these programs are a step in the right direction and must be considered by the Marshall government, child protection policy still needs to concentrate on reunification policies and building up kinship networks for Indigenous children who are an overrepresented cohort of children taken into care. The government needs to acknowledge that South Australia's child protection system is not achieving the best outcome for children and is unsustainable.

Escalating costs of the system are crisis-driven and reactionary. Money, energy and policy needs to be focused on early intervention strategies to keep vulnerable at-risk families together. Our child protection system is failing to improve long-term outcomes for children and families with complex needs.

The cost of providing out-of-home-care has risen dramatically since the government began outsourcing responsibility to non-government organisations. It is a sad indictment that the Marshall government believes that early intervention is the purview of the Minister for Education. This was confirmed by the Hon. Michelle Lensink in answer to questions raised by the Hon. Tammy Franks during debate on the Children and Young People (Safety) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill last month.

Clearly, early intervention is in the purview of the Minister for Child Protection and not the Minister for Education. This is the case in other states and it is time that the Marshall government got on board. If the purview of the Minister for Child Protection is only for children who have been removed from their families and placed in care, then it is a very myopic view of what child protection should encompass, and by then it is too late for many families. It represents a siloed approach to

issues that are achingly interrelated and would achieve better outcomes for families if they were under the same ministerial umbrella.

A recent report was published by Anglicare Tasmania entitled *Breaking the Cycle: Supporting Tasmanian parents to prevent recurrent child removals*. The report, which my office has provided to Minister Sanderson's advisers, documents the prevalence and experiences of Tasmanian parents who have children recurrently removed by Child Safety Services, and the experiences of the services that support them.

Through research which formed the basis of the report, garnered from interviews with 15 parents and over 80 service providers and documenting the experience of removal and its consequences for parents, the report examines the current service network and its capacity to support them and reviews interventions which are being deployed in other jurisdictions, both nationally and internationally, to break this cycle of recurrent removals.

The findings from this research into recurrent removals sits alongside a partner project, 'In limbo', which examines in detail the material consequences of child removal for families by exploring income and housing barriers and how to prevent these consequences from forming an obstacle to successful reunification for families.

The report makes for sobering reading and provide a series of sensible recommendations which should be considered by the minister. With those words, I commend the motion to the house and hope that it is supported.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee.

ADELAIDE FILM FESTIVAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:45): I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the Adelaide Film Festival being held from 10 to 21 October;
2. Recognises the opportunity to showcase South Australia and Australian filmmakers, performers, directors, production companies and the South Australian Film Corporation;
3. Notes the number of high-quality films at the 2018 event, particularly *Hotel Mumbai* and *The Nightingale*;
4. Encourages the South Australian government to have the Adelaide Film Festival as an annual event; and
5. Calls on the government to reverse \$3 million in funding cuts to arts programs and institutions announced in the 2018 budget.

The Adelaide Film Festival is rapidly becoming an iconic event in the world of the arts and cinema. *Variety* magazine puts our festival in its top 50 unmissable film festivals; that is a fabulous endorsement for an event that is only 15 years old. Hopefully one day soon it will reach the status of other celebrated international events like Cannes, Toronto, Venice, Berlin, Tribeca and Sundance. There is no reason why it should not, going by the quality of films Australia produces annually.

South Australia has outstanding and award-winning talent in the fields of acting, writing, directing, cinematography, editing, sound, post-production and computer-generated effects by internationally recognised companies Rising Sun Pictures and Kojo. Our state has a long and distinguished history in film and television production. In the 1970s, thanks to some bold visionaries in the arts and politics, the South Australian Film Corporation was established, with studios at the old Philips site at Hendon.

A succession of high quality movies followed—to name just some of the hits: *Sunday Too Far Away*, *Picnic at Hanging Rock*, *Storm Boy*, *The Club*, *Breaker Morant*, *Mad Max Beyond Thunderdome* and, one of my favourites, *Gallipoli*, in which my one and only film experience as an extra, in the famous ballroom scene, shot in the magnificent marble hall at the railway station, ended up on the cutting room floor.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Such an iconic movie, and I ended up on the cutting room floor! There followed more contemporary titles like *The Babadook*, *The Rover*, *Wolf Creek*, *52 Tuesdays*, *Snowtown*, *Red Dog* and of course Scott Hicks' *Shine*, which won a swag of awards including an Oscar for its star Geoffrey Rush.

The South Australian Film Corporation has showcased extraordinary acting talent. Geoffrey Rush, Judy Davis, Helen Morse, Jackie Weaver, Russell Crowe, Jack Thompson, Bryan Brown, Sam Neill and Anthony LaPaglia, and Hollywood has now beckoned for Tilda Cobham-Hervey and Teresa Palmer. There have been stand-out film directors like Rolf de Heer and Scott Hicks, who got his first break as a teenager in a road movie shot around Port Adelaide called *Freedom*.

Now we can add another to that list: Anthony Maras. Anthony, the youngest son of well-known property developer Theo Maras, is the director, writer and editor on *Hotel Mumbai*, which opened the 2018 film festival last week with its stars, acclaimed actor Dev Patel, Armie Hammer and Adelaide's rising star Tilda Cobham-Hervey. I can highly recommend this film. It is a gripping suspense thriller likely to pick up a swag of awards and almost entirely shot at the South Australian Film Corporation's new Glenside studios, which were converted to look like the lavish interiors of Mumbai's Taj Mahal Palace Hotel, which was attacked by terrorists 10 years ago.

Another featured film attracting huge attention here and overseas, particularly in Venice this year where it won the Special Jury Prize, is *The Nightingale*. Indigenous Australian actor Baykali Ganambarr won the Marcello Mastroianni Award for the best young actor at the festival for his role in the film, which received financial support from Screen Australia, the ADL Film Fest Fund, the South Australian Film Corporation and Screen Tasmania.

Enthusiastic and hardworking festival director Amanda Duthie has put together an exciting, eclectic program of feature-length films, shorts and documentaries. It runs until 21 October at various venues around the city and suburbs. There is something there for all cinematic tastes and I am informed ticket sales are strong and screenings are getting lots of bums on seats. The festival has been a biannual event since its inception in 2002, focusing strongly on local productions and it also features several overseas entries. This year is no exception.

It is the first Australian film festival to introduce an international competition in three categories, and the first to invest directly in film production through the ADL Film Fest Fund, which has delivered 100 projects including *The Nightingale*, which I mentioned earlier. These projects, from feature fiction, documentaries, shorts and TV series to interactive, augmented and virtual reality, have been screened internationally at other major festivals, winning over 100 international and 188 national awards. They have picked up gongs from Cannes, Venice, Toronto, Berlin and Sundance, an Emmy and three Australian nominations for the Academy Award for Best Foreign Language Film. I am tipping *Hotel Mumbai* or *The Nightingale* may well be the one this year.

Our film festival is an outstanding success story. Credit should go to former premier, Mike Rann, for his initiative to stimulate the local film industry, and to the previous government relocating the South Australian Film Corporation to new state-of-the-art studios at Glenside. It has breathed new life into our screen culture and investment in film production in the state. However, it was disappointing to see in the recent state budget that the Treasurer has clipped funding to the arts to the tune of around \$3 million.

This is the Festival State. Our arts festival is world class. The Fringe and cabaret festivals are among the best anywhere in the world. There is a vibrant local theatre and music community, and the recent French masters exhibition pulled the biggest crowd ever seen at the Art Gallery. The art scene is thriving in this state, it puts money into our economy and drives tourism. The arts deserve far more support from the state government, and I call on the Treasurer to reconsider his miserly move and restore that funding.

It was also disappointing to see Screen Australia lose \$50 million in federal funding. I just cannot understand the logic of this when prime ministers and MPs fall over themselves to have selfies with our biggest stars like Chris and Liam Hemsworth, Nicole Kidman, Hugh Jackman, Naomi Watts, Margot Robbie and Cate Blanchett. They are our homegrown national cultural ambassadors to the world. Why would you want to slice the creative reel that makes them and produces them?

As for the film festival, its growth and reputation are clearly outstripping its two-yearly encumbrance. It has demonstrated that it can now stand on its own on the international stage and bring the spotlight on our city. It is time it became an annual event and I call on the government to consider this from next year or 2020. I commend this motion to the Legislative Council.

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

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:54): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes the release on 8 October 2018 of the Special Report on Global Warming by the International Panel on Climate Change, which confirms that we need to act fast to avert a climate catastrophe;
2. Recognises the clear and urgent recommendation in the report that the entire planet needs to move to zero emissions by the middle of this century, including rapidly phasing out fossil fuels and in particular the burning of coal for energy, if we are to avoid catastrophic climate change;
3. Acknowledges that South Australia has led the nation in the development of alternative renewable energy sources but that leadership is being undermined by the state government's continued support for the fossil fuel industry, including the exploitation of new fossil fuel reserves and new fossil fuel power stations; and
4. Calls on the South Australian government to develop a roadmap for decarbonising the South Australian economy by 2050, including the phase-out of fossil fuel exports and all grid-scale fossil fuel power generation, together with a firm commitment to no more bad investments that harm the environment.

When the international panel on climate change released its latest report on global warming just last week, the gravity of its findings and the enormity of the task ahead appears to have been so shocking to the federal government that it was reduced to a catatonic state.

According to medical literature, a person in such a state often appears to be in a stupor. They may be observed holding a rigid position; they may be affected by mutism; and, again, according to medical authorities, this mutism may manifest itself as a complete inability to speak, or it may be partial. In those cases the sufferer may repeat meaningless phrases or speak only to repeat what someone else says.

Being in a catatonic state is an awful predicament and urgent treatment is required. I use this medical metaphor because it so accurately describes the government's response to the most significant existential threat facing life on this planet. Whilst other nations' leaders have been spurred into action by this report, the Australian government is hopelessly unresponsive, inadequate and ineffective: it is catatonic.

The motion I have moved today is in four parts, and to paraphrase the motion: it notes the report; it recognises the task ahead of us to stabilise the world's climate; it acknowledges South Australia's declining reputation in responding to climate change; and, it calls on the state government to get with the program and lead our state into a bright future by being part of the solution to climate change rather than the problem.

So let us look, first, at what the world's scientists have said. The report has been widely reported in the media since it was released on 8 October. One of the more succinct summaries was from journalist Sophie Vorrath from *Renew Economy*, and she says:

As Australia's Prime Minister plays with lumps of coal and prays for rain, a major new scientific report has called for the urgent world-wide phase-out of fossil fuels, as the goal of limiting global warming to 1.5°C drifts rapidly and dangerously out of reach.

The report—more than three years in the making, via more than 91 authors and editors who reviewed more than 6,000 scientific papers and 42,000 comments—was tabled on Monday by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

And it makes for sobering reading.

The key finding is that, if we are to have any hope of stabilising global warming at 1.5°C, global emissions of carbon dioxide must reach net zero by [the year] 2050.

One of the authors of the report, co-chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, Jim Skea, said in the press conference from South Korea on Monday:

Limiting warming to 1.5°C requires changes on an unprecedented scale. It means deep emission reductions in all sectors, the use of a wide range of technologies, behaviour changes and a significant increase in investment in low carbon options.

The report also points out that the scale of action that is required is unprecedented on a global scale. While there had been examples in the past of where rapid change is required, and specific technologies have advanced at a rapid rate, there is no precedent in our documented history for the rate of change at the scale required for limiting warming to 1.5°. In other words, we have never before witnessed such widespread, rapid transitions, and they will need to be made across the energy, land, industrial, urban and other systems, as well as across technologies and geographies.

So it is a sobering report. Some people might say that the heart of it was about the difference between 1.5° of warming and 2° of warming; surely, that cannot make that much difference. The report clearly says that it makes a huge amount of difference. For example, the difference between 1.5° of warming and 2° of warming is a 10-fold increase in the amount of ice-free years in the Arctic. In other words, if we can limit global warming to 1.5°, then the number of sea ice-free Arctic summers would be one in 100 years; at 2° of warming it becomes one in 10 years. It is ten times worse with half a degree. Half a degree will double the number of vertebrate species that go extinct. Half a degree will double the number of plants that we lose across the globe, and there will be three times as many insect species lost to extinction with just half a degree of extra warming. So the stakes are very high.

Let's explore what governments have done. I will start with the federal government and then we will move to the state government. I will start at the top with the Prime Minister.

An honourable member: Which one?

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: I will start with the current Prime Minister, Mr Morrison. He was asked to respond to it and was asked whether the government was going to invest. He was quoted in the media as saying that they were not going to spend any money on climate change conferences and 'all that nonsense'. So the current Prime Minister says 'all that nonsense', and I think one of his predecessors used the words 'complete crap' to describe climate change. They are not taking this seriously at all.

We go down to the Deputy Prime Minister, Michael McCormack. He said that Australia would not be dictated to by 'some sort of report'. This is the International Panel on Climate Change: 91 scientists, three years and all of the thousands of scientific reports and tens of thousands of comments that they have incorporated into their work. Then we go down to the current Treasurer and former energy minister, Josh Frydenberg. He said:

If we take coal out of our energy system, the lights will go out on the east coast of Australia—it's as simple as that.

That is what I believe is called a straw man argument, because no-one has ever suggested that we simultaneously flip switches at every coal-fired power station in Australia. Of course, if you did that, all at once, with no planning, the lights would go out, but no-one is suggesting that. It is about phasing out and doing it as quickly as we possibly can. Those responses I have referred to are from government ministers. If we go to the Coalition backbench it gets even better. Coalition backbencher Craig Kelly probably, more accurately than anyone else, summarised the collective view of the conservative wing of the Liberal National Party. He said:

The climate was always dangerous. We didn't make it dangerous, [and] it's fossil fuels that protect us from that climate.

I think he may have been referring to air conditioning, which I guess maybe makes you a bit cooler if climate change has increased temperatures and we are suffering, as we know we will, increased numbers of heatwaves. Really, these people are in power. They are in Canberra, and they are in charge of the nation for the time being. It really is quite remarkable.

I am not going to let the Labor Party off the hook entirely, because their response, although perhaps not as bad, is that they are refusing to get Australia out of coal. The number one

recommendation of the IPCC was to get out of coal, and the Labor Party is not prepared to do it. They have been lukewarm over Adani, they are completely hopeless when it comes to coal exports and they are not committing to what the IPCC says we need to do.

Really, the political leadership in Canberra is hopeless. I will quote one commentator, Mr Brian England. People might say that this is a person with a self-interest, but I think we need to take him seriously as he is the chairman of Australia's Solar Energy Industry Associations. These are people who are leading the charge in trying to decarbonise the economy and increase the transition to solar energy. There are similar quotes from the wind industry. The national chairman says:

The Coalition...government, from the leadership of Tony Abbott through to the current PM Scott Morrison, have ignored advice from reputable and overwhelming voices regarding impacts of climate change and the need to address it, to favour fossil fuels over renewable technologies.

They have vacillated between paying lip service to climate change through to ignoring it or panning it. They have used outdated data to support their ideology, they have used outdated costing of renewables to support their ideology, they have used outdated technology to support their ideology and have used sections of the media with the same myopic view point to try and harness public support.

Even if a catastrophic future outcome was only partially possible, rather than a certainty under business as usual, you would expect a responsible government to undertake a risk assessment and undertake measures to minimise that risk. This government does neither.

From a global point of view, we are a laughing stock of political ineptitude, with a climate policy so lacking that poor developing countries are exceeding our goals.

Since a cost of carbon was removed by this government, our emissions have gone from falling to increasing and many independent national and international bodies have shown that our capacity to meet a limit of 1.5C degree rise in temperature with business as usual is impossible. The States are fed up with the COALition's lack of vision and action and are undertaking the move to renewables themselves.'

I will come back to that point, because I think it is only partially correct. We should look at the response from the state government. I think the response is probably best described as tumbleweeds. We have had silence from the state government. Parliament has been sitting for a couple of days now. I sit at the edge of my seat waiting for the ministerial announcement from the Premier or the energy minister as to how we as a state are going to take this Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change report seriously and what we are going to do about it. It is not on the agenda. The Greens have put it on the agenda; the government has not. It should be number one on the agenda of both houses of parliament.

The response by just about everyone, other than federal ministers, has been one of disbelief, dismay and even disgust at the lack of action on the part of governments. In relation to the federal Liberal coalition in particular, people are dismayed that they are so hopelessly wedded to fossil fuels and the big companies that donate vast sums to their election campaigns and employ so many of their former ministers and MPs as lobbyists. I will give you a couple of the headlines from the last week: 'Our leaders are destroying our future'. I think that sums it up. Another one is: 'In the face of sustained government stupidity, many feel powerless'.

The third part of this motion acknowledges that South Australia has led the nation in the development of alternative renewable energy sources but that that leadership is now being undermined by the state government's continued support for the fossil fuel industry, including the exploitation of new fossil fuel reserves and new fossil fuel power stations.

I actually drafted this motion some days ago, before the ABC came out with the headline yesterday at 3.13pm, so after I had given notice of motion. The ABC's headline was 'South Australia's clean energy ranking slips according to Climate Council scorecard'. The ABC report says:

After years of claiming to be the nation's renewable energy leader, South Australia is now sharing the title with Tasmania and the ACT, according to a new scorecard issued by the Climate Council.

According to the report, the state's rating fell after the new Liberal State Government dropped the state's renewable energy target.

The report—Powering Progress: States Renewable Energy Race—rates states and territories based on their performance across a range of metrics including percentage of renewable electricity, proportion of households with solar panels and policies that support renewable energy.

The report goes on to say:

'South Australia's rating has fallen because the new State Government has dropped its renewable energy target of 50 per cent by 2025. That is unfortunate as the state is on track to achieve it easily and early,' climate councillor Professor Andrew Stock said.

The professor says:

'South Australia is on the world stage as a number one Australian destination for renewable energy, storage, innovation and investment. The state leads mainland states in cutting power emissions and the energy transition.

The Government needs to recommit to renewable innovation targets to continue to hold its pole position.'

So not all is lost: we are now on an equal footing with one other state and one territory. What the final part of my motion calls for is for the South Australian government to develop a road map for decarbonising the South Australian economy by 2050, including the phase-out of fossil fuel exports and all grid scale fossil fuel power generation, and to do that along with a firm commitment to no more bad investments that harm the climate. That might sound very reasonable, and people may think the government will do that. Well, their track record shows that they will not. What is the state government doing? Approving underground coal gasification.

We have the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change saying, 'Get out of burning coal,' so what do we do in South Australia? We give a company a permit to set fire to the coal seam under the ground, and hope to goodness that all of the gas and pollution will be caught in a pipe and managed. We know this project ended in disaster in Queensland and it defies belief that it has been approved, in trial form, in South Australia. Unless the community can stop it, or unless the government sees reason, there is a real fear that they will be given a commercial licence to continue to burn Leigh Creek coal under the ground.

The government is also approving fossil fuel power stations. Over the past year or so, I have been making representations to planning authorities, urging them not to support new fossil fuel power stations in South Australia, including a new power plant in Reeves Plains near Mallala. When I gave my representation to the State Planning Commission, I pointed out all of the climate change policies the government had adopted that spoke against approving new fossil fuel power stations.

Under freedom of information, we finally found out what the Planning Commission said to the minister, who was the final arbiter. They basically said, 'Well, people in the community'—meaning me—'have raised issues of climate change but we can't possibly take that into account.' The State Planning Commission cannot take climate change into account when it is approving developments in South Australia. What a remarkable situation.

Members will recall that one of the things we did in this chamber was require the State Planning Commission to prepare a state planning policy on climate change. The chamber supported this amendment to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Bill. The Planning Commission has released a draft of that policy, and it is completely inadequate. As such, I have lodged a submission, which you can read on the Planning Commission's website.

If the main group of people in this state whose job it is to say yes or no to developments, including things like new power stations, cannot take climate change into account, what is the point? What is the point of any of us taking climate change seriously if the government is going to nobble key agencies? I include the EPA in that as well. Carbon pollution and other greenhouse gasses are not regulated by the EPA. I tried to include that in the legislation over 20 years ago and was laughed out of the room. That predates all of these IPCC reports. The EPA needs to be let off the leash, and planning authorities need to be instructed to take climate change into account when they are considering developments.

The commonwealth Parliamentary Library did the sums and worked out that 12 coal-fired power stations throughout Australia need to be closed. We certainly do not need more coal-fired power, as is being proposed in Leigh Creek as part of their underground coal gasification project. I think we need to do what economist Jeffrey Sachs said on ABC's Q&A the other night:

Make a plan, make a time line, tell the world how you're going to decarbonise, and then we'll all be happy to hear from Australia that there's really a plan.

At present, there is no plan. The federal government is catatonic and the state government is not stepping up either. I will say one final thing. In my motion, I referred to the phrase 'No more bad investments.' That phrase is being adopted around the country by a range of conservation groups.

National legislation, which was drafted by environmental lawyers in Victoria, has been proposed for all the states and territories, and I will be bringing aspects of that to the parliament in the very near future. At the state level, we need to put our eye back on the ball. We need to pick up the slack that the commonwealth government has left. We cannot just shrug our shoulders and say that this international report is only a matter for national governments: it is matter for South Australia as well. With those brief words, I commend the motion to the house.

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

POVERTY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:16): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that this week, from 14 to 20 October, is national poverty week;
2. Notes that 200,000 people in South Australia currently live in poverty; and
3. Commits to working towards ending poverty in South Australia.

Not for the first time in this place, I raise awareness of the issues of poverty facing South Australia in 2018. We should not have to commemorate this week because there should be no South Australians living in poverty. We learn that, in fact, South Australia has the highest poverty rate in the nation. That new research and analysis by the Australian Council of Social Service and the University of New South Wales shows that more than three million people in Australia were living below the poverty line in 2015-16, and that number includes 739,000 children.

It equates to about one in eight adults and one in six children. More than 14.7 per cent of South Australian residents live below the poverty line. That number is just \$433 a week for a single adult and \$909 for a couple with two children. I have to echo the words of the ACOSS chief executive, who addressed the National Press Club and campaigned to raise the rate of Newstart and Youth Allowance to help people break out of the cycle of poverty: it is time to share the pie and advance Australia fair.

It is not fair in Australia when one in six children and one in eight adults are living in poverty. It is not fair in Australia when people in a rich agricultural nation, as the Hon. Justin Hanson remarked earlier in today's proceedings, are experiencing food poverty. Food insecurity should not be real in South Australia in 2018. We know that people are dumpster diving. While the supermarkets have fresh produce going to waste, at the end of the day, in the dark of night, South Australians are dumpster diving. They are not the incredibly Dickensian archetypes of old: these are suburban mums and dads dumpster diving.

There is so much more we can do. I am heartened to hear that the Labor Party, in their convention this weekend, propose to raise the rate of Newstart. I hope in my heart that we see even stronger shows of support when, in Adelaide in December this year, the ALP has their national conference. A federal election is looming. We must all do our part to eradicate poverty in this state, and raising the rate of Newstart and payments such as Youth Allowance will go a long way to ending that terrible situation.

I commend Labor Party members who have fought internally within their party, and I urge Liberal government members to take notice of this as an issue, because it is at your peril that you ignore the growing rate of inequality in this country. This 'Advance Australia Fair' that is not fair for all Australians will not be tolerated at the ballot box, and it should not be tolerated by this parliament. I urge all members to attend and support poverty events that are happening this week so that we can see this week end and never be held again because it would have no need to exist.

I commend the work of those members of this place who are, I know, seeking to end inequality in our society and seeking to end poverty. I urge us all to redouble our efforts and recommit to ending this scourge. With those few words, I commend the motion.

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

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DOMESTIC ABUSE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:21): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:22): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

It gives me great pleasure to introduce this bill which will create a new offence against controlling or coercive behaviour in a relationship. The bill is modelled on provisions in the UK's Serious Crime Act under the sections which deal with domestic abuse. I want to make it clear that, whilst I have introduced the bill into the parliament today, I intend to consult further on the bill and look forward to working collaboratively with the government. I do not imagine that I will be bringing this forward to a vote before the end of the year.

There has been a lot done in the last few years to raise the awareness of domestic violence and acceptable behaviour within a relationship. Work undertaken by organisations such as White Ribbon, the Zahra Foundation and Our Watch have taken this issue from behind closed doors to be out in the open. This is important work and a lot of progress has been made in educating the community and raising awareness.

However, much of the general community's understanding of domestic violence and domestic abuse only tells one side of the story. Undoubtedly, it is horrific if a relationship becomes violent, but in almost all circumstances the precursor to this physical abuse is mental, emotional and psychological abuse. These types of abuses often manifest in the form of put-downs, bullying, isolation, fear and gaslighting, amongst others. These behaviours are designed to lower the victim's self-esteem and increase their reliance upon the perpetrator.

The term gaslighting originated from the 1938 play *Gaslight* where the main male character would engage in activities deliberately to confuse and manipulate his wife into questioning her reality. For example, the character would systematically dim the lights and when questioned about it by his wife would deny that there was anything different. Today, the term is used to describe psychological manipulation where a person is made to question their memory, perception, sanity and reality. This is often done with the perpetrator persistently denying, misdirecting, contradicting and lying to try to confuse the victim.

To many victims of domestic violence it is the emotional and psychological scars which linger longest. The human body is very resilient and, with time, will heal bruises and broken bones; however, it is often only with a lot of hard work and with the assistance of psychologists and counsellors that nonphysical scars will heal. It often takes many years and, unfortunately, some do not recover from these wounds.

Even more unfortunate are the circumstances where people do not receive or seek out the support that they need because they have only suffered emotional and not physical abuse. This is often from a lack of understanding, not only in the community but also from victims themselves who do not understand what has happened or is happening to them.

This is why it is so important to introduce this bill, to start a conversation. I understand that these provisions by themselves will be difficult to successfully prosecute and I want to reiterate again that I will continue consultation. I am very open to amendments, but I think it is very important that this is introduced into parliament because I am hoping that it will start people thinking about other types of abuse that people suffer. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (FIXED CHARGES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:26): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Local Government Act 1999. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:28): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is identical to the one I introduced last year, which passed this house but did not proceed any further due to prorogation. The purpose of the bill is to prevent councils from charging a minimum rate per individual living unit in a retirement village. Currently, the act provides that a fixed charge cannot be charged against individual sites in caravan parks, residential parks and marinas. This bill will see retirement villages added to this list.

Like the properties that are already included in the Local Government Act, individual living units are small portions of a whole; namely, the retirement village. Retirement villages are often on one title with residents being given a licence to occupy by way of a contract. Councils provide no services within retirement villages.

Street lighting, rubbish removal, roadworks and verge maintenance is all the responsibility of the residents or the village owners, depending on the contract. Councils will still be able to attribute rates to a retirement village as a whole. It will then be up to village management to determine how this cost is to be paid. The Valuer-General provides advice on tenancy apportionment to village owners on request.

Retirement villages house some of our community's most vulnerable people. These people have worked their entire lives and do not deserve to be unfairly treated. I commend the bill to the chamber.

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

VALUATION OF LAND (SEPARATE VALUATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:30): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Valuation of Land Act 1971.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill is almost identical to a bill of the same name that I introduced last year to amend section 16 of the Valuation of Land Act.

The current section 16 of the Valuation of Land Act outlines that valuations may be separate or conjoint. It stipulates that the Valuer-General may, at their discretion, make a separate valuation of a portion of land or may value land jointly if it is required by law or if the land is under a separate physical occupation.

This provision was originally inserted in the act to account for situations where farmers leased part of their land to others on leases ranging from 40 to 1,000 years to establish shack sites. This occurred particularly along the River Murray.

Without a separate valuation, the landowner continued to have to pay rates and land tax on portions of land which were under a lease agreement and separately occupied. By creating separate valuations, rating agencies, such as councils and RevenueSA, then had the information needed to produce separate rates notices for lessees. This was reinforced in 1976 following a judgement by

His Honour Mr Justice Wells in *Harry v Valuer-General*. The judgment resulted in amendments to the act. The *Hansard* relating to the amendments read:

In the judgment His Honour placed a rather restrictive interpretation upon section 16 of the principal Act which empowers the Valuer-General, in his discretion, to make separate valuations of any portion of any land, or to value land conjointly with other land. It is necessary for the Valuer-General to exercise his power to make a separate valuation of portion of a larger holding (a) where the land is under separate occupation and (b) in cases, such as those arising in the South-Eastern Drainage Act, where the Valuer-General may have to make a valuation of a proportion of land notwithstanding that it does not form a separate holding.

However, the Valuer-General is now creating separate valuations in a number of other circumstances, which is beyond the original intention of the section.

My amendment seeks to clarify that separate assessments should only be made in circumstances where it is required by law or where a property has been separately occupied since 1967 or under a shack site lease and is situated on land where formal subdivision is prohibited. Whilst there is provision to allow separate valuations to be made, if it is required by law, it excludes the Valuer-General from making a separate valuation if the request is made under the Local Government Act. This is because there is an ability for local councils to request the Valuer-General to make a separate valuation if a property is under separate occupation so that a separate set of rates can be issued to the occupier.

However, this does not mean that council's revenue will be impacted. Local governments will still be able to issue rates under separate occupation by requesting the Valuer-General to assign a tenancy apportionment to the property. A tenancy apportionment means the Valuer-General can assign a value to a portion of a property, based on tenancy, without having to create separate assessments.

At this point I should explain that, where the Valuer-General makes a separate valuation, they create a new assessment. It is the assessments that are used by rating authorities, such as SA Water, council and RevenueSA, to issue accounts. A tenancy apportionment will not create a new assessment, it merely assigns values to parts of the assessment. It is also important to note that the Valuer-General currently provides a tenancy apportionment for properties which have several occupiers but are on one title. Shopping centres, commercial office blocks and blocks of flats are some examples of these. In each of these cases, the portion that is occupied, such as a single shop in a shopping centre, cannot be sold off separately.

For the Valuer-General to create a separate valuation and assessment for other similar properties where there are multiple occupations on one title is inconsistent. This is the case with retirement villages, which is the only type of property I can think of which has separate assessments for each living unit even though they are often on the one title. Whilst council revenue should not be affected by my bill, SA Water will be unable to charge a separate supply and sewerage charge to the occupant as SA Water issues accounts based on assessments.

SA Water's system does not have the ability to account for tenancy apportionments, and nor should it. For SA Water to charge a fee to supply separate tenancies is laughable as they are not supplying anything. SA Water supplies infrastructure from the mains up to the meter. Anything from the meter to separate tenancies is the responsibility of the owner. Only very large tenancies, such as a large group of units with over 15 units in the complex, would have more than one meter. In these circumstances, it may be warranted for SA Water to charge a supply charge per meter; however, that is not their current policy. It is their current policy to charge per assessment, which is often individual units, even though they do not supply anything to the units.

Last year, as shadow treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas indicated that he could not support the bill without knowing what the revenue impact would be or whether there are any unforeseen consequences to these amendments. As such, I flag that I will be leaving this on the *Notice Paper* until at least the end of the year to give Treasury the time to crunch the numbers and investigate further the impact of these amendments. I commend the bill to members.

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

*Motions***WAGE THEFT**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. I. Pnevmatikos:

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.

(Continued from 19 September 2018.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:39): I rise today to speak in favour of the motion by the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos for a select committee into wage theft in South Australia. As the wife of a small business owner, there are few things more insidious in the workplace than an employer deliberately underpaying their hardworking, loyal employees. Make no mistake, wage theft, which in simple terms is employers stealing money from their own workers' pockets, is rife in Australia. As odious as that is, the staggering statistics paint a disturbing and worsening picture.

A recent study by global workforce management provider Kronos showed that 10 per cent of Australian workers, that is, one in 10 workers or about one million people, have rarely or never received the minimum wage; 11 per cent are not paid for all the hours they work; and 43 per cent have at some point been paid less than the minimum wage. That means that someone we know and/or love, or even ourselves, have been the victims of wage theft over our working life. Releasing the report, Kronos Australia and New Zealand Managing Director, Peter Harte, said:

It's disappointing to learn that even in today's mature economy, a large number of Australians are being exploited in the workplace—at a time when wage growth is slow and many people are working harder than ever.

The practice is also illegal, with significant penalties for those businesses found to breach regulations. The situation is not ideal for building the thriving and intelligent economy Australia needs to compete in the international market place.

But Mr Harte had a disclaimer to his comments:

Given the complexity of workplace regulations and the changes that can occur annually, we understand it is not always easy for businesses to keep up to date.

Yes, it gets worse. A study by a union, United Voice, found that 76 per cent of workers in hospitality are paid under the minimum wage, and according to Industry Super Australia a staggering one-third of eligible Australian workers are being underpaid super. This equates to 2.4 million workers collectively having \$3.6 billion a year stolen from them, an issue that will seriously impact their quality of life in retirement.

A good example of this abuse has come to light following the collapse of the Australian arm of the Max Brenner chocolate cafe chain, which announced recently that it had appointed voluntary administrators and will close more than half its 36 stores. It has been reported that an expensive overhaul of the company's head office in Sydney hit the company's cash flow so hard that the company stopped paying their 600 staff their superannuation entitlements for the last six months of 2016.

The company sent a letter to staff advising them that the head office redevelopment is 'unfortunately taking longer than originally planned and is having a temporary effect on cash flow'. As a result, superannuation payments had been delayed, but would eventually be paid in full. It is not known publicly whether or not that has occurred.

If we all know that stealing is wrong, why is it that every year millions of Australian workers are robbed—the victims of wage theft? Wage theft, through employers deliberately underpaying workers and/or refusing to pay mandatory super, is affecting thousands of workers every year and it is affecting those workers who can least afford it, and the situation appears to be worsening.

Sadly, it is the vulnerable members, as I just mentioned, of our workforce who are likely to suffer the worst form of wage theft. This includes those with disabilities, young people and migrant workers, like backpackers. Generally speaking, the worst affected industries include hospitality, retail and agriculture, due to most of the jobs being casual.

The Australian Council of Trade Unions is currently pushing for the government to make wage theft a crime, punishable with up to 10 years gaol. While SA-Best and our Centre Alliance colleagues will continue to consult widely on whether current legislation surrounding wage theft is appropriate or otherwise, it would appear on the surface, given the statistics before us, that the employer versus employee ledger may need some recalibrating.

If a worker is caught stealing at work, there is every probability that police will be called in to investigate, the person charged and made to face the full extent of the law. He or she will also, in all likelihood, lose their job. With that I have no problem: you commit a crime, you pay the consequences. However, reverse that role, where an employer deliberately steals from their worker by deliberately underpaying their wages and/or refusing to pay mandatory superannuation, they invariably escape with a monetary fine, if indeed they are caught in the first place.

While toughening current laws, including increasing penalties for employers found guilty of wage theft, may be a step in the right direction, more needs to be done to ensure employers do the right thing in the first place. Earlier this year, while acting in the role of Fair Work Ombudsman, Kristen Hannah suggested that business owners were becoming overconfident in their understanding of awards and wage conditions. She said:

While these mistakes may be careless rather than malicious, the fact remains that there has never been more freely available information for employers than there is right now, so there are no excuses for making these mistakes.

I could not agree more, and SA-Best could not agree more. For all the reasons outlined, we support the honourable member's motion.

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

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 19 September 2018.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:46): I rise today to speak on this motion, and I thank the honourable member for bringing this motion to the chamber. Whilst we will not be supporting the motion in the form that it is in today, we are not opposed to having a look at some of the issues raised, if necessary. This is not to say that we do not think elements of the election, and perhaps even some of the elements raised, should not be reviewed, but the Electoral Commissioner conducts a review after each election. I note that it is explicit in the budget papers that were released last month that the targets for the Electoral Commission in 2018-19 are to:

- Conduct an operational review of the 2018 State Election and develop a program of improvements for conducting future state elections.
- Publish state election evaluation report and statistical report.
- Conduct audit of election campaign expenditure by registered political parties and independent candidates in accordance with public funding scheme.

These reviews, reports and audits may throw up something of interest. Legislative change may even be required. Some of the regimes under which the election runs may need to be tweaked. We will have a good look at that report once it is handed down by the Electoral Commissioner. If further things need to be investigated, we are not closed to having a further look at things, but I think the opposition's position has merits in letting those reviews, and then reports, be conducted first. We are happy to continue this discussion if there is anything further that needs to be done.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (17:48): The Greens are supporting this motion. We look forward to a committee being established. It appears from the numbers that that might not happen today. I will make the point that, in the past, the Greens have strongly supported a standing committee on electoral matters and we believe it should be a regular feature of parliament because issues arise after every single election. We are keen that all stakeholders get a chance to reflect on what went well and what went badly in the conduct of the election.

Certainly, I have had discussions with some of our administrative officers, who found some of the financial reporting requirements burdensome, especially having to issue audited null returns in relation to income and expenditure in the final days of the campaign. There are also lots of issues in relation to the Electoral Commission's interpretation of some of the rules.

I have had a conversation with a few members in this chamber around some material that was declared invalid by the Electoral Commission. When I pointed out to them that the Liberal and Labor material was identical, they then declared theirs invalid. I said, 'I don't want you to declare theirs invalid, just let us hand out our stuff.' That did not go well. There are a lot of issues that I think we need to deal with. The Greens are supportive of a select committee, but would be even more supportive of a standing committee.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:50): I rise in support of the motion of my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros for the establishment of a select committee into the March state election. Two weeks ago, I read an excellent opinion piece by former South Australian senator, Natasha Stott Despoja, about the state of politics in this country.

Let me say that you would not find a more dignified and dutiful political leader than Natasha. Her conduct inside and out of the Senate was impeccable, unlike many of her contemporaries. She referred to a report by the Museum of Australian Democracy and the University of Canberra that revealed distrust and disillusionment in politics is at an all-time high, surpassing 80 per cent in some communities. I quote some of her comments:

Politics should be an honourable profession. Recent events, including the prime ministerial churn, have disillusioned the most hardened citizen. Structural and behavioural change is necessary. We need to see members of Parliament working together respectfully across the political spectrum. We need the language and tone of the Parliament to be of a standard we are happy for children to observe and emulate. We need politicians to debate the merits of an issue, not insult the person. Our community is sick of privileged individuals practising behaviour that not only doesn't dignify them but would be deemed unethical or illegal in other workplaces.

She could easily be talking about the South Australian election of 2018. I have covered and observed campaigns both state and federal as a journalist since the Whitlam dismissal, but nothing compares with what I witnessed and experienced both as a candidate and as a media adviser for Nick Xenophon's SA-Best. This was the dirtiest I have seen. Ethics were non-existent. The lies, the deception, the dishonesty and the slander were astonishing, even for a seasoned veteran like me, from our political foes and—to my disappointment—even the conduct of sections of my own industry.

This was a brutal, no-holds-barred war, where the umpire, the state Electoral Commission, was feeble and toothless. My colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros has already explained her abject displeasure at the conduct and inaction of the SEC to dozens of her complaints; I will not delve any further. However, it does shine a light on what is wrong with this process of accountability—there isn't any.

That needs to change if politics is to win back the respect and trust of cynical voters. That can only happen with the cooperation of all the protagonists. Are we—are you—ready to make that change? Are you prepared to take a critical look at what went on unchecked and concede a radical shift in thinking, planning and strategy is required? Being dismissive, because that is what politics is all about, is a woeful cop-out. Politicians need to be looked upon as role models and leaders in their community, not backstabbing narcissists and opportunists. The tumultuous removal of the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull as prime minister by his own party further diminished the public's confidence, while cynicism soared to levels not seen since 1973.

Today's *Australian* punctuated the view that politics can be a self-serving and vicious snake pit. Julie Bishop's older sister MaryLou said she was glad her sister failed to win the top job in the coup because, 'The brutality of politics is dreadful. It's soul-destroying.' Such is Julie Bishop's

standing in the community that she was probably the outstanding option to salvage the government's shattered standing in the next federal poll.

When Nick Xenophon revealed to me his plan to return to state politics, he warned it would not be a clean fight, and that they would throw the proverbial kitchen sink at him and then some. What we got was a constant bombardment of septic waste. In the history of state politics, I cannot recall ever seeing the two major political parties conduct a venomous pincer action against the minnow eponymous party and its very popular leader. Both Labor and the Liberals resorted to the underhanded tactics and strategies to destroy the Xenophon factor that threatened to engulf them, costing them seats and perhaps even the chance to form government. They feared Nick, and the attacks became personal.

It is my view that election advertising needs to be policed and regulated before it is approved for use, much in the same way as commercial advertising standards are enforced by broadcasters. The ALP, with the help of the unions, ramped up the lies about the loss of education funding Nick was supposed to have cost schools over his support for Gonski 2.0. Never mind that he secured hundreds of millions more than the state was going to get and far less than what the federal Labor government had provided.

The Liberals played the scare card. According to them, Nick had done a deal with Jay Weatherill. This was, to quote one of Nick's campaign ads, a load of bull. Where was the SEC on that one? Or the corflutes on election day that had Nick under bedsheets with Jay, with the slogan, 'A vote for Nick is a vote for Labor'? Another lie they got away with. Then there was the one that Nick was against free trade—baloney. The scratchy cards were a disgrace and amplified what the Liberals really think about the inherent evils of gambling.

There is no real regulation of what is said and done across the broad spectrum of the media until the damage has been done. That is not how it should work. We remember Labor's robocalling 'mediscare' campaign in the last federal election. Who controls the content and assesses the accuracy of robocalling messages by political parties? They know they can get away with it, which is why they do it. They worked out how to manipulate Facebook by lodging objections when we posted fair and legitimate responses, resulting in our posts being blocked until there was a review. It was anyone's guess as to how long that was going to take.

My colleague has gone into some depth about the biggest ally of the Liberals, the Australian Hotels Association. Their relentless barrage of misinformation, lies and disruptions on election day to protect their life-destroying gambling interests was appalling and the lowest point reached. Just one media outlet in the whole country bothered to fact check the many outrageously false and questionable claims pumped out by the AHA and its CEO, Ian Horne. The Conversation investigation found much of just did not stack up to scrutiny. The media put the blow torch more on Nick Xenophon; he was a tall poppy there to be lopped.

Never mind the 16 years of Labor scandals, culminating in the highest power bills in the world, an energy crisis, Transforming Health, the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, Oakden and other secret and shady deals only now emerging. The Liberal manifesto hardly got a grilling; they let others do the dirty work for them. The name of the game was 'Kill Nick'. Our candidates were subjected to dirty tricks, and outrageous and unchallenged slander, in order to undermine them and Nick Xenophon.

What I found incredulous was that some media outlets were prepared to run defamatory stories that had no substance or balance in the mistaken belief that anything goes in the heat of a torrid election campaign. We could well ask the question whether the SEC should also have oversight of media reporting when it contains bias and factual errors. I will highlight some glaring untold examples. I will begin with the seat of Giles, where our candidate, Tom Antonio, was up against the controversial sitting Labor member, Eddie Hughes, whose biggest supporter in Whyalla was the incumbent mayor, Lyn Breuer.

After the war in Hartley with Nick Xenophon, Giles was the ugliest battle of all. There is no love lost between Mr Hughes, Ms Breuer and Mr Antonio. Mr Hughes worked as an adviser to Ms Breuer when, as Labor's sitting member in Giles in 2011, she was quoted on the front page of *The Australian* as saying that the steel plant was doomed and would shut its doors regardless.

Showing little faith in the town's resilience and its almost total dependence on the steel industry, her reckless comments understandably upset the then premier, Mike Rann, and industry minister, Tom Koutsantonis.

Now, if we fast forward to 2018, Labor is on the nose everywhere and looks like losing in its traditional heartland to Mr Antonio, a popular businessman and hardworking councillor who, as acting mayor, was a vital catalyst in saving the steelworks when Arrium went into liquidation. A week out from the election, with Mr Hughes at his side, Tom Koutsantonis gives the media in Whyalla a letter from a Colin Gillam, an executive of a mystery Chinese renewable energy company, SSE, in which Mr Gillam defames Mr Antonio, accusing him of endangering a \$30 million solar investment in the town because of his conduct as a councillor, and that he was waging a vendetta because he was not elected mayor. I quote an excerpt from that letter:

You seem prepared to throw away any positive investment opportunities for the sake of pursuing your petty vendetta on the current mayor because you weren't elected the mayor.

You do not have the interests of Whyalla and the community at heart, only your self-interest.

Mr Antonio said he had not seen that letter, even though it was supposed to have been emailed to him, but someone leaked it. As for the claims made by Mr Gillam, they could not be substantiated. The media failed to check the facts and still published Mr Koutsantonis's scathing comments. So who gave him that letter? No media there bothered to ask or even investigate what transpired.

For the record—and it exists—Mr Antonio had acted appropriately in his responsibilities as a councillor regarding SSE by seconding a motion to report a possible act of wrongdoing, which is required by law. Mr Gillam has since disappeared from SSE, leaving their solar project on the edge of town beset with problems until only recently. Again, no proper investigation of the facts in reporting. It sounded like a good story only because it added spite and spice to the fire and brimstone unleashed on our candidate.

But Mr Koutsantonis and Jay Weatherill went further in claiming that Mr Antonio had to be excluded from meetings with the Arrium administrator, Mr Mark Mentha, because his behaviour threatened to derail negotiations for the sale of the steelworks. Again, the media reported it as fact; no checking was done. Nobody called Mark Mentha to see if this was correct; they just ran with it.

This was quite a serious accusation and no doubt, along with the SSE claim, they severely damaged Mr Antonio's character and, with it, his chances of winning Giles in the last days of the campaign. When it came to save the steelworks, Mr Antonio was its most passionate fighter. His mantra was, 'Closure is no option.' As the drama unfolded, it took Labor and the Premier almost two months to wake up to it, get their backsides there and show some support. Mr Marshall, in opposition, and other Liberals had long before beaten them there.

Here is the truth in a letter from the administrator, Mark Mentha, to Mr Antonio, dated 25 June 2018 that totally exposes Labor's below-the-belt treachery and deceit. I will quote some of it here:

Dear Tom. As lead administrator of Arrium Group Ltd I write to personally thank you and acknowledge you for your contribution to the Korda Mentha team in the saving of the Whyalla Steelworks and associated iron ore mines in the South Middleback Ranges.

Tom, from day one you understood the symbiotic relationship of Whyalla with Arrium and stood by the simple creed: 'Closure Is Not An Option' and you never strayed from that message—privately or publicly.

As the civic leader of Whyalla at the time you continually publicly lay bare the catastrophic consequences of a closure of the steelworks and mines, and accordingly kept the issue at the forefront of public policy and media. This in turn went a long way to keeping the issue front and centre in the minds of policy makers and influencers at both state and federal level. Even after stepping down as acting mayor you kept this mantra alive in your role as a city councillor.

He goes on:

The end result of a successful restructure and sale of Arrium could not have been achieved without contribution from many key stakeholders. Tom you played a critical part and all stakeholders, including the City of Whyalla and we the administrators will be forever grateful.

On behalf of Sebastian Hams, Scott Langdon and the entire Korda Mentha team—a big thank you.

Yours sincerely Mark Mentha, partner

I now seek leave to table this letter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: His words could not be more compelling and a powerful endorsement of Mr Antonio, in total contrast to the sham portrayed by Mr Koutsantonis to save his mate's bacon. Mr Hughes did not go into that election as a cleanskin. Not many were aware that he had quite a notorious and colourful history with the police. We all knew that, but we chose not to play the man but make it a clean fight on policies. Yet they persisted with the mudslinging.

One voter went on Facebook and accused Mr Antonio of abusing her at a pre-poll. It was false and defamatory. Her story was published and broadcast on ABC as an 'allegation', even though there is a credible witness who can tell a totally different version of what took place because he heard what was said. On the back of all this, Mr Hughes just managed to fall over the line, but he cannot take much from it.

I hope that the media, particularly in the northern region, takes note. Mr Antonio's options for a libel action remain very much alive. He is running for mayor against Ms Breuer and he expects to be a target again. I urge Whyalla to support a man whose heart and soul is welded to the Steel City, not a person who had little faith in the survival of its biggest employer seven years ago.

Fake news also made an appearance. It took some investigative work to uncover the source of the bizarre gambit that encased our candidate for Morphett, Simon Jones. Curiously, it was first revealed in the public domain by a rival, the Independent Liberal Duncan McFetridge. As luck would have it, Duncan McFetridge somehow stumbled upon an obscure website, *The Highlighter*, which falsely accused Mr Jones of setting a garbage truck on fire. Days later, it again defamed him for speaking about the incident to *The Advertiser*.

An independent IT professional engaged by Mr Jones found that the site was linked to www.wcnvic.com, which is the home of the Western Community Network (WCN) in Melbourne. Who are they? Their website states:

The WCN is a growing group of Union and Labor activists that have come together to build a strong activist movement out in the West.

We hold monthly meetings that focus on Local, State and Federal issues as well as regular training aimed at providing personal growth and development to make members of the WCN more effective Labor and Union Activists.

Part of the Western Community Network membership criteria is that all members of the WCN must be a member of their industry union...[and the] Australian Labor Party.

They were totally false, unsubstantiated and defamatory fake news stories designed to trash Mr Jones and our fledgling party's reputation. Again, there was no interest from the media to track down the culprit. Why let the truth get in the way of a hatchet job? Well, Mr Jones has now commenced legal proceedings. Then our candidate for Davenport, Karen Hockley, outlaid a lot of money in the final week to mail out thousands of her pamphlets. They were duly delivered, but, strangely, Liberal Party brochures were placed in between. How could that happen?

In the northern suburbs, where Labor looked shaky in several seats, letter drops arrived from a phony resident by the name of Vicki from Parafield Gardens, dated 8 March. It warned her neighbours that SA-Best wanted to cut health services and spend it on people living in the country. It said, 'I've worked hard all my life. Why should I get less help at the expense of people in the country?' That is what Reggie Martin and the ALP thought about people in our regions crying out for improved health services. Their hypocrisy is mind-blowing. They all but ruined health. But one week from an election, where could you go to challenge this type of deception? I also seek leave to table that letter.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: SA Unions State Secretary, Joe Szakacs, was behind a costly scaremongering and smear campaign against Nick, blaming him for pension cuts and totally misleading and distorting the truth. The small number of affected pensioners were those with substantial assets, not the aged, disabled, veterans or war widows, as people were made to think.

Despite all this, SA-Best still managed an astonishing and unprecedented result for a first-time party. We secured two seats in the upper house and came second in the two-candidate preferred in 12 of the 47 lower house seats—five won by Labor and seven by the Liberals—and we did not do preference deals and we did not play dirty. These are just some of the untold stories. I could write a book on this and I probably will one day.

In closing, the point our motion wants to achieve in having a select committee into the last election is to clean up politics, make parties and candidates more accountable for what they do and say, impose stricter advertising and ethical standards that are actually regulated before and during campaigns, have full disclosure of political donors and, above all, to win back the trust and respect of the people who really matter: the voters. I commend this motion to the council, although I cannot envisage some of the parties having the stomach to confront the truth.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:11): I rise very briefly as the second speaker for the Greens, and spurred on by that particular contribution, just to raise a few points as to why the Greens wanted to support and see this select committee go forward. I have just listened to some interesting perspectives on history. I have some different perspectives on history.

When the racist fax incident occurred and was put into the media, citing potentially that Tom Antonio had been responsible for a racist fax some decades ago, I rang the person in this council who had taken action on the racist fax: the Hon. Ian Gilfillan. I do not know whether that racist fax is real or not. What I do know is that the Hon. Ian Gilfillan thought it was real at the time and serious enough to not only raise it in this place in question time but to refer it to the then attorney-general.

What I do know is that, in that phone conversation where I rang him to discuss the potential racist fax, Ian Gilfillan said to me, 'It's good that you called, Tammy. Nobody else thought to call.' I said, 'What do you mean? Didn't Nick Xenophon ring you to check?' Ian Gilfillan at that point said, 'No.' No checking had been done on whether or not Ian Gilfillan believed that fax to have been genuine.

I was also going to look on with great interest to the investigation of how Twiggy Forrest came to have a meeting with Nick Xenophon that resulted in an announcement less than an hour later by SA-Best in that campaign of a health policy—the first health policy that they actually declared for the state election campaign, which was to raise the smoking age—and whether or not there were any correlations to Twiggy Forrest and his links through his various NGOs/corporations/advocacy bodies with the polling that they had done on the state election just a week or so earlier that had recommended that Nick Xenophon would be a preferred premier. That polling had cited Nick Xenophon by name.

There may be nothing to it, but I was looking forward to hearing some answers as to whether or not Twiggy Forrest's polling was in any way done in consultation with any candidate that ran in the state election because it certainly has not been declared in the declarations that I have seen put forward by ECSA. I find it extraordinary that the first health policy announcement by SA-Best was one that accorded with Twiggy Forrest's views—one that he had sought to lobby many members, no doubt, of this place and certainly many candidates during the state election. I found that somewhat extraordinary.

On a final note, I will just reflect on a complaint that I made to the Electoral Commission that was upheld on 16 March this year, because I suspect you did not hear about it. It was a complaint against Nick Xenophon and his claims about the Greens' preferences. That complaint was upheld by ECSA on the night—literally about 5pm—of election eve. It stated:

I agree that they each contain a statement purporting to be a statement of fact: that the Greens have made a preference deal with the Liberal Party in relation to how-to-vote cards for tomorrow's election.

It noted my statutory declaration to the effect that no deal had been done. ECSA then stated:

With this submission, I am satisfied that the statement is inaccurate and misleading to a material extent. I have sent the following request to Mr Xenophon:

I request that you delete or amend the advertisements immediately so that they no longer make this statement. I also request that you issue a media statement to the effect that the statement was inaccurate and misleading to a material extent, and that no such preference deal has been made. I request that you post the media statement on your Facebook page and the linked webpage.

I watched the Facebook page. Nothing went up. I looked at the media. Perhaps Nick had forgotten how to put out a press release, because we certainly did not see anything before or even in the days following the election.

This cuts both ways. SA-Best has just gotten up and made a lot of allegations using parliamentary privilege. A select committee could get to the bottom of this, but I suspect a select committee would also play politics. We deserve better than some of the allegations and the misuse and abuse of parliamentary privilege that has just been put before this place with this phony debate that has clearly been put forward today in the interests of continuing the campaign for Tom Antonio for the mayor of Whyalla.

It is extraordinary that Nick Xenophon never called Ian Gilfillan to check on that fact. I certainly look forward to the current Attorney-General perhaps finding that correspondence from Ian Gilfillan to the Attorney-General back in the day and investigating that particular incident to its fullest extent. With those few words, I commend the motion because I think this cuts both ways.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (18:17): Much as I have enjoyed the toing and froing between the Greens and SA-Best over the last few minutes, given the time of the evening, my comments will be mercifully brief. There will be other occasions when I will be able to address many of the issues honourable members have raised in this debate.

The position the government has adopted, and I think the Attorney-General has outlined, is that there is a review by the Electoral Commission. There are obviously other reviews going on in relation to aspects, particularly in relation to public funding, which I think the Hon. Mr Parnell has referred to as well. Clearly, it was the first time around for everybody and there are a number of lessons to be learnt from that. I think there is much we can learn. In any review that we conduct as a parliament, however, it would be productive if we look to see how we can improve the legislative framework to the extent that that is possible. That will always be a challenge.

I do not disagree with the position of the Hon. Ms Bonaros; I just have a different perspective. I think their view is that this is the worst, dirtiest and the most bitter, etc., campaign that they have ever seen. It might be the worst that they have ever seen, but trust me, as someone who has been through a number of others, it is in and of the average in terms of election campaigns. The difference this time around is that you are in and amongst it and you are having to absorb it and experience it. Those of us who have been in and amongst it for decades can assure you that some of the concerns you have expressed—that and much more—have been expressed over campaigns over many, many years.

It is becoming worse to an extent in relation to social media. In the last 10 years or so with social media it is much more difficult and it is much easier to create grief. But I have a differing perspective. I accept that that is a genuinely held view by the two members, but my genuinely held view is that, if there is a problem, it does not excuse the issues, but it is certainly not significantly different from a number of other campaigns that we have been engaged in over many years.

The last point I will make is that some members will be aware—and I think the Hon. Mr Parnell has raised this issue—that during the last parliament there were informal discussions, with me representing the then opposition and the former attorney-general representing the government and other members, about a reform of the parliamentary committee system. I have recently been authorised by the Premier, now that the budget is out of the way, to recommence those discussions, and I intend to have discussions with the Leader of the Opposition and, at various stages, with other interested crossbenchers in both houses regarding options for reform of the parliamentary committee system.

These will be informal in nature, firstly, to see what the various options are. Ultimately, if there is to be reform and if there can be agreement in terms of that reform, any reform has to go through the parliament by way of legislative amendment. Part of that would be whether one of the committees would have an ongoing role in terms of monitoring a committee, and if that were the case it would mean the terms of reference would be generic rather than specific and targeted in relation to that proposed select committee, perhaps more akin to what occurs in the federal parliament. With those few words I indicate the government will not support this motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:20): I thank honourable members for their contributions. At the outset I would like to indicate that I am more than happy to come back to the Hon. Tammy Franks with responses in relation to some of the issues she has raised today. I agree 100 per cent that this does cut both ways. I have never denied that, and I do not think my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo has ever denied that. Personally, I agree with that 100 per cent, so I am happy to come back and provide some information in relation to the issues the member has raised. Obviously I do not have that at hand now, but I will do that.

Whilst I am grateful for the contributions, I cannot say I am terribly surprised at the position of the government and the opposition with respect to the motion. When I last spoke on the matter I indicated that I would bring it to a vote today: that said, and in light of the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in this place and the opposition's openness to revisiting this issue, I indicate that I will not bring this matter to a vote today. If the opposition means what they say—

The PRESIDENT: I don't know if you can.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I can seek leave to conclude my remarks, I understand; I have sought advice. So if the opposition means what it says, namely that it remains open to an inquiry subject to the findings in the report of the Electoral Commission, then I too am open to deferring the vote with a view to waiting for that report.

I am certain the report will flag the need for an inquiry, and in fact the Hon. Mark Parnell has just indicated as much. What we ought to establish is an ongoing committee that inquires into and reports on the outcome of each and every state election. That is something SA-Best fully supports. If it is good enough for the Electoral Commission to report into an election then it ought to be good enough for us.

In my view—and it is my view—my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo hit the nail on the head when he talked about the current mood amongst political voters and observers. I think the general public is sick of it. Many of us are sick of it. I know I am certainly sick of it, and I think if it were not for preference deals the results of the election would reflect that.

Unlike the major parties I do not underestimate the power of voters. We have all seen voters shifting away from the left side of politics and from the right side of politics because they are sick of politicians caring more about their own interests than the community's interests. That is fine, they can keep it up, because as far as I am concerned our party, SA-Best, and Centre Alliance will be there to greet voters and welcome them to the centre of politics with open arms. With those few words, and as indicated, I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2018

Introduction and First Reading

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

TEACHERS REGISTRATION AND STANDARDS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

FAIR TRADING (GIFT CARDS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

LATE PAYMENT OF GOVERNMENT DEBTS (INTEREST) (AUTOMATIC PAYMENT OF INTEREST) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:27 the council adjourned until Thursday 18 October 2018 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (18 September 2018).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development has provided the following advice:

Assistance measures available to drought-affected farmers includes:

- A dedicated 24-hour Agriculture, Animal Health and Welfare Hotline for anyone with questions relating to dry conditions, their individual circumstances and support available on 1800 255 556.
- Eight Family and Business Scouts (FaB Scouts) have been appointed to support farmers and their families impacted by drought conditions.
- Rural Financial Counselling Service, this service provides free, confidential and impartial business support and information to primary producers experiencing financial difficulty. An extra \$260,000 was provided for the Rural Financial Counselling Service in the 2018-19 state budget.
- The Farm Household Allowance, providing up to \$25,000 per year for up to four years for an eligible farming couple. Farming couples eligible for Farm Household Allowance by 1 December 2018 will receive a once-off hardship payment of \$12,000 paid in two transactions.
- The Farm Management Deposit Scheme allows eligible primary producers to set aside pre-tax income from primary production in years of high income, which they can draw on in years of low income.
- Low interest loans for farmers for farm investment, debt restructuring, operating expenses and drought recovery and preparedness activities. Loans are administered by the federal government's Regional Investment Corporation.
- PIRSA animal health officers are providing technical advice on animal health, especially for livestock transport, biosecurity requirements such as requesting commodity declarations when buying in feed sources.
- Technical advice and a range of workshops on animal nutrition and animal health, managing soil erosion and planning for next season.
- PIRSA has undertaken an extensive fodder audit.
- Livestock SA is establishing a fodder register to connect farmers to fodder donations.
- PIRSA is coordinating donations to ensure funding meets the needs of the affected communities and that it is targeted to those most in need.
- PIRSA is working with Brand SA to promote the many ways the public can support the state's farming sector through the I Choose SA campaign.
- The Farm Debt Mediation Act, legislated by the government, better protects farmers and provides greater financial security, enforcing a mandatory mediation process before a creditor is able to foreclose on a farming operation.
- SA has recently stopped charging stamp duty fees on multi-peril crop insurance – which will see a reduction of about 11 per cent of overall policy cost.

TRAMLINE EXTENSION

In reply to **the Hon. R.P. WORTLEY** (18 September 2018).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government has provided the following advice:

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is currently undertaking a feasibility study on the proposed right turn from King William Street into North Terrace. No formal advice, to date (as at 18 September 2018), has been provided to the current government, detailing traffic impacts.