

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 13 February 2019

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.

### *Bills*

#### **ELECTORAL (PRISONER VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Conference*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:16):** I move:

That the sitting of the council be not suspended during the continuation of the conference on the bill.

Motion carried.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:17):** I bring up the 13<sup>th</sup> report of the committee.

Report received.

### *Question Time*

#### **HOSPITAL BEDS**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding hospital beds.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Yesterday, during question time, the minister said in relation to the closure of beds and the need to reopen beds, and I quote:

...the beds available didn't match the current needs of the hospital. One was mental health, the other was subacute.

The model of care for the closed Ward 2A at Hampstead says, and I quote from SA Health's own publication:

This care is termed 'sub-acute' care and is often delivered in an offsite facility.

The unit is a 25 bed ward providing multidisciplinary patient care...to support the patients in their transition to home or another care provider. The unit is not a rehabilitation ward...

My question to the minister is: is the minister aware that the model of care for the 25 beds at Hampstead that the minister closed in December were subacute beds, which the minister himself has said are the ones needed in the health system, and will he now reopen these beds to address the unprecedented crisis we find in our hospital system?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:19):** The advice I gave to the council yesterday was based on advice that the chief executive of CALHN—

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** You are the minister!

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** —gave to a parliamentary committee earlier this week.

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, I am finding it hard to hear the minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** What we were having was a high number of general medical and mental health patients. What I said was that my advice was that the patients who were—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order from the opposition benches! I can't hear the minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** —needing beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital were—

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, just hold for a moment. I can't hear the minister and therefore I will not be able to rule on your objections. Minister, please continue.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** My recollection of what I said yesterday was that the patients who needed beds were not subacute patients who could go to Hampstead. I did not say they are not subacute patients. The point I was making was that I rely on management, I rely on clinicians to match the patients with the beds, and I think the people are getting well and truly tired of the Labor Party misleading facts in relation to beds.

As well as carping on about Hampstead, the Labor Party also likes to talk about beds at Flinders. The fact of the matter is that the beds in Flinders were opened in January, so it is yet again another example of Labor misleading. After all, it's the former Labor government that was famous for closing beds. In November 2017, they closed the Repatriation General Hospital with a net loss of more than a hundred beds—more than a hundred beds. Since then, the Liberal Party has opened 20 beds at the Repat site, particularly for people in transition, and we have secured the ongoing access to 20 beds at the Repat site in the ViTA complex.

In terms of the response to the patient flow issues at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the most significant initiative that this government has taken was only in recent weeks. After 16 months of trying to fix Labor's mess of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, we were finally able to open the 10 RAH psychiatric intensive care unit beds.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Hunter, restrain yourself!

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** One of the key initiatives that I was able to announce at the same time was that the government had secured the 10 beds at the Glenside site as forensic mental health beds. So considering that the ongoing problems at the Royal Adelaide Hospital are significantly related to mental health patient flow, to be able to get their PICU beds onto the same site as the rest of the mental health beds, as they were always designed to be, to have them on the same site as the other services is a crucial development in terms of securing patient flow.

Let's remember that the former Labor government had the Royal Adelaide Hospital operating with 25 per cent less mental health beds from opening day until we were able to secure the opening of those psychiatric intensive care unit beds in January.

*The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Hunter, we've all got the point.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** So the reduction of the 25 per cent of beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital in terms of mental health has had a dramatic impact over the last 16 months. I really appreciate the patience of the mental health clinicians and of the ED physicians.

It hasn't been easy to deal with the 25 per cent reduction in mental health beds inflicted on that hospital by the former Labor government. I wish them all the best, with the new PICU being opened, to develop the model of care, and an important step tomorrow will be the ramping summit being organised by CALHN, to get all the clinicians around the table to make sure that they can make the best use of the resources of the hospital to increase patient flow.

There are a lot of ideas coming forward, both through the KordaMentha initiative and through work being done by CALHN, with clinicians who understand their patients and understand their needs, working together to make sure that they provide quality and safe care in a timely way to make sure that once a person has been fully diagnosed at the emergency department they can go to the

part of the hospital which can support them, if they need admission, and to provide a timely transfer of care for ambulance teams arriving.

So we are taking time to get over to the closure of the Repat, the loss of more 100 beds. We are delighted that we are seeing additional beds at the Repat, at the RAH mental health unit and at the forensic mental health unit at Glenside.

#### HOSPITAL BEDS

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** Supplementary question: so that we are very clear, is it the minister's contention that reopening the 25 beds at Hampstead could have no effect on the crisis we are currently facing in our hospitals? Is that really what he is trying to say?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:25):** What I am trying to say is that I will continue to rely on management and clinicians to match their resources with their need. Ms Dwyer says that she does not think that at this time the reopening of those beds would assist.

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

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, how about incorporating that screaming into a supplementary?

#### HOSPITAL BEDS

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:25):** Supplementary question: is the minister aware that the very same management that he is relying on to do his job on Monday said that they could play a role in helping with the crisis in the health system?

**The PRESIDENT:** Much more preferable than screaming, Leader of the Opposition. We might actually get an answer. Minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:26):** As the honourable member said, the word was 'could'. It is completely within the power of management to open those beds if they need to.

#### HOSPITAL BEDS

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** Supplementary question: does the minister have any power to hold discussions and make requests about beds being reopened?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** You got it the first time, Leader of the Opposition.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:26):** If the honourable member is asking me whether I am able to talk to the chief executive officer of the Central Adelaide Local Health Network about issues in the health system: yes, I can. I did this morning and I probably will later this week as well.

#### HOSPITAL BEDS

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** Supplementary question: was the minister briefed or informed about the closure of the Hampstead subacute beds before the department closed them last year, and has the minister requested that they be reopened?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:26):** In terms of what advice I received last year, of course I was advised of what are normal Christmas/New Year closures. The Labor Party did exactly the same thing. Just quietly, doctors and nurses like their holidays, too. January is not a peak month for elective surgery. In terms of whether I have given any directions about opening of beds: no, I haven't.

#### HOSPITAL BEDS

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** Supplementary: did the minister sign a briefing either noting or approving the closure of these beds?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27):** I have no recollection of that. The normal course of events is that managers manage; they open beds and they close beds. I actually don't remember being asked permission for them to reopen the beds in Flinders after the Christmas/New Year break. You do expect managers to manage their hospitals on a day-to-day, week-by-week basis.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Are you ready, Leader of the Opposition, because I would really like to call the Hon. Ms Scriven—she is very keen to ask a question.

#### **CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:28):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has the minister been informed of concerns from Professor Elizabeth Dabars, CEO of the nurses union, about the Central Adelaide Local Health Network and KordaMentha not following procedural fairness in the treatment of nurses, and what action is he taking following these concerns?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28):** Associate Professor Elizabeth Dabars, as far as I know, has not raised concerns with me about procedural fairness and KordaMentha.

#### **CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:28):** Supplementary: can the minister assure the council that no doctors or nurses have been sanctioned on the basis of anonymous information without procedural fairness?

**The PRESIDENT:** It's not technically within standing orders, but—

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28):** In deference to your comments yesterday, sir, I cannot see how that is a supplementary. All I can do is reiterate my answer to the original question: if anything comes out of it, let me know.

#### **CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:29):** The original question was about procedural fairness, so I ask—

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes, but, the Hon. Ms Scriven, it comes out of the answer. The minister gave a tight answer.

**The Hon. C.M. Scriven:** 'Tight' is one way of putting it.

**The PRESIDENT:** Which wasn't that effusive.

#### **CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:29):** A further supplementary: can the minister assure doctors and nurses that under KordaMentha administration they will be provided with procedural fairness in line with what the nurses union is requesting after any complaints made against them, including confidentiality of the matter and being informed about the content of issues raised against them?

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Scriven, that is really pushing the standing orders, but the minister is on his feet and seems to be keen to answer it.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:29):** All I can say is that to be able to answer the honourable member in terms of her asking me whether I am going to respond to the issues raised by the ANMF, considering as far as I know they haven't raised procedural fairness issues with me, I am at a loss to be able to answer.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Scriven, I don't think we can get a supplementary out of that, but I am prepared to listen. The Hon. Mr Hunter, are you going to have a go?

**CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK**

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:30):** Thank you, sir. I will have a go. Will the minister cause his agency to inquire into the allegations raised by the Hon. Ms Scriven and bring back a response?

**The PRESIDENT:** I will allow that question.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30):** I am more than happy to get in contact with the ANMF and inquire whether they have any concerns of the nature raised by the Hon. Ms Scriven.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Mr President, that wasn't my supplementary question. It was will he ask of his agency and come back with a response?

**The Hon. S.G. Wade:** Ask what?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Mr President, I will repeat my question, or paraphrase it.

**The PRESIDENT:** I will allow you, yes.

**CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK**

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:30):** My question to the minister is: in light of the questions asked by the Hon. Ms Scriven, will the minister now go back to his agency and inquire as to their veracity and bring back a response?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30):** I am happy to take on notice the collection of questions that have been asked and come back with a response.

**The PRESIDENT:** I thank the Hon. Mr Hunter for asking supplementaries—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! I would like to thank the Hon. Mr Hunter for asking supplementaries within the standing orders. The Hon. Ms Bourke.

**HEALTH SERVICES**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:31):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding the health system.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Yesterday, during question time the minister stated:

The health system is run by a range of chief executives across the network. They make decisions on how best to manage their beds.

My question to the minister is: do you as the minister accept a responsibility for the health system, or can beds and hospital wards be closed, leading to hospital ramping, without the minister's involvement?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** If it's such an excellent question, how about giving the minister the courtesy to answer it in silence? Minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:32):** I stand by what I said yesterday. The health managers in the health system—

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

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, I would like to hear the minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** —run the health system on a day-to-day basis, and it doesn't just relate to whether or not particular beds need to be made available on the day. There is a whole range of decisions that they make that impact on the need for people to come to hospital, the capacity to handle incoming patients in relation to hospital discharges. It's not just about whether or not a bed is

open or closed. The health system is incredibly complex, and unexpected events, such as the extreme heat event in January, precipitate responses that can't be anticipated.

I expect the managers in our health system to respond to whatever comes. Do I expect them to give me a call as minister and expect me to validate or overturn every decision they make? No; the answer is no. We pay the managers to manage. The government will continue to work with the department and with the local health networks to make sure that the health system is ready to cope with whatever comes, but when we've got 40,000 employees, when we have more than 2,000 beds in the country, half of them being residential aged care, half of them being acute and thousands of beds in the city, it's a very complex network. To think that a minister, one person out of a team of 40,000, could actually be the executive running the whole system shows you how lacking in understanding the opposition is of how the health system works.

### HEALTH SERVICES

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:33):** Supplementary: do you take responsibility for decisions in the health system, or is your attitude, 'Don't ask me, I just work here' or, as the Hon. Mr Ridgway would say, 'I don't know.'

**The PRESIDENT:** It's commentary. I am going to rule that one out of order. Do you have a further supplementary?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** I do have another one, thank you, Mr President.

**The Hon. S.G. Wade:** Another staff question? Another question from some staff members?

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** No, I can write my own questions, thank you. I don't get my executives to do my work for me.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Ms Bourke, don't engage in a conversation with the minister, and the minister, don't bait the member.

### HOSPITAL WARD CLOSURES

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:34):** Is the minister's attitude that beds and wards can be closed across the health system without the health minister being involved in any of the action?

**The PRESIDENT:** I will allow that supplementary. Minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:34):** As I've said, I expect managers to manage. On a day-to-day basis, they will flex up and they will flex down. I would be very concerned about the competence of a manager that couldn't make decisions, that expected the minister's office to run their network for them.

### HOSPITAL WARD CLOSURES

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:35):** Can you guarantee that no more hospital wards will be closed under your tenure as minister?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:35):** What I guarantee is that the health system will continue to be managed effectively. That will mean flexing up and flexing down.

### HOSPITAL WARD CLOSURES

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** Supplementary question: minister, do you believe you are responsible to this parliament for the closure of hospital wards?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:35):** Under the health department, the responsibility for the management of our hospitals is with the CEO of each of the local health networks and the department. My responsibility as minister is to provide oversight of that. It is not to control, not to manage.

### HOSPITAL WARD CLOSURES

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** Supplementary: do you believe you are responsible to the parliament when hospital wards close, minister?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:35):** I am more than happy to give account for the activities of my department, as I have been doing continually since I was appointed in this role.

#### HOSPITAL WARD CLOSURES

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** Final supplementary: minister, do you stand by your comment from last year that hospitals would be more efficient without patients, and is that why you take these attitudes?

**The PRESIDENT:** I'm not allowing that.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** He said that last year.

**The PRESIDENT:** It was infliction.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** It was a quote from last year.

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes, last year, but not in his answer.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** He said that last year. It's entirely relevant to his answers.

**The PRESIDENT:** I'm not having an argument with you. It is supplementary by way of clarification. Check my *Hansard* from yesterday. The Hon. Mr Hood.

#### CRUISE SHIP STRATEGY

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:36):** My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister update the council about the exciting activity with respect to cruise ships in Adelaide and the regions of South Australia?

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

**The PRESIDENT:** I did note, the Hon. Mr Hood, that you used the word 'exciting', which was an imputation. Please refrain from it in the future. The Hon. Mr Ridgway.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** It is pleasing to know that the honourable member has an ongoing interest in the cruise ship sector. A record number of cruise ships are sailing into South Australia this month, signalling a bumper season for our local tourism operators and other businesses, and it is worth more than \$118 million to our state's economy.

There will be 34 cruise ship visits, including Cunard's *Queen Elizabeth* ocean liner and Silversea Cruises' newest flagship *Silver Muse*, with a total capacity of 62,681 passengers and crew docking in South Australian ports in February. Never before have we seen so many cruise ships come to South Australia in one month. We are delighted to welcome interstate and international passengers and showcase all that our wonderful state has to offer.

The boom is the combination of a dedicated government push to grow our cruise ship tourism market, which will have significant flow-on economic benefits for the local tourism operators, as well as cafes, restaurants and retailers. All up this season, from October 2018 to March 2019, we will see 82 cruise ships visit across South Australia, including five overnight stays, a 23 per cent increase on last year, which, as I said, will generate more than \$180 million for our state's economy.

The month began with the arrival of P&O's *Pacific Eden* at Kangaroo Island, one of the 10 cruise ships to visit there, and it includes another 19 ships at Port Adelaide's Passenger Terminal, Outer Harbor, including one overnight, while Port Lincoln will welcome five ships, including one overnight. Port Lincoln will actually enjoy its first ever double-header, with two ships, the *Astor* and the *Pacific Jewel*, in the port on one day, 20 February, in what will be a very busy time for that regional city.

Other highlights include the maiden visit of Silversea Cruises' newest flagship, *Silver Muse*, a six-star luxury cruise ship, to Kangaroo Island. Both the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Astor* arrived in Adelaide on the same day, 8 February, and have eight ex-Adelaide return itineraries. March is also busy, with 12 cruise ships scheduled, including Port Lincoln's first overnight stop, with the *Astor*

staying over on 2 to 3 March and a maiden visit by the *Viking Sun*, concluding a record season of 84 ships visiting the state.

The Marshall government has launched the South Australian Cruise Ship Strategy 2020 to help the record-breaking cruise industry reach new heights, drive tourism growth and support more regional jobs. The new strategy provides a blueprint for South Australia to continue to grow the sector and maximise the tourism, economic and job opportunities in this lucrative industry.

The SATC has developed this strategy with an ambitious goal of 100 cruise ships to visit South Australian ports and anchorages, contributing \$200 million to the state's economy by 2020. Employment will be stimulated both in Adelaide and regional areas such as Kangaroo Island and Port Lincoln with the introduction of new itineraries. Local retailers and operators will see flow-on benefits, too, with passengers spending more per day to create more tangible economic benefits.

With more home porting out of Adelaide this will also stimulate pre and post stays for domestic and interstate passengers embarking and disembarking on these cruises. Our visitor economy is currently at a record-breaking \$6.9 billion and the cruise ship strategy is a key part in delivering our \$8 billion target and will continue to be as we set our sights on 2020.

#### CRUISE SHIP STRATEGY

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:40):** A supplementary to the minister based on the original answer: what is the target for 2020, 2021 and 2022 for the number of cruise ships to visit our state?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:40):** As I said, but I will repeat for the honourable member, we have developed a strategy with the ambitious goal to have 100 cruise ships visit South Australian ports and anchorages, contributing \$200 million to the state's economy by 2020.

#### CRUISE SHIP STRATEGY

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** Supplementary question: which regional ports are currently being visited and which regional ports are targeted that aren't being visited by cruise ships?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:41):** Clearly, the regional ports of Kangaroo Island and, of course, Port Lincoln. Some work has been done around Wallaroo and, hopefully, in the coming year there may be a boat there. I know there has been some interest in trying to do something around Port Pirie, obviously to access the Lower Flinders and the Clare Valley, but there are some logistic issues in getting the ships in. However, the team at SATC is constantly looking for new opportunities. South Australia has a lot to offer and the more we can expose the cruise ships to our regions, the better it is for the regions, and so we will continue to look for all of those opportunities.

#### CRUISE SHIP STRATEGY

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** How many of the visits that happened this season occurred after the March election and how many were locked in before the Liberals came to government?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:41):** They have all occurred since the Liberals came to government and the visitor economy has been enjoying robust growth. I don't have the forward booking schedule at my fingertips but if there is more information that I can provide to satisfy the honourable member—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I can't hear half the time because the person behind him is continually agitating. If I can provide more information I will do so.

#### CRUISE SHIP STRATEGY

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42):** Further supplementary, and it might be easier to phrase it like this: is it the case that every single one of those visits was locked in



prior to March last year and you have had nothing to do with the record numbers we have seen this year, and that, in fact, they go up every year?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:42):** What I have had a lot to do with—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I will seek some advice. But what I have had a lot to do with—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Let the minister answer.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** —is the incredibly high morale at the SATC. They have actually got a minister who cares, a minister who goes to things and enjoys his portfolio. We have a great team there. I can't believe the members opposite can't recognise that the great team at the SATC continues to deliver for the South Australian economy, and all they want to do is ridicule them and laugh at them. It's a disgrace. Those people—in such things like the cruise ships and the Tour Down Under—work extremely long hours and weekends. There have been volunteers and people working in that sector for over 20 years, and the members opposite just laugh and ridicule. They are a joke and that is why they are on the other side of the chamber.

#### CRUISE SHIP STRATEGY

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:43):** Supplementary question: is the minister aware that one of the cruise ships—I think it was the *Queen Victoria*—only two nights ago couldn't dock at Kangaroo Island because of a problem with docking, to the absolute horror and frustration of the thousands of passengers—

**The PRESIDENT:** The first bit was appropriate. The first bit was within the standing orders; the subsequent commentary was not.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** Say, 'I don't know,' Ridgy. Go on.

**The PRESIDENT:** Let the minister answer. If we want to hear from you I am sure someone will ask you a question.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:44):** I was given some advice that because of the stormy weather and the unsafe seas near Kangaroo Island that unfortunately the ship was unable to dock at Kangaroo Island and came to Port Adelaide.

#### FUTURE JOBS FUND GRANT

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:44):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer—

**The PRESIDENT:** Is leave granted?

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** —about—

*The Hon. R.P. Wortley interjecting:*

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** About—

**The PRESIDENT:** Leave has not come yet. I am waiting for the Hon. Mr Wortley to finish whatever he is saying.

**The Hon. R.P. Wortley:** I'm trying to wake up the Treasurer.

**The PRESIDENT:** Thank you for showing concern to the other side of the chamber, the Hon. Mr Wortley, but I am sure they can look after themselves.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** The leave I sought was to ask the Treasurer a question about grants under the Future Jobs Fund. In February last year, the former government announced a number of grants under the Future Jobs Fund, including a grant of \$832,000 to the Australian Walking

Company to develop 'luxury tent-style eco-sensitive accommodation and other facilities on the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail', which is within the Flinders Chase National Park. In August last year, the new Treasurer issued a media release which stated:

After receiving legal advice, Mr Lucas said the former government's offers would be honoured but he had asked treasury officials to seek terms and conditions with grant recipients, where possible, to offer additional security for taxpayers.

According to the SA Tenders and Contracts website a contract was executed by the present government with the Australian Walking Company on 1 December last year for a grant of \$916,000 for the operation of walking tours and the construction of accommodation facilities. Two weeks prior to that date, on 15 November last year, the Australian Walking Company lodged a number of development applications with the State Planning Commission for accommodation, including one for nine permanent buildings—so not tents—on coastal cliffs near Sandy Creek in the Flinders Chase National Park, which is at least three kilometres as the crow flies from the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail and which will require the construction of 10 kilometres of new roads and trails within the national park to service the development. My questions of the Treasurer are:

1. What steps has the Treasurer taken to ensure that the proposed development is consistent with the original intent of the grant, which was to provide accommodation on the wilderness trail not three kilometres from it?
2. Will the Treasurer publish the full terms and conditions of the grant to the Australian Walking Company?
3. Will the Treasurer request his colleagues, the Minister for Planning and the Minister for Environment, to publish the development applications for these new private buildings within Flinders Chase National Park, because the development applications are currently being kept secret?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:47):** I am very happy to see what additional information I can provide to the honourable member within the constraints that may or may not exist within the terms of the funding formula or grant that was provided. The honourable member correctly quotes me, I suspect, in saying that in general terms the new government's position was that where there had been either a firm contract provided or a firm commitment given by the former government we would honour those particular commitments.

So I suspect that from the new government's viewpoint, this particular one, although I don't have much detailed recollection of this particular one—there were so many of them; it's pretty hard to keep track of. I am quite happy to seek further advice from my department and others in relation to the questions the member has raised and bring back a reply as soon as I can.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:48):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister advise whether he is still committed to delivering the high dependency unit at the Modbury Hospital, and if so, on what date will the works commence?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:48):** I thank the honourable member for giving me the opportunity to reassure the council and for the people of the north-east that the Marshall Liberal government is committed to the delivery of the high dependency unit at Modbury Hospital. That stands in stark contrast to the position of the Labor Party. Since the election they have continually cast doubt on this decision.

The Northern Adelaide Local Health Network has established a clinical working group to develop a plan to establish the high dependency unit, and that is important, not just to try to reduce the number of transfers to the Lyell McEwin Hospital, but it is also important to support the delivery of low to medium complexity surgery on the site. This government is very proud of the fact that we have restored up to 72-hour care on the site. That means that patients will be able to receive care closer to home, it will ease the pressure on the Lyell McEwin Hospital and it will help drive down elective surgery waits.

The clinical working group that is developing this plan is chaired by Professor Andrew Burston and Alison Hodak. It has met a number of times and is developing a model of care. The

government has also been to the Public Works Committee and presented our plans for the Modbury redevelopment, which include a high dependency unit. We will continue to work with the NALHN team, both at the Lyell McEwin site and the Modbury site, to make sure that we deliver high-quality care to the people of the north-east. We believe that a key to that is the delivery on our commitment to a high dependency unit. That's why it was fully funded in the first Marshall Liberal budget.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos, a supplementary?

#### **MODBURY HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:50):** The question that I asked hasn't been answered in terms of what date.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:50):** Are we committed? You said are we committed?

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS:** Well, I asked—

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

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, I can't hear the Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos. She is seeking clarification.

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS:** There's two parts.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I might take that as a supplementary.

**The PRESIDENT:** I am allowing supplementaries. Minister?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Yes. So if I can take that as a supplementary.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** If you like, by way of supplementary, whatever. Let me answer it. The former government closed the high dependency unit at Modbury in 2016. Right up to the election, it vigorously opposed it and continues to do so in opposition, and the people of the north-east will not forget that at the next election. The government made it clear to the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Allow the minister to answer.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** A point of order: Mr President, you asked for supplementaries to refer to the answers given. This was a very specific supplementary in relation to the answer about what date and the minister has not even come close to addressing the date after more than a minute.

**The PRESIDENT:** I've got the point. The ministers have leeway to answer the question. The minister has taken your point and as a courtesy to the Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos to answer her supplementary. Minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** As the government has repeatedly said in the media and elsewhere, the full development of Modbury Hospital is not scheduled to be finished until 2021, but we are looking at options to open the HDU earlier than that. I can assure you that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Earlier than 2021.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** Let's put it this way: it's before the next election and you guys were never going to open the HDU.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** A point of order, Mr President.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos!

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** Mr President, I draw your attention to standing order 181, which reads in part that:

No Member shall converse aloud or make repeated interjections or other disturbance whilst any other Member is orderly debating...

**The PRESIDENT:** Thank you for the reminder. I am sure the opposition benches will take that on board, given you are such a senior member of the council. The Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos.

#### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:52):** A further supplementary arising from the answer: has the minister actually received advice to say that a high dependency unit would be clinically viable and not risk patient safety?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53):** I met with Professor Andrew Burston recently and discussed the work of the working group. Professor Burston reiterated his view that not only would an HDU be safe but he questioned how you could increase the level of services at the site without an HDU. Let's remember this is the person that the former government had review the HDU twice and said that the former government was so poorly resourcing the HDU at Modbury Hospital that there were concerns about safety. But this government is committed to properly resourcing an HDU at Modbury and the person who is co-chairing that work is the same person who raised concerns about your former government's program.

#### COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:53):** My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on health services in country South Australia?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:54):** I thank the honourable member for his question and, to be frank, his longstanding advocacy for the people of regional South Australia over a number of years. Country health services were notoriously neglected under Labor. Only one of many examples is the capital works backlog which the Marshall Liberal government inherited at the last election. It was more than \$100 million in our hospitals, let alone the residential aged-care facilities. My understanding is, if you add both residential aged-care facilities and hospitals together, you are starting to approach \$200 million.

In government, we are working to address this. Just some of the initiatives announced in the 2018 budget were \$140 million for country capital works over 10 years, \$2.1 million to expand and upgrade the renal dialysis unit at the Mount Gambier hospital, \$1 million for safety upgrades to Lighthouse Lodge in Kingston, \$7 million for the upgrade to the Murray Bridge emergency department, \$8.5 million for Strathalbyn aged care and \$300,000 to support Yorketown surgical services.

An area of particular need is in Mount Barker, with a rapidly growing population. Projections by the council suggest growth from 36,000 this year to 56,000 by 2036, an increase of 50 per cent. As a state public health service, we need to be well positioned to respond to this growth. I want to acknowledge the ongoing advocacy of the member for Kavel, Dan Cregan; the member for Heysen, Josh Teague; and Georgina Downer, the federal candidate for Mayo.

All three have written to me and lobbied me on a number of occasions to make sure the health needs of their communities are heard. An issue which has been significantly raised is an upgrade for the Mount Barker emergency department. I note that the federal member for Mayo, Rebekha Sharkie, has also recognised this need; I was just surprised to read about it in the local paper. To date, I have not received correspondence from the member for Mayo regarding an upgrade to the emergency department. Instead, she has chosen a political stunt rather than the meaningful engagement of other members and candidates.

I thank the members Dan Cregan and Josh Teague and the federal candidate, Ms Downer, for their work on behalf of this growing area. I assure them that the Marshall Liberal government will continue to give a high priority to the needs of Mount Barker and districts and to other South Australians who live in country areas.

### COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:56):** Supplementary: is the minister able to outline what percentage of the savings target for SA Pathology will hit country people and country services?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, you were updating the council on Country Health.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:57):** I fail to see how it is supplementary, but SA Pathology efficiencies will be found right across the state.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Let's just leave the commentary out.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** They are being looked at both internally by SA Pathology management and by the PricewaterhouseCoopers report. The honourable member's supplementary, if that's what it was, gives me the opportunity to reflect on the hypocrisy of the Labor Party, which through the Ernst and Young report identified, I think, \$42 million worth of savings. I don't think it was the Ernst and Young report, but there was another report that the Labor Party received, I think it was perhaps in 2014, which actually recommended privatising country pathology services. So this is a party that preaches antiprivatisation and then commissions a report to recommend it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Opposition benches, allow the minister to answer the question. Minister.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** When the then minister, Jack Snelling, received the report and it became public, I think it took another four months before Mr Snelling ruled out privatisation, but then the Ernst and Young report went on full steam and recommended \$42 million worth of efficiencies.

The former Labor government, of course, courageous as they ever were, coming up to the last election was feeling the heat because they completely locked out the clinicians and their employee organisation from the Ernst and Young review, which completely undermined the credibility of that program. My recollection is that in mid-2017 they suspended or postponed the efficiency program until after the 2018 election.

This government makes no apologies looking for efficiencies in public health services because South Australians deserve to have high quality sustainable health services. We are not going to be ideological like the Labor Party, which in government calls for efficiencies and in opposition rails against them.

*The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Hunter, restrain yourself. The Hon. Ms Bonaros.

### MOUNT BARKER DISTRICT SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:59):** Will the minister retract his statement regarding the federal member for Mayo given that there is correspondence that has clearly been sent to the minister regarding the Mount Barker hospital emergency department upgrade?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:00):** I will certainly check my records but the advice I was given is that the honourable member had not written to me. I acknowledge that she has on other matters but I was not aware of any correspondence in relation to the emergency department.

### SA PATHOLOGY

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:00):** A further supplementary in relation to the answer dealing with country health generally: can the minister confirm that he has had no advice whatsoever as to what portion of the \$105 million being slashed from SA Pathology will be wrought upon country health services?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:00):** What has happened since the last budget is that SA Pathology has set about looking at efficiencies within SA Pathology.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** No, no; you did. They don't do these things themselves.

**The PRESIDENT:** I've allowed you the supplementary.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** He takes no responsibility for anything.

**The PRESIDENT:** We don't need your commentary.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** You did it, Stephen.

**The PRESIDENT:** We do not need your commentary.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** The PricewaterhouseCoopers report has been commissioned but my understanding is that it does not report until March. The efficiencies out of the budget, as I said, are in two waves, through management and through PwC. There are certainly ongoing efficiencies that SA Pathology has been working on. After all, the former Labor government had efficiency targets for health units and they would have been progressing before the Liberal government budget.

#### COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01):** A further supplementary: if the entire management, the entire savings target, the decision to open or close wards is entirely up to the department, minister, what is the point of you?

**The PRESIDENT:** That is a completely inappropriate supplementary. I am not allowing it. The Hon. Mr Ngo.

#### KORDAMENTHA

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:01):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister advise whether interstate corporate administrators KordaMentha have ever seen any patient information?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02):** The advice I have been given is that KordaMentha does not have access to private patient information.

#### KORDAMENTHA

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:02):** Supplementary: what about staff?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02):** I can assure you that staff do have access to private patient information. That is what nurses and doctors do.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Ngo, a further supplementary.

#### KORDAMENTHA

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:02):** What about KordaMentha? Have they seen any staff records?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02):** I am not clear about the nature of what the honourable member is referring to. In the context that KordaMentha has a specific role in appointments, I imagine the answer will be yes, but I am happy to take it on notice and seek clarification.

#### DISABILITY INCLUSION

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:03):** My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services about an important initiative to increase access and inclusion for children with disability in our community. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about the establishment of a working group to develop guidelines for inclusive play spaces throughout South Australia and the inaugural meeting that took place this week?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:03):** I thank the honourable member for her question. We are very pleased that we have had a number of representatives from a number of organisations who have been excited to participate in our play working group for

inclusive playgrounds. We have the new Disability Inclusion Act, which was the first piece of legislation passed by the new Marshall government in the new parliament and so the agenda at South Australian level is for inclusion in a range of areas.

At the time the legislation had been drafted, and through its passage through the parliament, there was some concern expressed by local government in particular, which is now captured. We will be required to have access and inclusion plans and they might need some assistance with that. So we have established this as a first step in providing inclusive play spaces and assisting councils, and it is likely that developers and so forth will find these useful as well.

State government agencies and local government councils are going to have some statutory responsibilities to advise what their inclusion plans are, and we thought it was a really important initiative to bring together a range of experts in this area who are able to assist us. Of course, we have the Quentin Kenihan playground, which was announced by the Premier, which is going to be done in conjunction with the City of Adelaide.

The range of stakeholders include people who represent the various forms of disability. We have people who are experts in universal design. The Community Visitor, Mr Maurice Corcoran, is also a member. We have a range of councils and we have some very proactive councils in this space. The Hendrie Street playground at Park Holme is a very impressive playground within the City of Marion. I have mentioned the City of Adelaide. The City of Salisbury and the City of Playford have also done some very good work in this area and the Commissioner for Children and Young People, Inclusive Sport, community centres, Can Do, Nature Play and a range of government departments.

The group of individuals had their first meeting on Monday. We are hopeful that they will be reporting sometime in August and that this initiative will assist councils to not only follow their obligations under the act but that these places will be very welcoming for everybody, including parents who have lived experience of disability, and will take into consideration all the design considerations, and that we will see much more appropriate playgrounds going forward.

### **BUILDING INDUSTRY**

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:06):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer regarding the building industry.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** The Master Builders Association of South Australia has raised concerns about the state of the state's building industry. ABS figures on building approvals in South Australia show that, while the decline in building approvals has ended for the first time in 14 consecutive months, only 621 homes were approved in December, only a slight increase of four homes on the previous month. In December 2017, there were 94 more approvals: 715 for the month. However, only 15 per cent of these latest approvals were for first-home buyers—the worst of any state or territory.

To boost the sector, the MBA wants a stamp duty exemption for first-home buyers building their first home, similar to New South Wales and Victoria—except their exemptions include all homes—and the removal of a requirement to have a rainwater tank installed in all new builds like Queensland did in 2013, which the MBA has calculated will save the average first-home buyer about \$25,000 of the cost of a new build.

My question to the Treasurer is: given the current crisis, what is the government currently doing and what is it planning to do to support the state's building industry? Will the government support the Master Builders Association of South Australia's proposal of stamp duty exemptions for first-home buyers building their homes and scrap the regulation requiring rainwater tanks? Will the government commit to investigate the feasibility of making first-home buyers building their home exempt from stamp duty?

Will the Treasurer support a call for its new Productivity Commission to review negative factors like inefficient land release strategies, excessive development levies, taxes and charges, and excessive planning and building requirements which drive up house prices by 40 per cent. Does the

government believe that boosting the First Home Owner Grant to \$20,000 in regional Australia, which would be up from \$15,000 presently, will be a positive initiative?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:09):** I thank the honourable member for his question. The new government always treats the views of stakeholders with due respect, and we of course have and will continue to treat the views of the Master Builders Association with respect as well. I had a number of meetings both before and after the election with the Master Builders Association. They did put the proposition in relation to stamp duty relief for first-home builders to both the former Labor government and to the then Liberal opposition prior to the election. Both the former Labor government and the then Liberal opposition made no commitment or promise to provide stamp duty relief for first-home owners in that frenetic period leading up to the March election last year.

So the new government made no commitment in this particular area, as was the position of the former Labor government as well. That remains the policy of the new Liberal government. I have a meeting coming up with the Master Builders Association in the next couple of weeks, and I will listen respectfully to their position in relation to this area, but the government's position is that we have no financial capacity to provide any more significant financial relief at the moment.

We are trying to turn around the state's economy after 16 years of financial mismanagement and negligence under the former Labor government. We committed at the election for significant tax and fee relief: a \$90 million a year reduction in ESL bills, which we implemented in July last year; a \$40 million to \$50 million a year reduction in payroll tax, that is, the abolition of payroll tax for all small businesses from 1 January, which we have implemented already; and, a commitment to reduce land tax from June of next year at around about a cost of \$40 million to \$50 million a year, which we have legislated for and which will be introduced.

So in those significant areas we have committed to tax and fee relief in an endeavour to try to generate economic growth and jobs growth in the economy, but we did not commit to the particular stamp duty relief that the Master Builders Association lobbied for before the election and continues to lobby for now.

In relation to the second area, it is not within my portfolio responsibility to be able to exempt builders from the requirement for rainwater tanks. That is, I suspect, probably more likely to be in the area of minister Stephan Knoll, but I am happy to take up the issue with the appropriate minister and see what, if any, policy response the government might have in relation to that.

In relation to the third general area, which was the Productivity Commission: we have already instituted a Productivity Commission inquiry in terms of government procurement, which touches in a small way on some of the issues that the Master Builders and other stakeholder groups have raised, and we would see some potential benefits for businesses and industries from that.

In relation to whether or not the Productivity Commission might undertake a further Productivity Commission review, or a number of reviews, in the areas that the Master Builders have raised, I think the government certainly would be interested in those sorts of areas, because that is what the Productivity Commission was implemented for, that is, to reduce regulation, to reduce red tape, and if it can be done in an area such as this, which might help drive down the costs for home builders and, therefore ultimately, homebuyers, obviously it would be a good thing. So certainly that would be something the government would be interested in, with further consideration and discussion with the Productivity Commission. I am sure the Premier would be interested in considering, at an appropriate time, something in that particular area as well.

### **BUILDING INDUSTRY**

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:13):** Supplementary question: considering that the construction industry is one of the biggest drivers of jobs and the economy in South Australia, isn't the Treasurer concerned that a number of building companies are folding or finding themselves in trouble?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:14):** Obviously, I am concerned at any business that might find themselves in financial difficulty, in particular in relation to building companies. There is obviously the concern for the workers who might work within that industry. There is obviously concern for subcontractors who might have undertaken work and might not get paid, and there is obviously



concern in relation to home builders who might be impacted in some way by that particular arrangement.

That's why we have a building indemnity insurance scheme, which is managed out of SAicorp within Treasury and which seeks to look after home builders who might find themselves impacted by a house builder who goes broke. The answer to the honourable member's question is yes, I do share the member's concern and the Master Builders Association's concern in relation to any business or home builder that goes broke.

#### **AUSTRALIAN NURSING AND MIDWIFERY FEDERATION**

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:15):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the minister agree with the comments of Professor Elizabeth Dabars, CEO of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, who says that the Liberal government has no plans to deal with nurses leaving the health system?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15):** Was this in relation to no plans for nurses leaving the health system?

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** Yes.

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I have had ongoing discussions with the ANMF and the nursing leadership within SA Health in relation to the refreshment of our nurse workforce. One of the areas that is of particular concern is the area of mental health. If the honourable member is correctly reporting the comments of Associate Professor Dabars, I would dispute them, because the fact of the matter is, we are rolling out plans to build the nursing workforce, particularly in the area of mental health nursing.

If my memory serves me correctly, the average mental health nurse in South Australia is in their 50s. Considering I am in that category, I don't regard that as old, but in terms of the sustainability of the workforce it is a concern because we need to be refreshing the workforce so that it is sustainable. The practical impact of the relative age of mental health nurses is highlighted by some of the recent challenges we have had in staffing facilities.

For example, after the Royal Adelaide Hospital mental health unit was unable to be moved from Glenside because of the problems with the duress alarms, this government made the decision to use them as general mental health beds until the psychiatric intensive care unit (PICU) transferred. It wasn't possible for us to use all 10 beds because we weren't able to recruit the staff to open them. Similarly, the temporary short stay mental health unit at Lyell McEwin was opened much later than we hoped because of problems with recruitment.

In terms of the nursing workforce, one area of particular focus will be the mental health nursing workforce. The government has a mental health nursing workforce strategy, which aims to support, attract and retain mental health nursing staff. On Monday 12 November 2018, there was a mental health nursing collaborative round table, which in fact the ANMF was invited to.

The LHNs are continuing intensive mental health recruitment to fill existing vacancies. LHNs continue to support nurses to gain mental health qualifications via the graduate diploma program, and in terms of green shoots, I am sure the council will welcome the fact that UniSA reports that they have received higher levels of applications for their graduate diploma in mental health nursing. My understanding is that it is 80 this year, compared with 40 last year.

The issue of mental health nursing recruitment was specifically an issue that I discussed with the ANMF in a recent meeting, so I am sure the honourable member's quote cannot be representative because the ANMF and I have been discussing these very issues recently.

#### **MIGHTY KINGDOM**

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:19):** My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister inform the council about the great work being done by local games studio, Mighty Kingdom, which is a growing part of our creative services industry?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:19):** I would like to thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in the gaming industry. On 29 January,

I had the great pleasure of being given a tour of the Mighty Kingdom CBD office in Pirie Street by Mr Dan Thorsland, the general manager, Mr Philip Mayes, founder and CEO, and Mr Tony Lawrence, the chief operating officer.

Mighty Kingdom is Australia's largest independent game developer. Founded in 2010, it has released over 20 games for mobile use and the web and has over 45 million players across the globe. They have developed games for some of the biggest brands and companies in the world, including Shopkins, LEGO, Disney—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Let him answer in silence. You can pursue this at next question time tomorrow.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** They are in the process of developing multiple games across multiple formats primarily for the export market. For the past two years, Mighty Kingdom has also run a graduate program, which is the only one of its kind in Australia. Graduates are employed by Mighty Kingdom for one year to build their game development skills. They tell me that all the alumni go on through the program and have been subsequently employed, which is a fantastic outcome for all involved.

Mighty Kingdom currently employs over 50 staff and has plans to expand further, as the games industry continues to mature and grow in South Australia. Based on my probably unreliable estimates of ages of people, looking at the group working there I would say most of the workforce are in their late 20s or early 30s. Stopping the brain drain from South Australia is vitally important for our future, and it is a key priority of the Marshall Liberal government. It is industries and businesses like Mighty Kingdom that will provide the careers and futures of tomorrow.

It was fantastic to see firsthand the great work that Mighty Kingdom is undertaking and the employment opportunities it provides to a younger generation in a fast growing, globally competitive and highly skilled business environment. Not only that, it is the vast service export opportunities that are so exciting for this industry. Most of the audience is offshore in Asia, Europe and the US, and they are hungry for more forms of entertainment to get stuck into. We see this area as one of the great growth potential areas for the years and decades ahead.

Many thanks to the team at Mighty Kingdom for the tour and for explaining the incredibly skilled and complex work they do. It is interesting to note that we put up a little post on LinkedIn of my visit there. It has had in excess 18,000 views. It shows, sadly, the opposition is not interested but that 18,000 people across South Australia, Australia and the globe are interested in the great work that Mighty Kingdom is doing.

**The PRESIDENT:** Thank you, the Hon. Mr Ridgway. The time for questions without notice having expired, I now call on members to make—

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

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, the President is working.

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

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Ridgway, do not have private conversations or incite bad behaviour from the Leader of the Opposition whilst the President is speaking.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Can the Treasurer and the health minister have a conversation outside? It is distracting the President. I call on matters of interest. The Hon. Mr Parnell.

*Matters of Interest*

## **ENVIRONMENT AND WATER DEPARTMENT**

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:23):** South Australians are rightly proud and protective of our wonderful natural environment. We love our national parks, our bushland, our rivers, our mountains, our deserts and the wide range of species that call these precious places home, which is why so

many of us were horrified to learn that the Marshall Liberal government was prepared to put our environment up for sale.

The chief executive of the Department for Environment and Water notified staff recently that the department was to become an economic development agency, not protectors and defenders of the environment. They were also warned to prepare for more staff cuts and more budget cuts. South Australians are not going to take this lying down. In the last week, nearly 1,200 people have signed my petition calling on environment minister David Speirs to stop the cuts and to do his job properly: 1,200 people are saying, 'No more cuts.' Protecting the environment should not depend on whether or not the government or their corporate mates can make money out of it. Our environment deserves protection for its own sake as well as for future generations. We are saying enough is enough.

We owe these revelations to an InDaily report two weeks ago by experienced political journalist Tom Richardson. Quoting from a bulletin issued to departmental staff in the new year, it was revealed that the chief executive, John Schutz, had told staff that they would be 'transitioning to a new agency' in the coming year. He then went on to outline that the first key shift was that:

...we are an economic development agency.

We balance environmental protection with economic development—this means we contribute to our state's economy by driving sustainable economic development, and unlocking the potential of our natural and heritage resources.

Now, 'unlocking the potential of our natural and heritage resources' is polly speak for, 'Let's find ways to exploit our natural environment and make private profit from our public assets.' The Marshall Liberal government has already approved a private golf course development and luxury private accommodation on public coastal conservation land on Kangaroo Island and now they are looking to approve private luxury accommodation in Kangaroo Island's Flinders Chase National Park. Then there is the private hotel development at Adelaide Oval on the publicly-owned Adelaide Parklands. This is not what the people of South Australia want or deserve.

Our environment deserves a properly funded government agency whose main responsibility is looking after our precious native plants and animals, not the financial interests of business. To quote the chief executive, 'I want everyone to be clear that we will have less staff and smaller budgets.' This bad news is all too common when it comes to the environment department. In the first Liberal budget last year over 100 jobs were axed and millions of dollars were stripped from the environment budget.

In previous years, under the former Labor government, the situation was similar. Every year the budget was cut. Every year jobs and programs were cut. For over a decade the environment was devalued and programs were defunded so that spending on our special places and biodiversity was cut from around 3 per cent of the state budget to just over 1 per cent, so it is not surprising to hear that many staff in the department are up in arms about the cuts as well as the fundamental shift in focus to become an economic development agency.

It must be depressing in the extreme to those hardworking environment staff to see their agency so devalued. Many of these people have devoted their lives to the South Australian environment. They have put their heart and soul into their work only to see it undermined. How must it feel to see billions spent on ribbon-cutting opportunities for ministers and other vanity projects while their modest budgets are cut year after year?

The Greens say enough is enough. The honeymoon period for the new Liberal government is well and truly over. It is now time for them to step up and take their responsibility to the environment seriously. In these early days of government, they are setting the scene for what is to come and, so far, the news is all bad. What we must remember is this: when the environment is neglected, we are all impoverished; when species go extinct, we are all diminished. It is time to stop the cuts.

#### PARLIAMENTARY CHRISTIAN FELLOWSHIP

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:28):** I rise to share with the chamber that yesterday I, along with our President, the Hon. Andrew McLachlan, and a number of other members from this chamber, and indeed from the other place, had the privilege of attending the opening service for the 2019 state parliamentary year at St Peter's Cathedral.

As I am sure members are aware, this is an annual event that provides an opportunity for members and their staff to gather for a time of reflection and encouragement as a new parliamentary year commences. It is just one of the many events that are held by the South Australian Parliamentary Christian Fellowship throughout the year, and is organised in conjunction with the Leader of Christian Churches of South Australia, known as LoCCSA, an organisation with which we have developed a strong relationship over the years.

Traditionally, the Governor of South Australia and the Lord Mayor join us, and they were there yesterday, in addition to other leaders throughout the community. Indeed, the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition are regular attenders at this event. It is open to people who do not consider themselves people of faith but who may wish to just come and have a moment of reflection at the start of the parliamentary year. We note that it is held throughout the commonwealth. The federal parliament also held a similar service yesterday morning marking the commencement of its parliamentary year.

This service has been held each year in the first sitting week of the parliament and, in fact, started soon after the formation of the South Australian Parliamentary Christian Fellowship way back in 1982. It is of course non-denominational. Over the years, many different churches throughout the city have hosted the event, but in more recent times there has been a consensus among committee members that the service should be held at St Peter's Cathedral, which is not only an exquisite and iconic building in Adelaide, South Australia, but location-wise is perfect, being convenient and close to the parliament and the workplaces of other dignitaries and church leaders in terms of travel to the service, which commences at 8am.

Given the ecumenical approach taken to the occasions we have heard sermons delivered by a variety of vastly different speakers from the Anglican Church, Catholic Church, Uniting Church, Lutheran Church and even the Pentecostal Church. This year, the Reverend Father Peter Zwaans, Director of Vocations for the Catholic Archdiocese of Adelaide and also the parish priest of Brooklyn Park and Richmond, delivered a poignant message directed largely toward the parliamentarians in attendance, of which there were approximately 20.

I also note we had the privilege of Reverend Dr Lynn Arnold officiating the service this year, who members would of course recall served as a member of the South Australian parliament himself between 1979 and 1994 and most notably as premier from 1992 and into 1993. In fact, as he welcomed us to the meeting Dr Arnold made a point of mentioning the pivotal role he played in the formation of the PCF some 37 years ago along with the father of our colleague the Hon. John Dawkins, who I learnt actually suggested the start of a group for like-minded MPs. The Hon. Mr Boyd Dawkins became its first president, with Dr Arnold serving as its first secretary, which is my current role in the organisation.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of those who are involved in arranging this event for the benefit of members year after year. I reiterate that it is open to any member that wishes to attend. I specifically would like to thank the Dean and his staff at St Peter's Cathedral, members of LoCCSA, the PCF committee and of course our parliamentary staff and in particular Miss Donna Krieg, from my office, who coordinates the event. Many other members and I are very grateful for their commitment to it.

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T.T. Ngo):** And thank you to your office for organising the event, too.

#### **MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN**

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:31):** There is no matter of greater interest to our state, I think, than the future of the River Murray. It is the lifeblood of our state. It provides our drinking water, it supports our irrigated agriculture, it supports our environment and ecosystems, it creates opportunities for recreation and tourism and it is vital to our state's future. Because it is so crucial to South Australia, it is no surprise that the state at the end of the river system will fight for our fair share of water.

South Australians know that fight extremely well. We have survived more than a century of squabbles and struggles, fighting over water supplies, excessive consumption upstream and critical

choke points which stop water from coming down the river system, choke points that have been put in place in some places artificially by regulation or otherwise by structures or natural river systems.

That is why, of course, the Labor government, after a century of struggle, came to a point where we had to accept a national agreement on the river, underpinned by the best available science, to restore the health of the Murray-Darling Basin and, importantly, to restore the environment of the Murray-Darling system. Those opposite, when they were in opposition, criticised us for holding firm and demanding the full 3,200 gigalitres of water that scientists told us was the bare minimum—the bare minimum—to protect the river, but our Labor government, led by Jay Weatherill, never backed down. In 2013, the former Premier, Mr Weatherill, informed the other place that:

The federal government committed to and passed legislation that established a \$1.77 billion fund to recover an additional 450 gigalitres of environmental water for the basin and to address constraints that impede water delivery. Added to that is an extra couple of hundred million dollars for industry adjustment here in South Australia, so over \$2 billion of resources have been made available to secure the health of the river and ensure that the benefits are shared in South Australia but that the burdens are not unfairly falling on South Australia. That is the measure of the success of this campaign, if you want to reduce it to dollar terms.

That is why when there were allegations on the ABC of systemic rotting, corruption and capitulation, we established the royal commission into the Murray-Darling Basin Plan.

I do not have the time in the brief matters of interest to go through the full litany of failures, the illegal and moral incompetent decisions that commissioner Bret Walker SC found, so I am just going to pick up on a couple. The commissioner found the MDBA had shown itself to be unwilling or incapable of delivering its own legislation, the Water Act, and the Murray-Darling Basin Plan; that the MDBA's decision to reject CSIRO science advice and not consider the recent climate of the past 10 to 20 years and climate change projections of the future amounts to negligence and maladministration; and that deferring to a later date or asserting that climate change risk is shared between the environment and licence holders by yearly allocations based on water availability is nonsensical policy as well as being unlawful.

I never expected the Eastern States or a federal Liberal/National government to fight for South Australia's interests. They never have. But never in our darkest days would I or any other South Australian think that a South Australian state government, elected by South Australians, would so disgracefully and inexcusably capitulate against the interests of every single person who calls our state home.

The harshest words from the entire report were reserved for the member for Black in the other place, Mr David Speirs. The commissioner stated:

The South Australian Government's agreement to changes to the socio-economic criteria for efficiency measures should not merely be described as ill-advised. It is nothing short of a capitulation to the interests of the current Commonwealth Government, and those of Victoria and New South Wales.

[It is] so contrary to the interests of South Australians that the decision by the Minister responsible is almost certainly a breach of at least clause 2.5 of the South Australian Ministerial Code of Conduct in that no minister acting reasonably could consider these changes to the criteria to be anything but totally antipathetic to the interests of South Australians and the South Australian environment.

The enhanced environmental outcomes set out in schedule 5 of the plan, that is the 450 gigalitres of water, must be delivered back to the system. That is the position our former state government took and that we thought the current state government would stand for but has not.

How can this happen when a government, led by this Premier and minister Speirs, has allowed the Eastern States to replace the original schedule 5 criteria that allowed willing sellers to sell their water back to the commonwealth with this new atrocious socio-economic test which will guarantee not one drop of water will come down the river over the border into South Australia. I noted last night that the Premier said this is about compulsory water buybacks. It never was. It is about willing sellers, and this government has sold it out.

*The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:*

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. T.T. Ngo):** Order!

Time expired.

**AL-ARAIBI, MR H.**

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:37):** This is a story of political football and an uncertain victory pulled from the jaws of fear and tyranny by the enormous power of people, social media and one man with a South Aussie connection. In December last year few had ever heard the name Hakeem al-Araibi. Today he is almost as well known around the globe as Cristiano Ronaldo, Lionel Messi and Mohamed Salah, not for his footballing prowess but for being at the centre of a high stakes game of political wills between Thailand, Bahrain and Australia, mostly played out on social media.

Hakeem is a Bahraini refugee who was living in Australia when he was detained in Thailand on his way back from his honeymoon after an Interpol red notice was issued by Bahrain. Bahrain wanted him extradited on trumped up charges that he firebombed a police station several years ago, that incident happening at the same time he was playing club football on live television. Hakeem, an international youth player for his country, managed to escape and was eventually granted asylum in Australia where he plays for the Pascoe Vale club in Melbourne.

As we saw in the joyous scenes in the media overnight, he is back home with his new wife after almost 75 days of illegal captivity in Bangkok. It could have turned out differently had it not been for one man who recognised this injustice that could have seen Hakeem facing torture, possibly even a horrific death, had Thailand bowed to pressure. That man is Craig Foster, a highly respected soccer pundit for SBS TV. Foster has a strong Adelaide link. I first met him when he played for triple National Soccer League champions, Adelaide City, in 1994. He was a very classy midfielder and, after a couple of seasons and 50 games, he joined English professional club Portsmouth in 1997 and then Crystal Palace. He played for Australia at youth level and has 29 senior caps for the Socceroos, and one of them as captain.

At the end of his career he turned to broadcasting, where he has shown the same consummate flare. Now he has demonstrated considerable skill as a human rights advocate, starting the movement to free Hakeem while our own national body, the Football Federation of Australia, shamefully took its time to enter the fray and apply pressure on the Asian Football Confederation (AFC), whose president, Sheikh Salman Bin Ibrahim Al-Khalifa, is a member of the ruling Bahraini royal family.

I am perplexed that the AFC, of which Australia is a member, could even endorse this person for a pivotal role, considering his country's record on human rights abuse. Hakeem's crime was that he criticised the royal family's alleged involvement in sports scandals. He was tortured when arrested by the country's security forces but managed to get away and was sentenced to 10 years' gaol in absentia for 'terrorism related offences'. In seeking his extradition, Bahrain insisted Hakeem would come to no harm because of the integrity of its judicial system.

According to Human Rights Watch, here is the sort of integrity people can expect: electric shocks, suspended in painful positions, forced to stand for long periods, sexual abuse and most likely water torture. Human Rights Watch says that a report of the Bahrain Independent Commission of Inquiry, appointed by the kingdom's ruler to investigate human rights abuses, was a whitewash. The country's Ministry of Interior and National Security Agency said it followed a systematic practice of physical and psychological mistreatment of detained dissidents. In other words, torture is okay. The report recorded five deaths in custody related to torture in 2011.

Unlike the freedoms we and Hakeem now enjoy, Bahrain has crushed independent voices and political debate. Opposition political parties and societies are outlawed. The media is controlled and suppressed. Activists and journalists have been jailed and usually subjected to beatings and torture. Hakeem claims he was also subjected to these reprehensible acts. Bahrain is an archipelago of islands next to Qatar, host of the 2022 World Cup, itself a nation accused of human rights violations. I would urge Australians planning to attend to give Bahrain a wide berth.

I will close again by pressing the assiduous work of Mr Foster. From his one tweet came a tsunami of support, from ordinary people and fans to professional clubs and players from around the world. The Australian government, through foreign minister, Marise Payne, and Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, became involved, lobbying behind the scenes. Joint Australians of the Year, Adelaide's Dr Richard Harris and Perth's Dr Craig Challen, revered heroes in Thailand for the rescue of a youth

soccer team and their coach in a cave last year, added their considerable weight to the hashtag #Hakeem movement. It was no surprise to see Thailand finally buckle.

Time expired.

### LUNAR NEW YEAR

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:43):** It is with great pleasure today that I speak about one of the most celebrated festivals around the world and in South Australia, which is the Lunar New Year. Our many multicultural communities in South Australia have certainly been very busy in organising functions to celebrate the arrival of the Year of the Pig. Lunar New Year is celebrated throughout Asia and beyond. It is commonly known in China and for overseas Chinese people as Chinese New Year or the Spring Festival, in Vietnam as the Tet Festival, in Korea as Seollal and as Losar for Buddhists in Nepal, Bhutan, Tibet and India.

This year, the first day of the Lunar New Year took place on Tuesday 5 February 2019, in accordance with the first new moon of the lunar calendar. Lunar New Year is also celebrated in many countries and regions around the world with large overseas Chinese and Asian populations, including Singapore, Hong Kong, Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Thailand, Cambodia and the Philippines, as well as the United Kingdom, the United States of America, Europe, Canada and, of course, Australia.

This year, 2019, marks the Year of the Pig, the twelfth animal in the Chinese zodiac, and the last animal to arrive at the Jade Emperor's party. Apparently he overslept and was therefore given the last spot in the zodiac order. However, the pig is associated with prosperity and good fortune and is blessed with success in life. The pig also has a romantic personality. For those of you who have watched the monkey king story, you would know that the pig is rather romantic, loves to socialise with friends and family, and is always enthusiastic and generous.

Lunar New Year is well celebrated by many active and vibrant multicultural community organisations in South Australia. It is a great honour to be invited to attend so many wonderful and colourful events associated with Lunar New Year. Our Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall, is passionate about celebrating the cultural diversity and achievements of our multicultural communities. It was wonderful to be a part of the Chinese New Year dinner that was co-hosted by the Premier and the Chinese consul general, Madam He Lanjing, on Thursday 17 January 2019 at the Adelaide Convention Centre.

It was the first Chinese New Year event in the 2019 calendar, which demonstrated the commitment and strong relationship between the South Australian government and the Chinese consulate office in South Australia. The dinner was well attended and was a great opportunity for the Premier to pay tribute to the Chinese community for their enormous contribution and, at the same time, to express his heartfelt warm wishes on behalf of the state government in welcoming the auspicious New Year. The Premier and the community also congratulated and welcomed the new Chinese consul general, Madam He Lanjing, on her new posting to Adelaide. We look forward to working closely with her and her team in strengthening the strong bilateral relationship between South Australia and China.

On the night, I received overwhelming feedback from the community, who felt very special to be invited to the dinner. They deeply appreciated the co-hosting of the Chinese New Year dinner and they thanked the Premier and the consul general for their mutual commitment to build a prosperous future for the community. I am pleased that many distinguished guests attended the dinner, including His Excellency the Governor, Deputy Premier the Hon. Vickie Chapman MP, and other ministers, including the Hon. David Ridgway, the Hon. Tim Whetstone, the Hon. Corey Wingard, the Hon. Rachel Sanderson, the Hon. Vincent Tarzia, Ms Katrine Hildyard (representing the Leader of the Opposition), Lord Mayor Sandy Verschoor and other distinguished guests.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank community organisations who have worked diligently to organise meaningful events throughout the Lunar New Year period this year. I thank Zhu-Lin Buddhist temple, Quan Am Tu Vietnamese temple, Chinatown Adelaide, Vietnamese Women's Association, Vietnamese Community in Australia, Malaysia Club of South Australia, Singapore Business and Social Association, Tamang Society of Australia, Overseas Chinese Association of SA, Chinese Welfare Services of SA, South Australian Hainan Association, Teo Chew

Association of South Australia and the South Australian Oceania Federation of Chinese Organisations from Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos. Thank you all for organising all of the events. I would like to wish everyone in Parliament House a very happy and prosperous Year of the Pig.

### CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING BOARD

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:48):** I would like to pose some questions today: how important is transparency and accountability? How important is it for a minister of the Crown to abide by the legislation of this state? There is currently a bill before this chamber to amend the Construction Industry Training Board legislation. I will not, of course, comment on that today, but when minister Pisoni announced his proposed changes to that act, he stated, and I quote:

Appointments need to be based on merit and experience to ensure greater alignment with industry requirements.

**The Hon. J.E. Hanson:** Sounds reasonable.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** It sounds reasonable, as the Hon. Mr Hanson says. It is a fine sentiment, and if the minister was sincere in the sentiment, we could agree that his behaviour would align with it. The minister appointed Mr Nicholas Handley to the Construction Industry Training Board, to a vacancy which required that the person appointed has:

...appropriate experience in vocational education or training and who are or have been employed or engaged in the provision of such education or training.

Mr Handley is an accountant. Mr Handley's LinkedIn profile shows no experience in vocational education or training. It shows no experience in the provision of such education or training. His professional profile on his Handley Accounting page shows no such experience.

I requested a copy of Mr Handley's CV through the FOI provisions. This was denied not once but twice by minister Pisoni's office, claiming that Mr Handley's CV was cabinet in confidence—arguing his CV formed part of a cabinet submission and was therefore cabinet in confidence. However, another FOI application made to minister Pisoni's office showed an email from Mr Handley to minister Pisoni, which included his CV, dated 12 June, and clearly that email with his CV attached is not part of a cabinet submission.

Why would minister Pisoni refuse to release a CV? Personal information, such as contact information, can be redacted. What is there to hide? Coincidentally, Mr Handley is the chair of the FutureSA Unley forum.

**The Hon. J.E. Hanson:** What's that?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** What is that? That is minister Pisoni's personal party fundraising arm. It is responsible for fundraising for minister Pisoni's election campaign in his seat of Unley. I understand that Mr Handley was responsible for signing up \$5,000 memberships for the FutureSA forums. Mr Handley chaired a forum, at which minister Pisoni was a guest speaker, just a few weeks after his appointment to the board. Minister Pisoni and Mr Handley were photographed together at Liberal Party events in the lead-up to the 2018 state election.

So what are Mr Handley's qualifications for appointment to this industry training board? No training qualifications to sit on this training board; no vocational education experience, as required under the act; no employment or engagement in delivering training, as required under the legislation, but he has experience in fundraising for the Liberal Party. He has experience in fundraising for minister Pisoni's local Liberal arm, yet the minister wants to appoint people on merit. How can we possibly believe that?

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** Five thousand a pop.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Five thousand a pop, as the Hon. Mr Hunter says. I have asked the Ombudsman to review minister Pisoni's office's decision to refuse release of the CV. I am pleased the Ombudsman has agreed to investigate the matter. I believe that this parliament should be able to see the outcome of that Ombudsman's investigation and allow the parliament the opportunity to scrutinise the appointment of Mr Nicholas Handley.



Minister Pisoni wants this legislation rushed through. He does not want this chamber to be able to scrutinise his appointment before the parliament considers granting him absolutely unfettered power to appoint whoever he likes to every position on the Construction Industry Training Board.

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** How you can trust him now?

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** 'How can you trust him?' as the Hon. Mr Hanson says.

**The Hon. J.E. Hanson:** Hunter, I believe.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Mr Hunter. Thank you.

**The Hon. J.E. Hanson:** We can both say it.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** They both said it, I am sure. They are both as one on this, because there are very dark clouds over minister Pisoni's behaviour so far. I urge members to consider delaying debate of the proposed changes to the CITB act until the Ombudsman's office has investigated this issue. That will allow the parliament the opportunity to scrutinise previous appointments before we grant the minister the power to personally appoint every member of the board.

The minister recently reappointed four members of the CITB for six months, so there is no rush. We do not need to have that legislation rushed through. Is transparency important? Is abiding by the law important? I say it is. If members agree, we should see the outcome of the investigation before the bill proceeds, otherwise we risk being associated with the stink that surrounds the minister's actions.

#### **MOUNT GAMBIER DRUG AND ALCOHOL SERVICES PETITION**

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:53):** Today, in the other place, the member for Florey, Frances Bedford, tabled a petition with over 2,000 signatures from South Australians concerned about the lack of rehabilitation facilities for people suffering with drug and alcohol abuse. Particularly, the petition requests that funding be put in place for the provision of a psychotic crisis centre and a rehabilitation and detox facility at Mount Gambier in the state's South-East—a region that is in desperate need of help to deal with addiction. The signatures were gathered with the tenacity of Mount Gambier city councillor and former SA-Best candidate, Kate Amoroso, a recovering addict herself, and I applaud her outstanding efforts in the call to action and in gathering so many signatures.

I remind members that Mount Gambier hosted the federal government's first national ice task force community meeting in 2015. That was because Mount Gambier was once labelled the ice capital of Australia, an unenviable title now bestowed on Darwin. In November last year, federal health minister Greg Hunt announced a \$20 million funding package for drug and alcohol treatment in South Australia, which will provide grants of up to \$2.5 million to substance abuse services in regions considered in need of greater services.

The funding was struck as part of a larger funding package of \$40 million secured by my federal colleague the member for Mayo, Rebekha Sharkie, and my Centre Alliance colleagues, something of which we were all extraordinarily proud. It was done as part of the federal government's welfare reforms, and announced in the 2018-19 federal budget. It is, therefore, a huge kick in the guts that, for reasons unknown, the state's South-East, which is home to SA's second biggest city—Mount Gambier—was not included among the areas identified for funding.

**The Hon. C.M. Scriven:** Shame, absolute shame.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS:** It is a huge kick in the guts for the region again, as it means that Mount Gambier is not eligible for direct funding from a federal government program aimed at boosting drug and alcohol services. It is such a misguided decision that it will have a detrimental impact on the people of the South-East suffering with addiction, and the loving families who are at their wits' end trying to find ways to help their loved ones kick their habits.

The federal Liberal member for Barker, Tony Pasin, has made excuses for the federal government that just do not stack up. He said that service providers from Mount Gambier and the South-East could partner with organisations in areas like Murray Bridge—a regional city eligible for the funding—and that is just not good enough. Mount Gambier is ground zero for meth abuse in this

state. Issues with meth addiction in the South-East have been well documented. What is not as well documented is the total destruction that the scourge of drug addiction can have on a person's life and on those around them, and in many instances on the community in which they live.

The needs of the community in the South-East clearly are being ignored by the federal government. Centre Alliance candidate for Barker, Kelly Gladigau, labelled it as absolutely disgusting. She went on:

It's not cost effective, it's not good for the region. I think he [Mr Pasin] should be fighting that this has been a massive oversight for Mount Gambier and the South-East. The federal member for Barker should be making things happen and fighting for the region, not just handballing it to another area that has been eligible for the funds and trying to do a band-aid effect that way.

I could not agree more.

The brave Kate Amoroso has gone on the record saying that she does not believe organisations in the region have the capacity to partner with providers in other areas, including Murray Bridge, which is a more than 360-kilometre drive from Mount Gambier. I have to take the opportunity to commend both these women, extraordinarily strong women, for their continued commitment and advocacy on this most important issue. It is a ridiculous and unworkable situation that has been proposed. The South-East clearly needs its own rehab facility, and I know that both Kate and Kelly will not rest until something is done about it. The number of signatures on the petition shows that the support for drug rehab in the South-East is far-reaching, and the need is extremely widespread.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: ANNUAL REPORT 2017-18**

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:58):** I move:

That the 2017-18 report of the committee be noted.

This report provides an overview of the activities undertaken by the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation in the Fifty-Third and Fifty-Fourth Parliaments, between 1 July 2017 and 30 June 2018, and provides some update on the committee's ongoing activities in the latter half of 2018.

The presiding member of the committee in the Fifty-Third Parliament, Second Session, during the reporting period, was the Hon. Steph Key. I think it is on the record here on a number of occasions that the Hon. Ms Key showed great leadership as the presiding member of that committee and also of the Natural Resources Committee. As I have said many times before, it was a pleasure to sit on committees under her chairmanship.

Other members were Ms Nat Cook MP until the 26 September 2017; myself; the Hon. Justin Hanson MLC; the then Mr Stephan Knoll, the member for Schubert; and the Hon. Jennifer Rankine, the then member for Wright from 26 September 2017, replacing Ms Cook. Actually, I think there is a name missing there; the Hon. Mr Darley has been left off that list. That is inadvertent, but the Hon. Mr Darley was on that committee for the whole of the Fifty-Third Parliament—and before that, I believe.

The membership of the committee in the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, First Session, is as follows: Mr Stephen Patterson MP, who is the presiding member; myself; the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC; Mr Jon Gee, the member for Taylor; Mr Steve Murray, the member for Davenport; and the Hon. Tung Ngo MLC. This committee was appointed on 3 May 2018, and Mr Patterson was appointed subsequently, as I said, as the presiding member at its first meeting.

The staff arrangements are worth commenting on, because I think this committee, like many others, has had very good service from a range of staff over some time. The committee was supported by long-serving executive officer Sue Sedivy between 1 July 2017 and 8 September that year, and research officer Peter Knapp between 1 July and 20 August 2017. Ms Peta Spyrou supported the committee as research officer on a part-time basis between 14 September and

17 November 2017, and from 29 August until 22 December 2017 Mr Peter Knapp acted in the executive officer role.

From 23 December 2017, Anthea Howard supported the committee in the executive officer role—which has now been renamed 'parliamentary officer'—in an acting and part-time capacity until very recently. I pay tribute to the work of Anthea Howard. In addition to her duties as a parliamentary officer in the House of Assembly, her service to the committee was exemplary, and I thank her for that.

The committee's activities during the reporting period were interrupted between the prorogation of the Second Session of the Fifty-Third Parliament in December 2017 for the state election and May 2018, when the new parliament commenced. The new committee was constituted for only a short time during this reporting period. Within the reporting period during the Fifty-Third Parliament the committee completed three reports.

The new committee appointed in the Fifty-Fourth Parliament met for the first time, as I said earlier, in May 2018 and considered a referral to it from the Legislative Council dated 1 November 2017 regarding SafeWork SA prosecutions into South Australian workplace fatalities since 2010, with particular reference to the death of Jorge Castillo-Riffo. At its last meeting, the committee constituted by the Fifty-Third Parliament proposed that the incoming committee consider this referral but that it consider that such an inquiry would be assisted by the Coroner's findings in the inquest into Mr Castillo-Riffo's death.

The committee constituted by the current parliament considered this referral and determined that it should await the Coroner's findings before proceeding with such an inquiry. The committee was also conscious that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption had also announced an evaluation of the activities of SafeWork SA on 10 May 2018. The new committee subsequently resolved to commence an inquiry into workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services.

The following reports were finalised and tabled in both houses of parliament during the reporting period of the Fifty-Third Parliament, Second Session: the 29<sup>th</sup> Report: Briefing Report—Work Health and Safety concerns related to the Home Care and Support of South Australians with a Disability and Elderly South Australians; the 11<sup>th</sup> annual report of the committee; and the 28<sup>th</sup> Report: Inquiry into the Return to Work Act and Scheme.

The following ministerial responses to committee inquiries were received during the reporting period: work-related mental disorders and suicide prevention, with a response from the minister for industrial relations on 4 August 2017; industrial manslaughter, with a response from the minister for industrial relations on 4 August 2017; and there was the 67 is the new 40 inquiry—and as I approach that number I think I will endorse that—

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** Are you almost 40, Dawkins?

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS:** Yes, I wish—and the response for that came in from the ministers for industrial relations, health, higher education and skills and ageing on 28 September 2017. Finally, the report on the Return to Work Act and scheme came to the committee from the Treasurer on 29 June 2018.

In conclusion, I would like to say that I enjoy the work of that committee. I am the only continuing member from the previous parliament, and I am enjoying working with those members who have joined the committee. Some are new members of parliament, some are continuing MPs but new to the committee.

I mentioned the work of Anthea Howard. I think there was a very long period when the committee had only an acting parliamentary officer, someone who was having to do that work along with her other duties for the House of Assembly. I think it was a pity that the delay went on for so long because previously that committee had been served by only one officer, Sue Sedivy, for a long time. The workload of the committee and the previous parliament was eventually recognised by the addition of a research officer.

Unfortunately, under some of the changed arrangements in the administration of committees from the House of Assembly, we saw the departure of a number of those people. It was for that quite lengthy period that we had a part-time, acting person. She did a wonderful job, but I think those situations need to be avoided. I am pleased that very recently the committee was joined by two new staff members. I look forward, as I think other members of the committee do, to working with our parliamentary officer Simon and research officer Eugene. I commend the motion to the council.

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

**SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: REVIEW OF OPERATION OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS (LIFETIME SUPPORT SCHEME) ACT 2013**

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:09):** I move:

That the final report of the committee, for the review of the operation of the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013, be noted.

Before beginning my commendation to the council, I would like to take the opportunity to acknowledge and thank all of those who have contributed to this review. On behalf of the Social Development Committee I thank the Lifetime Support Authority (LSA) and board for their assistance in providing the committee with very comprehensive evidence throughout the review.

I would like to thank the Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator, also known as the CTP Insurance Regulator, for providing detailed information on the CTP insurance scheme, and I thank the specialists from the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre for their contribution to this review. Their expert evidence greatly aided the committee's understanding of the trauma and rehabilitation involved when a person experiences catastrophic injury.

Thank you also to the insurance industry and, indeed, representatives of the legal profession who provided technical and insightful evidence on the CTP insurance claims. The committee wishes to give thanks to Mr John Walsh and to the disability advocacy organisations who were central in the development of the Lifetime Support Scheme and its operation and importantly, of course, thank you to the Lifetime Support Scheme participants, their families and loved ones.

Although this committee of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament did not hear all of the evidence, having shared the stories with a previous committee, reading the evidence from the *Hansard* has given each of the members of the committee a depth of understanding of the individual experience of living with catastrophic injury and the manner in which the Lifetime Support Scheme, which I will be referring to from here on as the scheme, has assisted each of you, and their evidence has been invaluable.

As Presiding Member, I also extend my thanks to committee members for their commitment to this review. Without labouring the point, it has at times been challenging for the committee, having picked up the review somewhat through. It should be noted that the previous committee undertook the hearing of oral evidence from the witnesses and prior to this committee being appointed for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament.

The previous committee drafted a number of recommendations of which 19 have been agreed and adopted by the committee with some amendment: eight of these are made with a view to extending parts of the Lifetime Support Scheme and improving its processes and procedures; 11 recommendations have been made focusing largely on the fairness and accessibility of the compulsory third-party insurance scheme and making a claim under the Civil Liability Act 1936.

In brief, there is one recommendation addressed jointly to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services; two recommendations are addressed jointly to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing and the Premier of South Australia; two recommendations are addressed solely to the Premier; and the remaining 14 recommendations are addressed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

I also make mention here that one member of the committee was not able to support the committee's report in full and consequently the minority report made by the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC can be found at the end of the report.

As to the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013, the introduction of a no-fault Lifetime Support Scheme that can provide people who have been seriously injured in a

motor vehicle accident with all of their necessary and reasonable treatment, care and support is an historic shift in personal injury insurance policy in South Australia. This is a scheme that can provide the footprint for the future development of other categories of accidental injury as recommended by the Productivity Commission in 2011, and for which the heads of agreement continues to be progressed by the Council of Australian Governments.

The Lifetime Support Scheme is an insurance scheme which benefits South Australians in a way that no other accident injury insurance scheme has done previously and relies on the Motor Vehicle Registration Lifetime Support Scheme levy for its funding. The merit of drawing on funds from motor vehicle registrations, despite the criticisms of the past, has been adopted across the country as the most efficient and accountable way to provide this important safety net.

Approximately 1.79 million vehicles were registered in South Australia in the 2017-18 financial year, with the average scheme levy being \$102.54 per vehicle. This amount had not changed from the preceding year and in 2015-16 the average levy was \$102.49, meaning the yearly adjustment sits around less than 1 per cent of the levy cost.

In 2017-18, the LSA received approximately \$151 million in revenue from registration levies and the scheme, although still young, has an exceptional probability of sufficiency at 78 per cent. This is above the target limit of 70 per cent for its age and is consistent with other older long-tail accident insurance schemes in Australia and New Zealand which typically targets 75 per cent to 80 per cent. These figures demonstrate a scheme that is highly effective and financially responsible.

Overall, the evidence shows that the act is providing a fair and effective scheme for people catastrophically injured in a motor vehicle accident on South Australian roads. Participants' stories and experiences tell of the everyday realities of living with catastrophic injury and the ways in which the scheme can ease the burden for the injured and their supporting individuals. The scheme has a robust governance framework with the rules also operating well. The LSA presents impressive key performance indicators meeting the objectives, functions and obligations under the act.

It was also clear to the committee that the scheme is highly regarded, having been received extremely well by stakeholders in general. A lot of that is down to the dedicated management of relationships with partnerships and service providers undertaken by the LSA's executive and staff. It was also evident, though, that the scheme is not highly well known, and some work to raise the scheme's profile is being undertaken by the LSA.

There were few criticisms or concerns raised in the evidence pertaining to the scheme, the LSA or the LSA staff, and the committee found the strengths of the scheme include, as already mentioned, that it has a reliable funding source through motor vehicle registration levies; that the authority prioritises and utilises best practice person-centred methodologies; that financial accountability is high, with greater than 80 per cent of the dollar spent on participant services; and also that there is dedicated funding support for medical, scientific and technological research to advance the treatments and supports for the scheme cohort and to contribute to the broader field of understanding catastrophic injury.

Of the few concerns raised in the evidence, the majority were in relation to third-party service providers. There were some issues raised regarding LSA's administrative procedures for the procurement of goods and services and in particular there were consistent accounts of difficulties in relation to the attendant care services industry. The issues concerning third-party providers and attendant care services which were raised in the evidence include that time frames for purchasing of specialised equipment can be too long and that some attendant care workers' training is too basic, with overall fairly low minimum standards for qualification. This is a particular concern for participants with complex needs. Worker to client ratios are also low, with a highly transient, largely unskilled workforce filling temporary and casualised vacancies whilst in between other occupations.

There are some obvious issues with the matters raised, and the committee has made several recommendations to address some aspects of these issues, such as the introduction of a minimum standard of certificate III in home care and community care training or equivalent and an on-the-job home care training package to be implemented by SA Health and the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre to ensure attendant care workers are meeting the minimum safety and quality framework requirements.

Other concerns raised include some slow turnaround times in the procurement process and that some participants who are incarcerated have not had access to the scheme supports while in gaol nor other forensic disability support. One of the other concerns raised was the need for the scheme to provide greater support for participant spouses and/or their families. The committee has made recommendations to address each of these.

Chief among other concerns and pertinent at this time is the adequacy of the systems and supports for older South Australians who have sustained a serious injury through a motor vehicle accident but who are not eligible for the Lifetime Support Scheme. The committee found there were some gaps between services available to this particularly vulnerable group and so has made a recommendation for an assessment to be undertaken in relation to the issues of equity of access.

I will now look at the National Injury Insurance Scheme. In terms of extending the scheme, stakeholders made a strong case to include people seriously injured in a motor vehicle accident involving vehicles which do not presently meet the definition of a registrable vehicle under the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. These include accidents that occur on private property and the use of farming equipment or other motorised vehicles that are not currently able to be registered or can only be conditionally registered, such as some tractors, harvesting equipment and quad bikes.

The committee considered that a restricted miscellaneous vehicle conditional registration could be prescribed to such vehicles. This would provide the driver or rider with compulsory third-party insurance, and conditions of use would apply to protect the rider and the public. The cost to provide the scheme to those injured in the use of a quad bike alone, based on existing actuarial analysis, would be in the area of approximately \$15.8 million or a further six or seven people entering the scheme per year.

The next category, accidents that cause moderate to severe brain injuries, could be covered for interim periods according to actuarial analysis. What makes this compelling is the evidence from brain injury advocate organisations and specialist brain injury professionals, who suggest early interventions through detecting and providing individually tailored treatment and rehabilitation which are critical for achieving better long-term outcomes for people with moderate to severe traumatic brain injury.

It is estimated that 30 to 40 children and 25 adults experience moderate to severe traumatic brain injury each year in South Australia. Based on the evidence the report shows that, where moderate to severe brain injury is present and not currently picked up by the scheme or the NDIS, over time this cohort will be likely to require increased support and resources from the public health system, social welfare system and justice system, with long-term outcomes being worse for children.

For the scheme to pick up this cohort and provide an interim program of reasonable and necessary treatment, support and rehabilitation based on the 2017 levy analysis, it would be in the area of approximately \$1.5 million to \$1.7 million in total extra per year. There is a real potential for the scheme to review the moderate to severe brain injury group as a category for inclusion in the scheme and the committee is aware some research has already commenced, looking to New South Wales Brain Injury and Rehabilitation Program for examples of the types of programs that might be offered.

Other evidence reviewed by the committee shows there is a need for a category for people who sustain multiple injuries but who do not meet the existing eligibility criteria. Actuarial analysis undertaken by Finity Consulting for the authority in conjunction with specialists at Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre identified there is a potential for a multiple injuries category which would include injuries such as muscular and tendon damage, vertebral and pelvic fractures, and internal abdominal and/or chest wounds, lumbosacral plexus injuries and severely damaged limbs that have significantly reduced functionality.

Costs associated with bringing this cohort into the scheme as interim participants focused on early intervention and based on costs determined from the 2017 levy analysis would be around \$300,000 to \$500,000 over three years per participant which would be a cost of approximately \$4 million for 10 people per year to enter the scheme—a relatively modest amount, in my view. I make the note that the committee did not undertake its own actuarial analysis but has made

recommendations for further investigation to be undertaken for consideration of broadening the eligibility criteria for access to the scheme for these categories.

In relation to the categories of accident injury insurance as identified by the Productivity Commission's 2011 inquiry, funding sources for these streams remain the principal obstacle to realising the full National Injury Insurance Scheme (NIIS). The committee understands that some work continues to be undertaken to determine funding options in order to progress the Productivity Commission's recommendations and establish the full NIIS.

The Standing Council on Federal Financial Relations and the Council of Australian Governments is yet to progress agreed minimum benchmarks to further the NIIS and funding options as agenda items in 2019. In particular, the committee heard that there is strong support from stakeholders for inclusion in the NIIS category of general accidents in the scheme with the key issue being an appropriate funding source. Various options are being considered and, importantly, the LSA has shown that stakeholder engagement will be critical to ensure the criteria on the conditions of eligibility are appropriate.

Evidence shows an alarming increase in brain injury through family violence. The statistics are overwhelming, and the committee understands that compensation through common law or the victims of crime levy may not be appropriate in all cases. Notwithstanding that, the committee acknowledges the scheme may not be best placed to deliver the necessary services to this cohort and welcomes research being undertaken by Brain Injury Australia into this important area.

In relation to sporting accidents, the committee found that in most cases these should be covered by sporting clubs and associations operating in South Australia in the form of public liability insurance. There was no evidence to suggest existing compensation arrangements need to be altered at this time. There would need to be further review of entitlements and benefits for sporting related accidents to be included in the general accidents stream of the scheme.

Whilst it is understood medical treatment accidents are more complex than other accidents to fund under the NIIS, the South Australian government committed to retaining its current arrangements in managing risk for the treatment of medical injury caused by fault in public and private hospitals. An agreement was also made between the state and commonwealth governments to undertake further partnering to review and implement the no-fault medical treatment scheme by July 2018. Whilst this has not occurred, the committee welcomes the further planning and research work being conducted on this. Further discussions need to be had by the COAG and the Standing Council on Federal Financial Relations to progress this accident stream.

The evidence in support of the Lifetime Support Scheme is overwhelming, signalling there is a strong public interest in it continuing and growing. For growth to occur, security of funding and sound actuarial oversight are the key. On the basis of the scheme's performance over the past four years, extension is conceivable as well as desirable, in the committee's view. While the committee acknowledges there may be some apprehension regarding increases to motorists' levies, the evidence suggests no significant increase in the scheme levy is likely to occur, given the prudent management of the LSS Fund.

The committee is not complacent to the fine balance between providing this vital service and keeping costs to the South Australian community low. The committee welcomes and appreciates the further research being undertaken to advance the extension of the scheme by the authority and scheme actuaries. As a result, the committee has recommended a follow-up review of the parts of the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013 reviewed by this committee be undertaken in three years.

I turn now to the Civil Liability Act of 1936 and compulsory third-party insurance. In relation to amendments made to the Civil Liability Act in 1936 and, as a consequence, the compulsory third-party insurance (CTP) scheme, the committee recommends the state government consider moving to a full no-fault accident injury insurance scheme for motor vehicle accidents, with statutory benefits for a prescribed period of time and retention of some common law rights for more serious injuries. This would bring South Australia's scheme in line with similar schemes in Victoria and Tasmania and recently introduced schemes in New South Wales and the Australian Capital Territory.

While evidence provided by the CTP insurance regulator was generally positive regarding the changes to the Civil Liability Act as a consequence of a lifetime support scheme being introduced, other evidence suggests that making a claim or progressing a claim through the courts has become more difficult. The introduction of injury scale values (ISV) ranging from zero to 100, with seven being the threshold for economic damages and 10 for noneconomic damages to be awarded by the courts, has seen a significant decrease in claims for more minor injuries.

While this was intended, it was also the intention that those claims should be truly minor or indeed trivial. What the evidence suggests, however, is that somewhere between the very serious and the truly minor are injuries which are serious enough for people to require long periods off work and therefore loss of income, to become dependent on others for a period of time and therefore strain interpersonal relationships, to become socially isolated, to be at risk of developing comorbid mental illness and to suffer pain without recourse to compensation or, in some cases, even adequate treatment. The committee considers that these types of outcomes for many South Australians are not desirable.

To strike a balance between the CTP insurance scheme being viable and supporting people with injuries, which result in the previously mentioned outcomes, the committee has recommended lowering the ISV thresholds for economic loss, noneconomic loss and gratuitous services to five points. This will be fairer and more consistent. At the same time, the committee recommends that there be a review of the discounts in the Civil Liability Act which are applied by the courts to any compensation awarded. The committee considers, based on the evidence received, that a discount of 20 per cent imposed in relation to economic loss has been shown to be simply too high.

Recently, we have seen a rise in mental illness in our communities. While there are myriad causes for psychiatric impairment, evidence suggests that in some cases where motor vehicle accidents are concerned a minor to moderate brain injury can cause a person to also suffer a mental illness. As well as this, where a person has suffered other types of physical injuries with resulting incapacitation, sickness and disability, these can also negatively affect mental health. Evidence suggests that early interventions are crucial for both brain injury and in treating some mental illnesses. The committee recognises and acknowledges the complexities associated with the onset of mental ill health.

In light of the evidence provided during the review, the committee has recommended changes to make it easier for people with comorbid mental harm caused by a motor vehicle accident to access compensation that is available for physical injuries which might be of a lesser injury scale value. The committee also considers that mental harm should be treated as a separate injury, not merely as a feature of a physical injury, and recommends that the courts have the discretion to make this determination in assessing injury for damages.

There was also evidence that shows there are many people who find themselves unlucky enough to sustain several injuries which may not meet the minimum ISV thresholds individually, yet in aggregate cause ongoing pain and disability. The committee has recommended a review of the criteria relating to multiple injuries and the requirement for there to be a dominant injury over the ISV threshold upon which compensation rests.

To conclude the noting of this report to you, I want to highlight that, for the NIIS, of which the Lifetime Support Scheme was the initial phase, to be fully implemented, South Australia would need to take a lead role in COAG discussions. For the accident injury insurance scheme to be fair and equitable to all, there needs to be continual evidence-based improvements made. The committee has made recommendations that support a long-term vision for South Australia to have a full no-fault motor vehicle accident insurance scheme developed by the state government.

In introducing the lifetime support scheme, it was recognised that South Australia was joining several of the other states in providing such a scheme. There is now the opportunity once again to join the states of Victoria, New South Wales, Tasmania and the Australian Capital Territory in implementing a full no-fault scheme. The report provides recommendations to give our state's most critically injured, as well as those who suffer some types of moderate to serious accidental injury, whether at fault or not, the best opportunities to recover and to be able to contribute again within their families and their communities. As Chair of the committee, I commend the committee's report to the council.



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

*Motions*

**MURRAY-DARLING BASIN**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:30):** I move:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the South Australian government decision to endorse socio-economic criteria for efficiency measures to deliver 450 gigalitres of water for the environment at the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council on 14 December 2018, with particular reference to—
  - (a) the advice considered by the South Australian government and the Minister for Environment and Water in making the decision to endorse the socio-economic criteria and who provided that advice;
  - (b) the rationale for supporting the socio-economic criteria;
  - (c) the resources applied in the Department for Environment and Water in providing advice to the minister on the management of the Murray-Darling Basin;
  - (d) the current and potential options for the best available science to inform such decision-making;
  - (e) the advice the Minister for Environment and Water sought that suggested the South Australian government was legally able to override the existing socio-economic criteria outlined in section 7.12(2)(b) of the basin plan;
  - (f) the consideration given by the Minister for Environment and Water to the recommendations from the independent report provided by Ernst and Young for the basin ministerial council on delivering the 450 gigalitres of water for the environment;
  - (g) any recommendation, finding or observation in the report of the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission 2019, as deemed relevant by the committee; 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.

South Australia can be a harsh and dry place, and water is amongst our most precious resources. The River Murray is the longest river in Australia and we are blessed to have it wind through our south-eastern corner and make its way to the sea on the coast of the world-famous Coorong. The Murray sustains producers and communities along its banks and Ramsar wetlands with plants and animals found nowhere else in the world. Half of Adelaide's drinking water is sourced from this mighty river, and that is in a good year with full reservoirs. We simply cannot afford to let this river die.

It is therefore incomprehensible that the water minister of this state of South Australia, backed we are told by the Premier and his entire cabinet, chose to sell out South Australia in December of last year at a meeting of water ministers where a deal was signed to place conditions on projects which are designed to return water to the Murray-Darling Basin system for environmental purposes. These conditions, agitated by the New South Wales and Victorian governments, will mean there is little chance South Australia will ever see the 450 gigalitres of water we as a state fought so hard for when the Murray-Darling Basin Plan was created.

It is not just me who is saying this. It is not just the Labor Party that is saying this. Here are the words of the royal commissioner, released just two weeks ago:

The South Australian Government's agreement to changes to the socio-economic criteria for efficiency measures should not merely be described as ill-advised. It is nothing short of a capitulation to the interests of the current Commonwealth Government, and those of Victoria and New South Wales. It is so contrary to the interests of South Australians that the decision by the minister responsible is almost certainly a breach of at least cl 2.5 of the

South Australian Ministerial Code of Conduct in that no minister acting reasonably could consider these changes to the criteria to be anything but totally antipathetic to the interests of South Australia, and the South Australian environment. South Australia's agreement to these changes should be immediately reversed.

They are the words of the royal commissioner. What about the experts? What do they say about this deal? Here is what Mr David Papps, the recently retired commonwealth environmental water holder from 2012 to 2018, had to say about this deal, and I quote:

It was cleverly crafted to minimise the legal water recovery requirement under the basin plan.

And:

David Littleproud has vacated the field, New South Wales and Victoria are running the show, and they have white-washed the plan.

And what did he specifically have to say on minister Speirs agreeing to the plan? I quote:

...absolute definition of a turkey voting for Christmas.

It is with these points in mind that we seek to establish this committee. We need this committee to thoroughly scrutinise what advice the minister and the Premier were relying on when they took this decision in December. We need to find out what changed between the minister's submissions to the royal commission and Productivity Commission earlier in the year, which highlighted that the then criteria were sufficient and South Australia should not agree to changes, and the subsequent capitulation in December.

We need answers to questions that the minister and the Premier have so far been unable and unwilling to give. South Australians deserve answers to these questions, and that is why this motion is before the chamber. I cannot help but to think back to those famous words from then shadow minister and member for MacKillop, Mitch Williams, who urged the Labor government to accept less water for the agreement. His now-famous quote was:

This is obviously not the Rolls-Royce, but it's a very good Mazda and we're quite happy to drive in the Mazda.

The underlying problem is that the South Australian Liberal Party constantly capitulate to their federal overlords and are not prepared to stand up and fight for South Australia. We saw it with the closure of Holden, we saw it with energy and we have seen it again, as was so clearly demonstrated by the findings of the royal commission on the River Murray. I once again commend this motion to the chamber and look forward to it being supported. I indicate to members that I intend to bring this matter to a vote on the next Wednesday of sitting.

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

### *Bills*

## **SENTENCING (LIMITS ON HOME DETENTION) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:36):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Sentencing Act 2017. Read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:37):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill amends the Sentencing Act to do a very important thing: it removes the possibility of home detention for child sex offenders. This bill, in almost identical form, was moved last year in the lower house by the Labor opposition. It was moved in response to great community concern, particularly in the Pasadena area, and concern from victims of notorious paedophile Vivian Deboo.

Last year, Mr Deboo was found guilty of horrific crimes and applied for home detention to be served in lieu of a prison sentence. Under the Sentencing Act there are certain classes of offences, including murder and treason, that are excluded from the possibility of a sentence of home detention. The Labor opposition believes that serious child sex offenders like Vivian Deboo ought to be excluded from that possibility as well.

As I said, the Labor opposition moved this bill in the lower house last year and on numerous occasions the government has used its numbers in the lower house to prevent the bill being considered by the lower house. That is why the bill is before us now. Fortunately for the community, the court did not grant Vivian Deboo home detention but instead ordered that his sentence be served in prison. However, Mr Deboo has now appealed that sentence and is seeking on appeal to serve his sentence of imprisonment on home detention.

The one change that is made in the bill that is now before the Legislative Council to the bill in the other place is that the bill in the Legislative Council makes very clear that it applies no matter what stage of the process someone is up to, so it makes clear that this bill applies to Vivian Deboo, with his appeal pending to serve his sentence on home detention.

The people of South Australia expect their government to keep the community safe and, unfortunately, the Attorney-General, the member for Bragg, has not always fulfilled this promise in her first year of serving as Attorney-General. In this case, the Attorney-General has not allowed debate on this very important bill in the House of Assembly, which is why it has now been introduced in the Legislative Council, and we have seen it in other areas as well.

Many members may recall that in June last year a notorious paedophile, Colin Humphrys, was being considered for release. Colin Humphrys has a history of offending across five states over 30 years—horrible sexual offences against children. He was declared unwilling and/or unable to control his sexual instincts and ordered to serve indefinite detention. Colin Humphrys made an application for release, even though medical experts said nothing had changed in terms of his willingness or ability to control his sexual instincts.

We as an opposition thought that was unacceptable. We drafted legislation that required someone who is serving indefinite detention, who has been declared unwilling or unable to control their sexual instincts, to demonstrate to the court that that has changed, to make sure that such an offender has to demonstrate to the court that they are now able and willing to control their sexual instincts.

We had that legislation drafted, and on Monday morning in June of last year the Attorney-General went on radio and said that that legislation was not necessary. She said she would prefer to leave it up to the courts. She said, in effect, that she would gamble it, take the risk, and let the court decide, and if Colin Humphrys was released from prison, unwilling and unable to control his sexual instincts, well so be it. We thought that was an atrocious lapse in judgement, and I think that most of the Attorney-General's colleagues agreed. By the end of that day, she had to do a complete reversal of her view. I suspect cabinet had forced her into making a complete change of heart, and instead introduced legislation almost identical to that which the Labor Opposition introduced.

I think we can be thankful that the Attorney-General was forced into that capitulation to support Labor's views that a sexual offender, serving indefinite detention because they are unwilling or unable to control their sexual instincts, should have to prove that they are now willing or able to control their sexual instincts.

That Colin Humphrys matter was before court again only last week, where the government made submissions to court that they had one of two specialist medical reports required, but that they did not have the second report and that it would be a further six months before the second report would be furnished to the court. That matter was then adjourned for one week, where it was foreshadowed that Mr Humphrys' legal team would make submissions that he ought to be released because of the government's inaction and inability, after more than six months, to get the second report. It was an abject failure on the part of the government, which knew for half a year that a second report was required but had not furnished it to the court.

We learned that, at 7.17 this morning, the DPP informed the court that they would now have that second report, not finalised in six months as they previously informed the court, but by early March. That begs the question: if a report could be done in a few weeks, why on earth was the Attorney-General not doing her job properly and making sure that that report was done in the six or seven months in which she knew it had to be done?

The Attorney-General is spending her time fighting with judicial officers; disagreeing with the ICAC commissioner about who said what; making comments about the River Murray-Darling Basin commissioner, which led to apologies being requested; and, most recently, having an unedifying fight with the Chief Justice over her entertaining reintroducing the post nominal QCs.

These seem to be what the Attorney-General is concentrating on. These are her priorities. They are not the priorities, I think, of the community and not the priorities of South Australians. I think the community expects the first priority of an attorney-general is to keep the community safe and especially to keep the community safe from dangerous sex offenders. That is what our bill aims to do, and if the government is not prepared to debate the bill in the House of Assembly then we should have the opportunity in the Legislative Council so that the people of South Australia know that this parliament considers the safety of our children a very top priority.

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

### *Motions*

### **GAMBLING REFORM**

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:46):** I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that the latest figures from the 34th edition of Australian Gambling Statistics of total gambling expenditure in Australia for 2016-17 show that:
  - (a) the nation's gambling spend was \$23.694 billion for 2016-17;
  - (b) total sports betting increased to a record high of \$1.062 billion, representing a 15.3 per cent increase from the previous year;
  - (c) total race betting expenditure in Australia increased from \$3.099 billion to \$3.313 billion (a 6.9 per cent increase) in 2016-17; and
  - (d) \$12.136 billion was emptied into poker machines by Australians in 2016-17.
2. Acknowledges that the 2010 Productivity Commission report into gambling found that around 4 per cent of the adult population plays poker machines at least weekly, and that 15 per cent of these players are 'problem gamblers' with their share of total spending on poker machines estimated to be between 40 and 60 per cent.
3. Acknowledges that according to figures released from the Australian Electoral Commission covering the 2017-18 financial year, the Australian Hotels Association of South Australia donated \$324,944.43 to the South Australian Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division), the Federal Liberal Party of Australia, the South Australian Labor Party (SA Branch) and the Australian Conservatives.
4. Supports the call by the Alliance for Gambling Reform for a complete ban on political donations by licensed gambling operators.

Two weeks ago, the Australian Electoral Commission confirmed what SA-Best has long suspected. According to figures released from the AEC covering the 2017-18 financial year, the influential Australian Hotels Association of SA donated a whopping \$324,944.43 to the SA Liberal Party, the federal Liberal Party, the SA Labor Party and the Australian Conservatives. That is a lot of cash by anyone's measure, and every South Australian should be incensed by these figures, which of course do not include the funds spent by the AHA in their own right in a bid to influence the election outcome.

The biggest recipients of the largesse of the poker machine dominated AHASA are the SA Labor and SA Liberal parties, which both received extremely generous donations. Being a sceptic, I wonder why—not. It proves beyond any doubt the power and influence these poker machine barons have over the major political parties. These powerful lobby groups do not donate hundreds of thousands of dollars for nothing; they do it to buy influence.

During the state election, both major parties, flush with funds thanks to this group of wealthy poker machine barons, aimed all their venom at SA-Best, not at each other, as you might expect, because we have a policy to reduce the scourge of poker machine addiction in this state. I remind both major parties that Australians lost nearly \$24 billion in gambling in 2016-17, with poker machines continuing to outstrip all other forms of gambling, with a whopping \$12.136 billion emptied into ravenous poker machines by Australians over the same period.

It is no surprise that poker machines are described as the 'crystal meth of gambling'. Here are some sobering, some might say sickening, facts to back that up. Australia has 20 per cent of the world's poker machines, yet only 0.3 per cent of the world's population. Australians lose more at gambling than any other nation, with \$1,000 in per capita losses, mostly because of the prevalence and ferocious hunger of poker machines.

Poker machines are in the majority of the state's pubs and clubs, housed in 511 venues in South Australia, with a staggering 12,210 machines still taking money from South Australians. As of June 2017, there was an average of nine poker machines per 1,000 South Australian adults. Poker machines are concentrated in South Australia's most disadvantaged areas, with South Australians losing \$680 million over 2016-17. We know from the Productivity Commission's report into gambling that 15 per cent of regular poker machine players are so-called 'problem gamblers'. It is these gambling addicts that provide the lion's share of profits to poker machine barons.

The Productivity Commission has also estimated that around 40 to 60 per cent of spending on poker machines comes from problem gamblers. We know these are conservative estimates that are now close to a decade old, yet the major parties are more than comfortable to take these donations, derived in large part from South Australians battling with gambling addiction.

This year marks a disgraceful anniversary. On 25 July, it will be 25 years since poker machines first arrived in South Australia. I wonder how the major parties will be celebrating on that day. One wonders just how many lives have been destroyed by poker machines during that time. I personally know, as I am sure many others do, of so many families that have been destroyed by the insidious glut of these blinking, ringing, ravenous machines.

Do the major parties stop to think about those who have lost everything, in many cases their own lives through suicide, while others have lost their health, their marriages, their families, their homes and/or personal wealth due to the poker machines, when they gleefully put out their hand to accept money from poker machine barons? Does it make any of us, of you, the least bit uncomfortable? It is shameful.

The Guardian recently reported that research published in the Drug and Alcohol Review, a peer reviewed medical journal, analysed publicly available donations to federal and state parties in the 10 years to June 2015 and found that Australia's tobacco, gambling and alcohol industries, which have donated \$14 million to the major political parties, saw their donations spike during debates on alcohol tax and gambling law reform or immediately before elections, with the ultimate aim of buying immediate influence or building long-term relationships.

A similar trend is borne out by the AHA SA donations to both the SA Labor and Liberal parties in the lead-up to the 2018 state election. In the days leading up to the 17 March election, SA Liberals received \$12,500 on 8 March and another \$12,500 donation on 14 March from the AHA SA branch. The SA Labor Party received \$12,500 on 23 February; \$12,500 on 26 February; \$12,500 on 1 March; \$10,000 on 5 March and a separate donation of \$12,500 on the same day; \$6,000 on 9 March; and \$4,000 on 14 March. You do the math. This kind of influence simply cannot continue.

The Alliance for Gambling Reform recently called for a complete ban on political donations by licensed gambling operators. The alliance said political donations from gambling operators showed 'blatant industry funding to manipulate state election outcomes in Tasmania and South Australia.' In Tasmania, the gambling lobby donated more than \$500,000 to the Liberals to help them defeat Labor in the state's 2018 election and in doing so stymy plans to remove poker machines from the state's pubs and clubs. In that state, Labor faced an advertising blitz opposing the policy, including the claims that thousands of jobs would be lost in pubs and clubs around the state if the policy went ahead. All this was funded thanks to a massive donation to the Tasmanian Liberal Party by the AHA.

SA-Best similarly faced an advertising blitz with similar messaging during the 2018 state election thanks to the gambling lobby and its very deep pockets—exceptionally deep pockets—and, of course, generous donations to the major parties. It is shameful that last week the Tasmanian Labor Party abandoned its hardline gambling policy just 11 months from its election loss. We will not step back from ours. We are not beholden to the gambling lobby.

Tim Costello, director of the Alliance for Gambling Reform, has said Australia would not begin to tackle 'our world's worst levels of gambling harm' until political funding by licensed gambling operators was banned. He went further, and I quote:

What happened in Tasmania and South Australia in early 2018 was nothing short of disgraceful and now that we've seen the size of the pokies money that was poured into those campaigns, we need Labor and Liberal to agree to a complete ban on gambling donations similar to what they have done with tobacco.

SA-Best unequivocally supports the call by the Alliance for Gambling Reform for a complete ban on political donations by licensed gambling operators. In doing so, I call on the major parties to do what is morally right and stop taking money from gambling operators. How can they possibly be trusted by the South Australian people if they continue to take money from poker machine barons?

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

### **FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK**

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:55):** I move:

That this council expresses its deep concern at proposals to develop private luxury accommodation in Flinders Chase National Park on Kangaroo Island.

This motion calls on this council to express its deep concern at proposals to develop private luxury accommodation in Flinders Chase National Park on Kangaroo Island. I brought this motion to parliament on behalf of all those South Australians who believe that national parks were created first and foremost for the conservation of nature. I want this parliament to consider the future of our national parks. Are they natural areas where conservation and protection of the environment comes first and all other uses rank lower down the list, or are they simply an untapped economic development opportunity to enable private investors to profit from our shared heritage?

The moment the penny dropped for me in relation to this issue was when I heard that the Friends of Parks group that looks after Flinders Chase had gone on strike. That is unheard of. These are passionate conservationists who donate thousands of hours of unpaid labour and expertise to look after our most precious natural areas. The Friends of Parks are the ones who manage weeds, they help with surveys of plants and animals, they help to maintain infrastructure and all of the other jobs that our underfunded professional park rangers do not have the time or the money to do themselves. So when I heard that the volunteers had gone on strike I knew something must be very wrong. The government had clearly gone too far and the cry from the wilderness must be heeded.

Flinders Chase National Park is the jewel in the crown of our conservation estate. It is wild and remote. It is largely free of weeds and feral animals and it is largely undeveloped, with few public roads, few buildings—some of them heritage listed—and a limited number of confined camp sites. The absence of major human intrusion is the main reason why it is in such good shape. Parts of the park have since been declared wilderness protection areas.

This year, the park is celebrating its centenary and this should be a time of pride and celebration, including for the hardworking Friends of Parks group, but they are not—to coin a phrase—happy campers. Their strike includes withdrawing from the organisation of the park's centenary, which has thrown many of the planned events into doubt.

How has it got to this point? What is the government doing that has so upset some of the most passionate and dedicated conservationists in the state? Why have they gone on strike? Why are a growing list of environmental and conservation groups lining up behind them to say that they are unhappy with what the government is doing to our national parks?

To answer these questions we need to go back a few years. Clearly, Kangaroo Island is a much promoted tourism destination. Images of its wild coast, the abundant wildlife and the iconic Remarkable Rocks feature prominently in state tourism promotions. Flinders Chase National Park is the largest park on Kangaroo Island and the government has sought to capitalise on its wonderful qualities through the construction of things such as the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail.

The trail is a five-day, four-night experience for walkers which has been generally well received. The experience ensures limited numbers on the trail at any one time and strictly controlled camp sites designed to minimise environmental impact. I make no criticism of the Kangaroo Island

Wilderness Trail. Whilst I have not yet walked it myself I understand that it is a good project and it is sensitive to the natural environment.

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** Do you want to pair? I will get you out there.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** My daughter has walked it; she thought it was great. I think an interjection from the Hon. Terry Stephens was inviting me to join him walking it, and I may take him up on that. There is no criticism of the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail from the Greens. However, the push is now on to expand facilities on the trail to open it up to those who are seeking a more luxurious experience. This is where we need to pay close attention to what is going on.

Members might be familiar with the concept of glamping or so-called glamorous camping. Generally, these concepts involve accommodation that is a little more permanent in nature. It is often a larger size tent, bigger than you can carry in a backpack, and one that does not need to be erected and dismantled each day. These tents are often on permanent platforms. They are tall enough to stand in, and they will usually contain a camp stretcher or maybe even a bed. It is still camping, but it is not roughing it.

If that was all that was proposed for the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail I do not expect there would be too much opposition. I have no great problem with glamping, provided it is done sensitively and the impact on the environment is minimised. In the case of the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail what that should mean is that the facilities would be placed in or near existing campsites, and it would involve existing infrastructure such as roads and trails. But that is not what is being proposed here.

We also need to go back to the management plan for the Flinders Chase National Park. Certainly, the idea of this type of glamping accommodation was envisaged by the previous government; they consulted on a change to the management plan, and the management plan was changed to allow this type of accommodation in limited locations. The management plan for Flinders Chase National Park now refers to major and minor development zones, and the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail was identified as a minor development zone; in other words, minor forms of development would be envisaged in relation to the trail.

But the zone was not defined. There is nothing in the management plan that says, you know, 'The Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail zone is within 100 metres of the trail' or 'within 10 metres of the trail'; it is not defined at all. So one of the questions it will come to is whether a facility three kilometres from the trail, unconnected to the trail by any existing roads or paths, is in fact envisaged by the management plan for Flinders Chase.

The Sandy Creek proposed development site is the one that is furthest from the trail. It is on a very remote coastal area, up on the cliffs, with magnificent views looking out over the sea, but it is not on the trail. And what is proposed in that location is not glamping. In fact, it is effectively a village. What they are proposing—and the details are limited—is, as I find the words here, eight accommodation pods, whatever they are; a long house, whatever that is; two lookouts; a services building; and ancillary water tanks and connecting pathways. So it is effectively a village not on the trail, and that is not envisaged by the management plan.

That is one of the reasons why—

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** It wasn't the original proposal, either.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** And as the honourable former minister interjects, it was not in the original proposal, and we will come back to that because I think he is very likely right; he would know. The other thing we should point out is that the public funding on the trail—it is well publicised—was around \$5 million, from memory, to build the trail. There is no problem with that. We now have nearly \$1 million of public funding being given to the Australian Walking Company to build their private accommodation—and I did ask in question time today of the Treasurer a question around that, and I hope to get an answer back from him in due course. So there is a large public investment in this, and of course at the risk of stating the obvious it is on public land; in fact, it is on some of the most precious public land that we are responsible for in this state.

So the friends are unhappy with the concept. They are fearful of the nature of development, the size of development. Apparently—although we have not seen the plans—one of the buildings is nine metres long and four metres high. That is not glamping. That is commercial development. In fact, the total cost of the development, I think, including the million dollars or so that the state is putting in, is something like \$4 million. You get a fair bit of development for \$4 million. We are not talking about tents, we are not talking about glamping.

What we now see is that development applications have been lodged. There are four in total but there are three main ones. One of them I do not propose to talk about. It is less contentious. It involves fixing up the old lighthouse keeper's cottages at Cape de Couedic. I have stayed in those cottages. They are pretty rundown. You rent them from National Parks. I have to tell you, though: location, location, location! What a fantastic place! So I do not have a great problem that they are fixing up those accommodations. I would still prefer them to be run by National Parks and rented out by National Parks for public use. I understand that, if they are not being used by Australian Walking Company walkers, they will be available for the public to hire from National Parks, so I am not going to explore that one.

But the two other locations—Sanderson Bay and Sandy Creek—are seriously contentious. The applications that have been lodged, as I have said, effectively are for permanent villages on those locations. Certainly what upsets me, and what is upsetting many locals on Kangaroo Island, is the level of secrecy that is surrounding this project. I will have to give people a bit of 'Development 101'. These development applications have been categorised as category 1. Category 1 means they are not advertised, no-one is invited to make comment, no-one is invited to make a submission in person. In fact, it is done entirely in secret. That is category 1.

The plans are not available. Whilst there are some conceptual architect's drawings that are floating around, that is not the same as seeing the actual development application. We are all familiar with the architect's drawings of something that suck us into thinking, 'This will be fantastic.' You need to have a look at what actually has been proposed. We have not seen that. I know the architects involved, I know their work is of high quality, but that does not mean that what they have proposed is the right development in the right location. That is what this motion is largely about.

I have lodged freedom of information applications to try to get copies of the development applications, but why on earth should I have to do that? Why should I have to lodge a freedom of information application to get plans that are publicly funded in a public national park on public land? Why on earth should that be secret? First of all, I asked the Department for Environment and Water. I lodged a freedom of information application there. They said, 'We do not have the plans. We do not have them. We will send it off to the planning department to DPTI.'

I know for a fact that that is not correct and the reason I know that for a fact is because the environment department is effectively the owner of the land. They are the ones who run national parks and they have signed off on this project. They are the ones who have put in a letter to the State Planning Commission saying, 'The CEO of the environment department supports these plans.' Don't tell me the environment department does not have a copy of the plans. Anyway, I have not challenged that because it has gone off to DPTI and I know they have them as well, so I will hopefully get those plans from the planning department. It is remarkable that we are having to jump through so many hoops.

The next thing is that, whenever you have a development like this, it has to be referred to various government departments for comment. Just think about it. We are talking about a fire-prone area, so they have to refer it to the country fire authorities, the Country Fire Service. They have to refer it to the coast protection boards on the coast. They have to refer it to the NRM board, to the local council. When you go to the planning portal—in fact, if you went to the planning portal two weeks ago you would have found a list of all the government agencies that had been consulted and that list would have included when they were consulted and whether or not they have responded. I went onto that same website this afternoon. Zilch. It has all been removed. All information about who has been consulted has been removed from the public register.

To be fair, I used their feedback form and I said, 'Where is this stuff? You have taken it off the public register.' I rang them. Of course, you do not get a person, you just get a voicemail, but I have left messages. I told them I would be talking about this at 5 o'clock in parliament. No response.



I look forward to seeing what they say. Even if all we knew before was who had been consulted, we still do not know what they said. Again, we come back to it: public money being spent on facilities on public land in a national park and we cannot see what these agencies have said.

I have heard on the grapevine off the back of the truck that the NRM board, for example, was dead against it. I have heard that but I cannot prove it because I do not have the documents. Why should I have to go through FOI? This stuff should be routinely put on the public register for members to see—members of the public, not just members of parliament.

I also point out that I have written to the honourable minister, David Speirs. I have written to the head of the Planning Commission. In fact, I have written to anyone who I thought could help with this. I wanted to point out to the minister, first of all, that he was legally wrong with what he has been telling the public through the media but also to give him an opportunity to make it right. I am from the Greens and we are here to help. I want the minister to be able to make it right.

On ABC radio a couple of weeks ago, on I think 22 January, the minister and David Bevan had this exchange:

(Bevan: ...David Speirs, good morning...are you going to listen to the Friends of the Park? They're so cranky they have withdrawn their labour?)

The minister's response:

Well...it's very disappointing that they've taken that approach. We will be consulting more and more on this project. There has been consultation to this date and the planning development process going forward requires considerable consultation. So the idea that people have been shut out of consultation isn't correct...there has been some consultation and there should and will be more...

This is where I say the minister is wrong: with all due respect to the minister, I am the planning lawyer and I know category 1 developments do not have public consultation. In fact, it is not even just that they do not, there is a provision in the Development Act which basically stops them from consulting. Section 38(3) of the Development Act provides:

Where a person applies for a consent in respect of the Development Plan for a Category 1 development—  
that is what we are talking about—

(a) the relevant authority—

in this case the state Planning Commission, or SCAP as it is known—the State Commission Assessment Panel—

must not, on its own initiative, seek the views of the owners or occupiers of adjacent or other land in relation to the granting or refusal of development plan consent...

It actually prohibits them from finding out what anyone thinks. Mind you, there is a loophole. I am a lawyer, and the loophole is that they are not allowed to, of their own initiative, seek views. But I tell you what, I will be encouraging all those people on Kangaroo Island and anyone else who cares about the future of our national parks to make their views known. I hope that the Planning Commission will take that into account.

I have written to minister Speirs and I have urged him to instruct his CEO to basically put the brakes on this project, and basically to say, 'As minister I have promised on radio that there's going to be more public consultation. Can you stop the process so we can actually do that now?' It is a very simple thing because, as you know, the owner of the land holds the whip hand when it comes to development applications. You cannot develop on someone else's land without their permission. Whilst I am not saying that the department has to withdraw all permission to do anything in a national park, they can at least put the brakes on it so that we as a community can discuss whether this is the type of project that we think is appropriate for land that is held in trust on our behalf.

So no serious consultation to date. As I have said, I am fearful that even the small amount of information that is available is now being withdrawn, and I am really not happy with that. Luckily, I had a screen snapshot of the planning portal before it was modified, so there is certainly evidence of what was there a few weeks ago compared with what is there now.

As I foreshadowed earlier, because I have a number of live requests out there looking for a response, I am going to seek leave to conclude my remarks. I want to have the opportunity to see what comes back before we conclude this debate. In summary, I have several applications out there. I certainly have freedom of information applications. I am still waiting to see plans of the development. I have FOI requests for the submissions that were made by public agencies, including the local council, the Native Vegetation Council and the NRM board, and I am waiting for those. I have a request in to the department to find out why they have removed information from the planning portal; I am still waiting on that.

I have requested a meeting with the State Planning Commission and I hope that that will happen soon. They have been very cooperative so far. As I said, earlier today I asked the Treasurer a question about how this \$1 million of public funding is being spent and whether it is being spent, as the honourable former minister said, 'on something that was in the original plans or is it something that is new?' I hope to get that answer back soon. As a result, I now seek leave of the council to conclude my remarks at a later date.

Leave granted.

### SERVICE SA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. E.S. Bourke:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the vital services provided to the community by local Service SA centres;
2. Notes that local Service SA centres provide access to a range of transactions, many of which are not able to be undertaken online or over the phone but must be completed in person;
3. Condemns the announcement that the government will close the Modbury, Mitcham and Prospect Service SA centres;
4. Acknowledges the negative effect these closures will have on local residents who will face longer commutes, longer waiting times and lower levels of service as a result;
5. Acknowledges the impact that these closures will have on other Service SA centres, which will see wait times soar as they are inundated with additional clients;
6. Acknowledges over 7,000 South Australians who have so far signed petitions to keep the centres open; and
7. Calls on the government to listen to the community and reverse this heartless decision.

(Continued from 7 November 2018.)

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:16):** I would like to thank the Hon. Ms Bourke for putting this motion, which gives us the opportunity to give our firsthand experience of the tragic consequences of the closure of the Service SA centres. Prior to the last election, the Leader of the Government in the other place gave a commitment that they were not going to cut services, but they were actually going to increase them, so you can understand the shock-horror when, at the last budget, it was decided to cut three Service SA centres—Modbury, Prospect and Mitcham—among other things, I must say: three TAFE colleges and, arising out of the budget, the closure of the Strathmont pool, which I might spend a few seconds on.

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** That's not correct.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** I hope I get some protection from the quite brutal interjection from over there.

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** That is not correct. Check the budget papers.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** It will be an indirect consequence of the budget.

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** Your government was going to close it.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Lensink, let the member speak in silence.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** The reality is, though, the Strathmont pool provides swimming lessons for 1,500 children, many of whom have disabilities. There are quite a few migrant children

who are learning to swim as a result of some tragic deaths on our beaches because of their lack of knowledge and understanding of water. During questioning, we asked the Hon. Ms Lensink how all the users of that pool—which meant the children—were going to be accommodated? She misled parliament by saying that all the user groups—

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Wortley, you are making an allegation of privilege. I ask you to withdraw.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** Well, you just have to look at the *Hansard* to find the truth.

**The PRESIDENT:** You can say that you do not agree with what she said. You can say—it is not appropriate for you unless you are making a formal allegation of privilege.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** Okay.

**The PRESIDENT:** I ask you to withdraw that.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** I withdraw that. The minister informed this parliament that her advice was that all the user groups were being accommodated. There are currently about 400 or 500 children who now have no access to swimming lessons, many of them with disabilities, and a lot of them are new migrants who are now going to be subjected to—the only respite a lot of these children with disabilities get is going to a nice pool like the Strathmont Pool—

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** It is not a nice pool.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** It is a beautiful pool—and for these kids with disabilities, it keeps their treatment going—

**The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink:** So it is appropriate that something that has had a major gas leak—do you take responsibility for someone being injured if that happens?

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Lensink, please, you are a minister. Allow the backbencher to have his say.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** Nothing has been presented to this parliament to say that that pool had to be closed. The only conclusion that we can come to is that it is an indirect budget measure. For \$300,000 a year they are subjecting hundreds of kids to go without very important swimming lessons.

In regard to the Service SA centres, a month before I just happened to be at the Prospect Service SA centre registering my car. I remember sitting there, thinking to myself, 'This is taking a long time to do because it's so busy.' So you can imagine the shock I got when they announced that it was going to be closed.

There are 100,000 people who use this Service SA centre each year. I went out and stood in front of the Service SA centre to get people to sign a petition, and I was actually surprised how easy it was to get people to sign a petition. It is not always easy to get people to sign a petition, but we had people searching for us throughout the Northpark Shopping Centre looking to sign that petition because they were absolutely outraged that this government, which promised not to cut services, had suddenly cut such a vital service that they use on a regular basis.

Obviously, the intent is to get people to do their work online. I remember there were a lot of elderly people, senior citizens, who do not have computers, who have 30 or 40 more years of life, who will not do this online and you really have to wonder what the government has in mind for them because they are some of the most outraged people who came up to us and told us of their outrage at the closure.

What struck me at the Prospect centre was the number of businesses that came out to us to express their concern at 100,000 people not going to that shopping centre. When I was getting signatures on the petition I noticed that many of them would go from the Service SA centre up to the Telstra office, to Coles, to Woolworths, to the local deli, to the cafes. Take that sort of business out of the shopping centre and it will have a major impact on those businesses.

I wonder if before the Treasurer made his decision to make this cut actually did his research on the impact it would have on those local businesses. For a party that cries out that they are the

great champions of small business, I think that decision was absolutely outrageous. You also must consider that for 40 per cent of the transactions in those Service SA centres you have to attend personally. The government has not come out with any alternative on how to accommodate those people who must go to that Service SA centre to do a personal transaction.

Labor has already committed to re-establishing these service centres and that has met with a great positive response to my office. Many people have emailed me and congratulated the Labor Party on our commitment to re-establish it. On the rallies we have had, people have come up and congratulated our leader, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas from another place, saying that they will be voting for Labor at the next election because of the dishonesty of giving a commitment that there was going to be an increase in services. They were not going to cut services, but they did it in the very first budget.

Even the Mitcham Service SA centre, which is probably less than a kilometre away from where the Hon. Mr Ridgway lives, has been cut and I know that a lot of people from around that area are expressing their concern. I cannot understand how callous a government can be. Many of the people at the Prospect Service SA centre, especially the elderly—that is what astounded me—had no idea how they were going to perform and complete their transactions. They would have to go to Regency Park or into the city. Now that the bus services have been cut it is going to make it much harder for a lot of people to catch the 222 bus into the city.

**An honourable member:** Have you been on the 222 bus?

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** I have been on the 222 bus, yes. I have photos of the 222 bus.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** I caught it on New Year's Eve, actually, and when I told people of these bus cuts they were absolutely outraged. That is another thing: not only have they cut the Service SA centres, the TAFE colleges and closed the Strathmont pool but they have also taken \$46 million out of the transport network, which will cut thousands of bus routes and reduce many hundreds of others. At the end of the day, many South Australians rely on public transport—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** They laugh about it! It is easy to laugh about it when you drive around in chauffeured cars, but the reality is that a lot of people rely on public transport to be connected with their community. Students require it to get to their universities or place of study, the unemployed require it to hopefully seek employment and pensioners require it just to keep in touch with the everyday world.

The Liberals are out of touch. I remember when we asked Mr Ridgway about the cutting of the *Overland*—\$300,000, a small amount of money—why would they deprive the *Overland*? We mentioned Bordertown: what about people in Bordertown? His answer was, 'Well, they can go and catch a plane.' Where on earth would someone from Bordertown go to catch a plane to Melbourne?

**The Hon. D.W. Ridgway:** At the airstrip.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** At the airstrip! You have no idea. Some poor 80 year old—this is how out of touch the Liberals are. It has been great going out there and talking to people about the Service SA centre and the cuts to public transport, because it really keeps you in touch with the average person out there who relies on these services, whose day-to-day existence relies on these very services.

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** I caught the bus this morning and not one person raised it with me.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** I caught a bus this morning, too, and there was a bus full of people.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Wortley, do not respond to the interjections. It is not a debate about your bus habits.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** Any government must make public transport attractive to use. You do not cut routes and expect them to be used; you actually have to make them comfortable and safe.

**The Hon. D.W. Ridgway:** I thought we were talking about Service SA, not public transport.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Ridgway, do not interject.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** It is a whole range of outrage out there, and it is going to come—

**The PRESIDENT:** Through me, the Hon. Mr Wortley.

**The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY:** It will come like a tsunami at the next election, because people have lost confidence in the first year. Normally, this anger out there is left for a government after 12 or 16 years. But after the first year, people are fed up with this Liberal government and they are despondent about the way they are being treated.

There is so much more I could say, but it is falling upon deaf ears. Mr President, thank you very much for the opportunity. I thank the Hon. Ms Bourke for giving us the opportunity to speak. You will find out the effects of your decisions made today in three years' time.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:27):** I rise to wholeheartedly support the motion. South Australians, I think, have a right to expect that they can access important government services in a timely and efficient way, and in a way that suits them, in a way that meets their needs and not the government's needs. Service SA centres are there to meet the expectations of our citizens. They provide access to licence renewals, vehicle registration and a host of other services to thousands of South Australians each year.

After the Liberal government announced the closure of three Service SA centres in the 2018-19 state budget, I joined many of my colleagues in visiting Service SA centres to see firsthand what impact that would have and to speak to people who utilise these centres. When I visited the Mitcham centre, one that the Liberals have targeted to shut down, the demand for these services was obvious: the car park was full and there was a constant flow through the centre. In fact, I met a man who said that he had come down from the Prospect centre, where he was in a line that went outside the door and into the street, and he made a decision to come down to Mitcham because he thought he would get served more quickly.

These centres are being utilised by South Australians every day of the week, and they see them as part of their essential way of getting in touch with the government and utilising the resources that are provided at these centres. It would be one thing for the government to close down centres that were being underutilised, I suppose—after all, that is the argument they use for bus services—but we know from freedom of information that in fact these three centres are some of the busiest Service SA centres in the state.

Why on earth would a government want to close down Service SA centres that are being patronised so heavily by its citizens? I spoke to many of the people, as I said, who were using these services at Mitcham. If members opposite join minister Stephan Knoll in closing down the centres, they need to have an understanding of what the impact will be on people's lives. I suggest they should go out and engage with the citizens who are using these services and ask them what they think about their proposal to close down these Service SA centres.

**The Hon. E.S. Bourke:** Ask the member for Adelaide what she thinks.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** The member for Adelaide apparently does not agree with the decision to close down Service SA centres, and I can only imagine what the members for Newland and King out in the north-east would think about it. I was very surprised to hear some of the feedback about the member for Elder in regard to the Service SA centre. Why on earth would a government do this to itself? Why on earth would a government do it to its citizens? I cannot imagine the frustration that people will be venting on this Liberal government for the closure of these incredibly busy Service SA centres.

The Hon. Mr Wortley mentioned in his very interesting speech the impact on the elderly, the impact on people who do not use, or cannot use, internet services and mobile devices, and who

need to speak to a person to help them through the process. How are they to access these services that they need when Mr Knoll says, 'There will be better ways of doing it; just wait and see. There will be better ways of doing it.'

What he actually means is that there will be remote ways of doing it, which will not suit a lot of the people who want to physically go in and talk to a human being to transact their business. It is obvious to anyone who has visited these centres how valuable they are to the community. I can only suggest that Liberal ministers and Liberal members have not done that legwork and gone off and looked for themselves at the impact this will have on our community.

I expect there will be a Liberal amendment to the motion, and the amendment, of course, will say basically this, 'Trust us, we will make things even better down the track. Let us close these Service SA centres now. Trust us, we will deliver you a better outcome.' My goodness gracious, that is putting the cart before the horse. If you want people to trust you, improve the services first. Improve the services first, go out and prove to the public that you have done that, and then persuade them that closing down Service SA centres it actually going to give them a better outcome. No-one, I dare to suggest, will believe you. I support the motion, and I will be opposing any stupid amendment to that effect.

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:32):** I also rise to offer my support to this very important motion. Service SA centres provide vital services to the South Australian community. Importantly, they provide services to those in South Australia who do not have access to the internet, those who find it difficult to use a telephone and those whose first language is not English.

I was disheartened when I heard that the government had decided to close the Service SA centres at Mitcham, Modbury and Prospect. The Prospect and Modbury Service SA centres are two of the busiest centres in the state. In the financial year 2016-17, more than 104,000 South Australians used the Prospect Service SA—

**The Hon. R.P. Wortley:** That is 2,000 a week

**The Hon. T.T. NGO:** That is 2,000 a week—and more than 103,000 South Australians used the Modbury Service SA. The government cannot tell you that these centres are being closed due to declining use, because in the 2017-18 financial year the number of South Australians using these centres actually increased. More than 105,000 South Australians used the Prospect Service SA, and more than 104,000 South Australians used the Modbury centre.

The Mitcham Service SA is no different, with nearly an extra 5,000 people using the centre in 2017-18 compared with 2016-17. If you visit the Northpark Shopping Centre, you will see the waiting area of the Prospect Service SA very often full of people. The same can be said of the Modbury Service SA, which regularly has a line out the door.

The minister has claimed that 82 per cent of transactions that come through the door of a Service SA centre can be conducted online. However, the minister failed to mention that, of all the services that Service SA provides, approximately 40 per cent must be conducted in person. What does that mean for those without an internet connection if the minister wants 82 per cent of transactions that come through the door to be conducted online instead?

It is believed that 17.5 per cent of South Australian households do not have internet access at home and 15 per cent of South Australians do not use the internet at all. In the rush towards technological efficiencies, these people cannot be left behind. South Australia is an inclusive community. We cannot afford to leave these people behind. Service SA provides South Australians with services. Is it too much to ask for the people who utilise the Mitcham, Modbury and Prospect Service SA centres to be provided with a face-to-face service? A face-to-face service means that questions can be asked and, most importantly, questions can be answered. In the minister's rush to push individuals online, has he turned his mind to who will answer people's questions if they are forced out of Service SA centres and into cyberspace?

In recent weeks, I have been privileged to spend a significant amount of time in the electorate of Enfield, where I live, speaking with many local residents about the by-election, which was held on Saturday. Time and again, the question was asked of me, 'Why are they shutting down Prospect Service SA? Where am I supposed to go now?' The electorate of Enfield is a wonderful part of

Adelaide. There are elderly residents who have lived there their entire lives. I know an elderly resident who has lived there for 80 years; he lives across the road from me. Some do not know how to use a computer let alone the internet.

There are residents from every wave of immigration to Australia who speak English as a second language. Importantly, there are young people who are excited about visiting their closest Service SA centre to obtain their learner's permit. This is such an important issue—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Excuse me, the Hon. Mr Ngo. Can the Hon. Mr Wortley and the minister not engage in a conversation across the chamber? It is completely disrespectful to the Hon. Mr Ngo. If you want to have a conversation, go outside. The Hon. Mr Ngo, please continue.

**The Hon. T.T. NGO:** Thank you for your protection—again. This is such an important issue that many of the candidates who ran in the Enfield by-election opposed the closure of Prospect Service SA. If this government closes down the Prospect Service SA, where will these residents go to apply for drivers' licences and proof-of-age cards, renew their car rego and pay their bills? If this government is going to close down two of the busiest Service SA centres, what do they expect to occur in other offices?

Closing these Service SA centres will only result in longer waiting times in Adelaide, Elizabeth, Marion, Tranmere, Port Adelaide and Regency Park. It must be asked why the members for Adelaide, Elder, King, Newland, Unley and Waite in the other place have not stood up for their communities and demanded these centres remain open. I understand that to date more than 15,000 South Australians have signed a petition to keep these centres open.

This government must listen to the communities who have been vocal in their opposition to this decision. I call on the government to reverse its choice to close down these three Service SA centres. I commend this motion to the council.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:39):** I rise on behalf of the Greens to support this motion, in support of the vital services provided to the community by local Service SA centres, specifically those slated for cuts under the recent Marshall government budget, being Modbury, Mitcham and Prospect. I do so noting that the government has tabled, just today, a proposed amendment to this motion. The original motion has seven parts and the new government amendment would seek to replace that with two parts.

I note that the first point is a repetition of the Labor original motion, and I do not understand why the government felt the need to replicate the words 'Acknowledges the vital services provided to the community by Service SA and' when they were already there in the Labor motion. What I would point to is that then the Liberal amendment will seek to remove the part of the motion noting 'that local Service SA centres provide access to a range of transactions, many of which are not able to be undertaken online or over the phone but must be completed in person', and so I ask the government to explain if this is not the case, and then why the government would not want the third point:

Condemns the announcement that the government will close the Modbury, Mitcham and Prospect Service SA centres;

I understand that that might be uncomfortable for the government and they probably oppose a condemnation of their actions but certainly the Greens will be supporting point 3 of this motion. The government then seeks to remove point 4:

Acknowledges the negative effect these closures will have on local residents who will face longer commutes, longer waiting times and lower levels of service as a result;

Again, I note that minister Knoll has been on record saying that people will have to travel further and they will be inconvenienced, so I ask whether or not that is not in fact a statement of fact that the government has already acknowledged? Point 5 will be deleted if the government amendments to the original motion are successful, and that states:

Acknowledges the impact that these closures will have on other Service SA centres, which will see wait times soar as they are inundated with additional clients;

Given the government itself has said that clients will go to the other Service SA centres I am bemused by the lack of acknowledgement that there will be an impact of the closures on the other Service SA centres. Point 6 states:

Acknowledges over 7,000 South Australians who have so far signed petitions to keep the centres open; and

I note that that is simply acknowledging a statement of fact and I certainly pre-empt that I understand the Hon. Connie Bonaros will be lifting that number to recognise a far increased number of petitions that have now been signed since this original motion was moved, and certainly query whether the government intends to not acknowledge any such petitions just as a matter of spite and sheer bloody-mindedness. It is quite extraordinary to try to attempt to erase statements of fact rather than argue the political points here.

I certainly support the original point 7 calling on the government 'to listen to the community and reverse this heartless decision', rather than the government's preferred point number 2 which states:

Notes that the state government is conducting a full business review to identify a sustainable Service SA model that will give the community access to better services through more channels.

I find this last point put forward today by the government of an announcement made last year in its budget quite extraordinary. Surely, you would review how to best deliver services before cutting the services rather than after cutting the services.

I am not necessarily a gambling person but I have been told that there is a tip: if you review something first then you do not find out by sheer error that it was the wrong decision. It is best to review the thing first before you cut it rather than cut it and then review it afterwards, one would pontificate. I also express some disappointment that the language in this debate has used the term 'fall on deaf ears' because this is not a government where these words have fallen on deaf ears because to fall on deaf ears indicates, by the language of the person who uses it, that a deaf person has the choice to not listen.

Before your time, Mr President, I have previously raised such points of order in this place about ableist language being used in this place. I note that previously we had found such language unparliamentary and to the detriment in our representational roles here of all South Australians. With those few words I commend the motion in its original form.

**The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:44):** I rise on behalf of SA-Best to support the Hon. Emily Bourke's motion calling on the government to reverse its budget decision to close three Service SA centres in the busy precincts of Modbury, Mitcham and Prospect, two of those centres, as we know, Prospect and Modbury, being among the busiest in the state. In so doing I commend the honourable member for the motion, and I also commend the member for Florey in another place who has campaigned tirelessly on this issue.

This crazy decision is akin to banks closing branches—all about increasing the bottom line and no thought to the best interests of customers. It is estimated, as has been said, that the closure of three Service SA centres could foist more than 750,000 transactions onto the already struggling other centres, which means longer queues and an increased burden on staff at the other eight sites across metro Adelaide. The government has made a pretty big assumption that the transactions will mostly morph online instead, which is unrealistic for poorer or older South Australians.

That figure has not been pulled out of thin air. It was obtained under freedom of information laws by Labor from the transport department itself. The figures that have been obtained show that during the 2017-18 financial year 277,266 transactions were made at the Prospect centre, 254,616 at Modbury and 231,913 at Mitcham. The average wait times, as has been referred to by other honourable members, at those centres across the same period was 12 minutes and 27 seconds at Mitcham, nine minutes and 34 seconds at Prospect and seven minutes and 56 seconds at Modbury.

Does the government in all seriousness think that 277,266 transactions conducted at the Service SA centre at Prospect by over 105,000 customers and the 254,616 transactions at Modbury will just miraculously move online? Customers will more than likely go to the Service SA centre at Regency Park, which is already the state's busiest Service SA centre, handling 480,602 transactions



last financial year with an average wait time of nine minutes and 34 seconds. I ask honourable members to imagine what that time will be when the Prospect and Modbury branches close.

The figures also show that the number of customer transactions and average waiting times increased over 2016-17 to 2017-18 at most Service SA centres, including the three earmarked for closure. They are not diminishing; that is fact. The state government is in denial if they think that the closures will not lead to longer queues, stressed staff and poor service delivery. Transport minister Stephan Knoll has said that:

Over 80 per cent of all transactions can be conducted online so we need to educate the public because a lot of people standing in those queues don't have to be there. They can conduct many transactions from the comfort of their living rooms.

I am sure the minister has the means, as do all of us, to own a number of devices which would allow him to do that, but what do you do if you do not know how to use a computer or if you do not own a computer and do not have the funds to buy one? What do you do if you are elderly or if you need help understanding information that has been provided? What do you do if English is not your first language? And what do you do in terms of services that simply are not provided online?

The decision has incensed the majority of South Australians and rightly so. They are being duded by the Marshall Liberal government. I attended the rally held on the steps of Parliament House, and I gave my commitment, as did many other honourable members of this place and the other place who attended, to oppose this measure and to continue to call on the government to reverse this ridiculous decision. I did so not because the union or any particular member asked me to—they did not—but because those people who will be directly impacted by the closures asked me to.

I did so because, like them, I could see how disempowering this move will be for those who can least afford it. I did so because, unlike you or me, many of these people will not have the luxury of hopping into their car and driving to the nearest Service SA centre to conduct their transactions. Instead, they will be forced to use public transport, if it is available, to travel further and therefore over longer periods of time, sometimes for up to an hour longer, and therefore well out of their way to access essential services.

This is a term that appears to be lost on the government: essential services. They are services none of us can do without, services that each and every one of us rely on in order to carry out our daily functions and, of course, the appropriate provision of such essential services. The member for Florey in the other place has tabled to date two petitions signed by more than 6,877 members of the community. She has collected, as I understand it, over 10,000 signatures from concerned members of the community, predominantly from her own community.

There are other petitions online by the PSA and the opposition which have also been signed by thousands of people who oppose these closures. As I understand it, the opposition has collected at least 10,000 additional signatures. Those impacted by these changes have clearly spoken, and it is high time the government stood up and took note of their opposition to the closures and do something about it.

With those words, and on behalf of SA-Best, I am pleased to support this motion. In so doing, I note for the record that we will not be supporting the government's proposed amendments. What I will do, as alluded to by the Hon. Tammy Franks, is move to make the motion more reflective of the actual number of signatures that have been collected to date. As such, I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out '7,000' and insert '25,000'.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:51):** I thank the chamber for their indulgence. Even though I was not originally on the list, I rise very briefly to support wholeheartedly the Hon. Emily Bourke's motion about Service SA. I want to make the point that there are local members who I do not think are fulfilling their responsibilities particularly well in relation to Service SA.

**An honourable member:** Which ones?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** In particular, the member for Adelaide, whose constituents are going to be extraordinarily disadvantaged by the closure of the Prospect Service SA centre. They will have to travel a lot further. People who do not usually have access to the internet will be expected to fork out for computer and internet access if they cannot travel a lot further. But also, the member for King, whose constituents will be very angry at the fact that she has not done anything in relation to making sure her residents can access the services they need. The Modbury Service SA centre has tens of thousands of customers each year.

I can assure members opposite that this is not something we will be campaigning on for the next few weeks or the next few months. We will be campaigning on this right up until the next election. If people like the member for King and the member for Adelaide think that their constituents are going to be happy that they have done almost nothing to stand up for vital community services, I think they will be judged accordingly.

**The Hon. C.M. Scriven:** And the member for Newland.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** And the member for Newland with the Modbury Service SA centre. We will make sure that the constituents of those members who are not fighting for their electorates and not fighting for their constituents are very aware of their inaction and what they have not done.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (17:53):** I rise on behalf of the government to respond to the Hon. Ms Bourke's motion. As we have circulated, I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraphs 1 to 7 and insert new paragraphs as follows:

1. Acknowledges the vital services provided to the community by Service SA; and
2. Notes the state government is conducting a full business review to identify a sustainable Service SA model that will give the community access to better services through more channels.

As announced in the budget, tough measures have to be taken to deliver better value for South Australian taxpayers. The announced closure of the Mitcham, Modbury and Prospect Service SA centres is just one example of these, and it has not been taken lightly. These three centres were selected because there are alternative locations nearby and because they were not providing the additional—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Allow the minister to speak in silence.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Thank you, Mr President. They are a bit animated, the people opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Allow the minister to speak in silence.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** They were not providing the additional network support services, such as call centre operations. This is something I want members opposite to listen to: the dates of the closures of these centres is still being worked through as part of a broader service review. However, these centres—

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** And what have the local members done about it so far?

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, please! The minister heard you in silence; show him the same courtesy.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** —will not close until an alternative service delivery model is in place. I will repeat that, because all the conversation this afternoon has been that they are closed. They are not closed, and these centres will not close until an alternative service delivery model is in place. There is scaremongering going on on the other side of the chamber to say they are closed.

I know the Hon. Mr Hunter used to say he could not read an iPad; he did not understand. It is almost as though they are not prepared to look at any particular new service model that will probably provide a better, more efficient service to the people of South Australia.

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** Tell that to people with vision impairment, David.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** You are not even prepared to entertain it. I will repeat that again: however, these centres will not close until an alternative service delivery model is in place. The pending closures will have communication and education strategies in place for customers to support and encourage more efficient transactions and to better promote nearby locations. It is evident that Service SA cannot continue with the current business model.

Minister Knoll in another place has tasked the department with undertaking a review of all Service SA operations and determining a sustainable future operating model. This will focus on improved customer service. The members opposite think it will be a poorer customer service. The whole focus of the review is improved customer service, and a new value proposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Mr President, as you rightly pointed out, I heard them in silence. I think they should have some respect for the chamber.

**The PRESIDENT:** Allow the minister to speak in silence.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** The focus will be on improved customer service and a new value proposition of how services are delivered and how they will be delivered as effectively as possible for all customers and all taxpayers.

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** Weasel words. You have taken a cut in your budget.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Hunter, you have had your go. Allow the minister to have his go.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Thank you, Mr President. The review will provide recommendations on how to best manage resources and staff across the network and develop a business model that provides the best outcomes for customers. The intention to drive more transactions online has significant benefits: it reduces costs for business, it reduces the cost of having to attend a centre for customers and it allows services to be more effectively and efficiently delivered to those customers who do need to attend a Service SA customer service centre.

Service SA continues to expand the range of transactions available online, particularly through the online mySA GOV portal. This will greatly improve access across the state to some of our customers' most commonly requested transactions. The emphasis is currently being given to further improving accessibility and simplifying information for customers. Recent attention in the media has focused on transactions that can only be undertaken at a Service SA customer service centre. There are some transactions where this is certainly the case, owing to system constraints or regularly requirements, such as with respect to identity verification.

That said, the department continually reviews the regulatory requirements and has a number of proposals within the current simplified bill that will further assist in the reduction of red tape for Service SA customers and reduce the need for more customers to personally attend a customer service centre, saving them time and money, and for many much more. We also recognise that not everyone has access to online services. Service SA is working with alternative local service delivery partners across the state to further improve the physical services available to all South Australians. With those few words, I encourage members to support the government amendment.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Point of order: in his speech the minister just portrayed that he heard the opposition in silence during the debate, which is clearly patently false. He had to even be cautioned by yourself, so I ask him to withdraw those words from his speech.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Mr Ridgway.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I was responding to a conversation with the Hon. Mr Wortley, who had no interest in the speaker who was speaking but, if it pleases the member, I will withdraw those comments.

**The PRESIDENT:** Thank you for the courtesy. The Hon. Ms Bourke, will you please sum up the debate.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (17:59):** I thank the members who made contributions today, particularly—

**An honourable member:** All of them.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** All of them. I thank the Hon. Russell Wortley; the Hon. Ian Hunter; the Hon. Tammy Franks; the Hon. Connie Bonaros, particularly for making your suggested amendment; the Hon. Tung Ngo; the Hon. David Ridgway; and the Hon. Kyam Maher—how could I forget?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** How could I forget the leader? A particular thank you to the Hon. Kyam Maher. I want to touch quickly on the amendments made by the government because, unlike the government, we have been out talking to members in front of Service SA centres, and also at the local train station, where I am sure you have seen us on many mornings as you walk into parliament. As the Hon. Russell Wortley pointed out, and rightly so, it has been very easy to get people from the community to sign a petition because they are angry, and they are rightly angry. They should be angry at people like the member sitting in our gallery today, the member for King, because—

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Bourke, you cannot refer to people in the gallery.

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE:** Sorry; apologies, member for King—who has long experience in the services provided by Service SA, being a manager of two of the busiest Service SA centres that are scheduled to be closed by this government, one of them with 104,000 and the other with almost 105,000. Between the three service centres you are looking to close, almost 300,000 people visit those service centres every year. It is no surprise that 15,000 people have signed our petition to keep those Service SA doors open so that they can go and get a community service face to face.

I am disappointed in your amendments. Yes, I agree with your first amendment that they do provide a very vital service to our community, but you are putting up smoke and mirrors about what you are actually trying to achieve. As the Hon. David Ridgway stated, you are wanting to push more people online. How can the most vulnerable people in our community access a Service SA centre if you close three Service SA centres where 300,000 people visit every year? That is not making it more accessible. I commend the motion to the chamber.

**The PRESIDENT:** I will be putting a series of questions. Honourable members, the first question I will put is that paragraphs 1 to 5 stand as part of the motion, so if you are in agreement with the motion you will vote in the affirmative. If you disagree with the motion, you will vote in the negative. I put the question that paragraphs 1 to 5 stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** I now put a second question that the amendment moved by the Hon C. Bonaros to paragraph 6 be agreed to.

Amendment carried.

**The PRESIDENT:** I put the third question that the motion moved by the Hon. E.S. Bourke and as amended by the Hon. C. Bonaros be agreed to.

Motion as amended carried.

### MID MURRAY COUNCIL

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 42: Hon. T.J. Stephens to move:

That by-law No. 7 of the Mid Murray Council concerning camping and mooring, made on 13 March 2018 and laid on the table of this council on 3 May 2018, be disallowed.

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (18:04):** I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

*Parliamentary Committees***ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

The House of Assembly informed the Legislative Council that it had appointed Mr Brown to the committee in place of the Hon. J.R. Rau.

**STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE**

The House of Assembly informed the Legislative Council that it had appointed Mr Picton to the committee in place of the Hon. J.R. Rau.

**STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMITTEE**

The House of Assembly informed the Legislative Council that it had appointed the Hon. A. Koutsantonis to the committee in place of the Hon. J.R. Rau.

*Bills***RESIDENTIAL PARKS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Final Stages*

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

At 18:07 the council adjourned until Thursday 14 February 2019 at 11:00.