

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 20 March 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.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:16): I lay upon the table the 15th report of the committee.
Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Will the minister guarantee today that the government will extend the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme for South Australians living with a disability who require transportation and, if she won't, why won't she?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:19): I thank the honourable member for his question. This question should be correctly directed to the Minister for Transport, the Hon. Stephan Knoll.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Supplementary arising from the answer: is the minister saying she has no responsibility and doesn't feel the need to answer questions in relation to South Australians living with a disability? Is that outside her ministerial purview?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:19): There was a fair amount of commentary in the supplementary question, from which I reject a large number of items. In relation to the direct ministerial responsibility and funding responsibilities, this falls in the bailiwick of the Minister for Transport, the Hon. Stephan Knoll.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): A further supplementary arising from the answer: has the minister, who has responsibility for services to South Australians living with a disability, made representations or held discussions with the Minister for Transport about the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme, or does she not care or see that as any part of her role?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:20): Mr President, if we just set aside the last bit of innuendo in the supplementary question, the substantive response to the question is yes.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: That's what you want people listening to take away, is it? Think about that before you answer next time.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, the minister doesn't need gratuitous advice.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister doesn't need gratuitous advice. Leader of the Opposition, you are talking across one of your own members who has the call and is standing. Show some respect for the Hon. Ms Scriven. The Hon. Ms Scriven, you have the call.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:21): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding the NDIS.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Lisa Pearce has an 18-month-old son. Lisa is legally blind and uses taxi vouchers every day to get to and from essential medical appointments. If the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme, which the minister has said has nothing to do with her, isn't extended, Lisa's travel allowance under the NDIS will leave her up to \$200 a fortnight out of pocket. This will mean she may have to pick and choose between which essential appointments she attends or go without food and basic amenities.

My question to the minister is: in terms of funding, will the minister guarantee that Lisa and other visitors who are living with disability will not be worse off under the NDIS than they would have been if this government guaranteed block funding?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:22): I think I thank the honourable member for her question. She is actually mixing up several issues, as the Labor Party are wont to do; if I can take those separately. On the issue of people not being worse off under the NDIS, I have received advice from my department that former Labor ministers were advised not to—

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Excuse me, minister, there is a point of order. The Hon. Mr Hunter.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I'm sorry to raise this, sir. I was giving the honourable minister some leeway, but he is having an ongoing conversation on his phone that's going on for too long, and none of us can hear the honourable minister's response.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wade, could you please take the phone call outside? Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I was advised by one of my agencies that Labor ministers had made comments publicly to the effect, in the main, that in relation to the NDIS nobody would be worse off. They were advised that that was not actually correct. In relation to the specific matter of the transport scheme, that is a matter for the Minister for Transport, the Hon. Stephan Knoll. I have had discussions with him, but it is his ministerial responsibility.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): Supplementary, Mr President.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Sit down, the Hon. Ms Scriven.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Have we all got it out of our system? I would like to hear the supplementary from the Hon. Ms Scriven. The Hon. Ms Scriven, you have the call.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Will the minister call for substantial improvements or, as part of the state government's commitment, ensure that those people living with a disability who may be worse off under the NDIS, as the minister has just admitted, can get the care and support they need? Will the South Australian government support them?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:24): That was quite a strange grab bag of supplementary posits put together into—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: On specific matters in relation to specific clients, my office, unlike members of the Labor opposition, stands ready to assist individual constituents.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down. They are obviously not interested in your answer. The Hon. Ms Bourke, you have the call.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:25): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services a question about the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Dr David Squirrell, a retired medical consultant and current president of Blind Citizens Australia, is a long-time advocate for the rights of South Australians living with a visual disability. Dr Squirrell is particularly concerned about the impending cut to the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme and the impact this will have on the ability of visually impaired South Australians to get to school, to work and to essential medical appointments. My question to the minister is: under your proposed scheme—if you have a proposed scheme—will the minister ensure that Dr Squirrell will continue to be supported by the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her question. Once again, the Labor Party in opposition—it has only been 12 months and their proximity to having access to advisers and departmental advice is really starting to show their own inadequacies. That aside, the NDIS provides a transport component for participants who have transitioned, and the matter of the transport subsidies is something that I have discussed with minister Stephan Knoll. It is within his ministerial responsibilities, so I will refer it to him.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:27): Supplementary: can the minister please update the chamber on what the advice was from the Minister for Transport?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:27): Those matters are cabinet-in-confidence discussions.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke, a supplementary.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can the opposition benches show some respect to their own member.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Your own member has the call, the Hon. Mr Hunter.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:27): Can the minister—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: Why don't you show some respect to the chamber; you can't even turn your phone off.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, I have just admonished the opposition. I do not need a government minister being equally ill behaved.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: —please confirm to this chamber the completion date of the current scheme?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:28): Let me put some facts on the record for the honourable members who clearly have no idea about what the current situation is. NDIS participants can receive transport assistance as part of their package, if this is assessed by the NDIS. The South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme was extended until mid-2019 for eligible clients, regardless of whether they are NDIS participants. This work continues and discussions remain. The state government has been progressively transferring SATSS funding to the NDIA. This matter is principally within the purview of the Minister for Transport.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Mid-2019, as I stated. I am sorry, Mr President, I should not be responding to interjections. I remain admonished. This is a matter for the Minister for Transport, the Hon. Stephan Knoll.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:29): Supplementary: will you be seeking a further extension if they are not eligible for the NDIS or there is no other scheme in place for people to actually be able to access public transport?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:29): I stand by my previous answers.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): A supplementary arising from the original answer and the minister's assertion that there is little she is responsible for in this area.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, supplementaries are not for insertion of political rhetoric.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Thank you, Mr President. The supplementary is: what aspect of support for South Australians living with a disability does the minister have responsibility for then? What is your job?

The PRESIDENT: No, you have asked a question, Leader of the Opposition. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary because it gives me an opportunity to outline a range of things that the South Australian government is doing for people with disability.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: Point of order, Mr President: I have been pretty patient. I sit right behind the minister, and for a series of questions and supplementaries I have had great difficulty in hearing her. I would like to hear her answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, if you wish to go on with your answer, you may. Can the opposition benches show some restraint?

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. Mr Dawkins is having trouble hearing, as am I. I would like to hear the minister's answer.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: That's because she's said nothing.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, you are not assisting me in any way, shape or form. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Thank you, Mr President. So—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, please!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What are you doing for people with a disability who are going to be short-changed?

The PRESIDENT: This is an opportunity for you to listen to the minister's answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, there is no point. Sit down. The Hon. Mr Hunter! The Hon. Mr Hood.

AUSTRALIAN TOURISM AWARDS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:31): My question is for the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister tell the chamber about the exciting results for South Australian tourism operators at the recent Qantas Australian Tourism Awards in Launceston?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:31): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in the tourism sector.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yes, I am in this house and I am very happy to answer this question. I recently had the great pleasure of visiting Launceston to join our South Australian nominees for the 2019 Qantas Australian Tourism Awards. The awards took place with the backdrop of the beautiful Cataract Gorge on a very warm evening, particularly for Tasmania. It was a pleasure there. It was my first national awards that I had attended. Especially when—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, don't put me in a position where I am going to start docking questions. I cannot hear the Hon. Mr Ridgway talk about—I am not even sure what he is talking about because I haven't had an opportunity to hear him.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: This is the first national awards that I have attended. Especially when you are in the room, it becomes very obvious the calibre of the competition South Australian tourism operators are up against. It is a very highly competitive market. It was a pleasure to be there at the awards, hosted by the Tasmanian industry, and particularly to catch up and speak with my very good friend and Premier of Tasmania, the Hon. Will Hodgman.

It was a highlight to see The Frames Luxury Accommodation from the Riverland inducted into the prestigious Australian Tourism Awards Hall of Fame after winning the self-contained accommodation category for three consecutive years. Located in Paringa, The Frames offers three opulent private retreats, each exquisitely tailored to help couples rejuvenate, with magnificent views over the Murray River.

The Adelaide Hills Convention Centre was named Australia's best business event. Surrounded by picturesque landscape of the Adelaide Hills, the convention centre provides unique, world-class business event facilities and services. It has been transformed since the Schirripa family invested in it following the sale of their mushroom business.

Proud Mary was crowned Australia's best specialised tourism service. The purpose-built riverboat operates 365 days a year and provides an ideal environment for passengers to explore, experience, indulge and discover all that the River Murray has to offer.

In addition, six regional tourism businesses were awarded silver and bronze medals, acknowledging their commitment to delivering outstanding tourism experiences. They were a silver award to Seppeltsfield Barossa estate for tourism wineries, distilleries and breweries; a silver for the Wallaroo Marina Apartments in the category of deluxe accommodation; a bronze for Calypso Star Charters in the category of adventure tourism; a bronze for Yorke Peninsula Tourism for destination marketing; a bronze for the Mulberry Lodge Country Retreat in the category of hosted accommodation; and Vasse Virgin received a bronze at Seppeltsfield for a new tourism business.

As I mentioned, the awards were announced at the gala dinner on Friday 1 March at Cataract Gorge in Launceston, attended by Australia's key tourism representatives and leaders. The standards demanded by these awards are exceptionally high and it is certainly clear that a place on the national stage takes a huge amount of persistence, passion and innovation.

Having travelled through our unique and beautiful regions a lot, particularly in my time as minister, I know that South Australia offers an incredibly diverse and niche range of tourism products and experiences. To see that acknowledged at a national level was a real thrill and honour. Each business epitomises the passion, dedication and verve of our state's \$6.9 billion tourism industry, focused on delivering unforgettable experiences to countless local, interstate and international visitors each year. I wish them all continued success in the years to come.

I also encourage those who made submissions for the state awards to take the opportunity again this year. The awards program is a great business development exercise and assists operators to really identify every opportunity to finesse their product or experience. Of course, South Australian finalists for the Qantas Australian Tourism Awards are selected at the annual state awards where most category winners go on to represent the state at a national level. Nominations for the 2019 South Australian Tourism Awards opened on Tuesday 12 March and will close on Monday 24 June.

EASTERN FLEURIEU SCHOOL, STRATHALBYN

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:35): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Minister for Education, a question about school overcrowding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Our Centre Alliance colleague, Rebekha Sharkie, recently briefed me on a case involving overcrowding at an Adelaide Hills high school. Eastern Fleurieu School's campus at Strathalbyn is the school in question and it is said to have outgrown its current infrastructure and requires immediate action.

The campus is supposed to cater for 675 year 7 to 12 students, but there are currently 800 students enrolled. Over summer, students were taught outside in the extreme heat, a situation the governing council has called a safety risk. To compound that, up to four classes at a time are expected to share the resource centre and the school's open-plan library is constantly packed with three classes, including year 12 study groups.

Rebekha told me the state government has recognised the school's concerns and has committed to providing two modular buildings to create an extra four classrooms from the start of term 2. However, the concern is that this will not address either the short-term or long-term needs of both students and teachers. My questions to the Treasurer for the Minister for Education are:

1. What are the government's long-term plans for the school and interim plans for the rapidly rising number of students?
2. What immediate steps is the government taking to address the safety and wellbeing of students to ensure their current situation does not have a negative impact on their future education pathways?
3. What further assistance is the government providing to EFS's staff to ensure they are able to create a high-quality learning environment under these obviously trying and undesirable conditions?
4. Why wasn't the EFS (only one of the few secondary schools in the region) identified as a high-demand school as part of the government's announcement last month of a \$65 million capital works funding commitment for high-demand schools?
5. Is the government intending to release a second round of funding to assist with capital works for regional SA and is the Eastern Fleurieu School on that list?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:38): I am happy to take the substance of the questions on notice and seek a reply from the Minister for Education, but I would make just a couple of brief points. If indeed, and I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the numbers, those figures

are correct, it is a sad statement on 16 years of neglect by the former Labor government that the sort of sensible long-term planning that should have been undertaken clearly—if those numbers are correct, they wouldn't have occurred overnight—hasn't occurred. As I said, if those numbers are correct, and I have no reason to doubt them, then it is a sad statement on 16 years of neglect by the former Labor government in relation to the issue.

In relation to the issue as to why the school wasn't included in the other high-demand schools, the minister will be able to correct me if I am wrong in relation to this but I suspect the other schools were schools in the metropolitan area that were high schools, which are about to have additional year 7 components added to them because of the decision to add year 7 to secondary schools by 2022 like every other state and territory in the nation has.

My understanding is that Eastern Fleurieu is an area school, so that is not an issue that will relate specifically to Eastern Fleurieu because it already has year 7 students in it. There might be some greater impact (and this is where the minister and his greater knowledge and his department's greater knowledge applies) in relation to feeder primary schools and to where they might feed year 7 students, and that may or may not impact further on Eastern Fleurieu—I acknowledge that. With those brief comments, I am happy to take the substance of the questions, refer them to the minister and bring back a reply.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:40): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding elective surgery waiting times.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: Two days after the election the Premier said on ABC radio, 'We're going to activate the theatres there as quickly as possible to chew through this unacceptable large elective surgery backlog.' Today, the SA Health elective surgery dashboard shows that the elective surgery waiting list stands at 17,957. This is up by more than 1,100 people from this time last year. The question is: does the minister support the comments made by the Premier then, and will the minister apologise for failing to deliver on this promise to reduce elective surgery waiting times?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for his question. I am used to Dorothys from the Labor opposition, but a double-header Dorothy is quite stunning. Not only am I being asked to comment about the reactivation of the operating theatres at the Repat, the hospital that Labor promised never, ever to close, but I am being invited to reflect on Labor's performance on elective surgery waiting times as well. So today the honourable member talked about—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Allow the minister to respond. Minister.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: All he ever does is talk about the past government—he never talks about his own responsibilities.

The PRESIDENT: We've heard you, the Hon. Mr Hunter. We heard you yesterday. Allow the minister to respond.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: No, he won't.

The PRESIDENT: He can't, the Hon. Mr Hunter, because you're shouting.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Indeed, I can't. The former minister, who has now been promoted to the position of Opposition Whip, apparently doesn't like hearing other people answer ministerial questions. Well, get used to it because it is going to happen for at least the next four years, and I hope you enjoy every single one of them.

Let me return to what this government is doing to clean up Labor's mess. The Hon. Tung Ngo is taunting me to talk about the Repat, so let me do that. The Repat, to which the honourable member's question refers—the Premier was talking about our determination to reactivate the Repat site. The former Labor government closed the Repat Hospital, the hospital they said they would never, ever close. The significance of that, in particular in relation to elective surgery waiting lists, is that orthopaedic surgery and neurological surgery are the two areas where we have the highest numbers of overdue—it is an overdue hotspot.

What did the Repat do? The Repatriation General Hospital supplied 25 per cent of metropolitan Adelaide's neurological and orthopaedic surgery before the Labor Party broke its promise to never, ever close the Repat, and then closed it in November 2017. What we said was that we would reactivate the Repat. So I was delighted this morning to be at the reactivating of the Repat market presentation about the surgical precinct, where a range of providers were briefed on the opportunities on the Repat site. The former Labor government trashed the Repat site; very valuable assets are being reactivated there—not just the brain and spinal precinct, not just the dementia and mental health precinct—but today we had another milestone in the government's program to reactivate the Repat.

In terms of elective surgery—that's the other Dorothy the honourable member gave me, and I thank him for it; it was in relation to elective surgery—let's compare what the former Labor government did in the 12 months up to the last election. They managed from March to March to increase the overdue elective surgery waiting list—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order, Mr President.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Sorry, this is directly on the question.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, point of order.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The relevance of the question asked about the minister's failings and the length of time to respond, and I do appreciate, Mr President, your wise counsel when people have gone on for more than five minutes in the recent past.

The PRESIDENT: Well, he has not gone on for more than five minutes, because I have been watching the time. Secondly, the minister has some latitude, and he is within the boundaries of relevance. The question was very broad.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am almost offended. I am talking about the Repat and elective surgery; that is what the questions were, and the honourable member gave me the opportunity—

The PRESIDENT: There is no need to respond to the point of order. The point of order has been answered.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The former government—

The PRESIDENT: Clerk, turn the dial. Right. Let's go.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: The former government, in the last year before the election, saw a 300 per cent increase in overdue elective surgery. Since the election we have managed to stabilise that growth, and elective surgery overdues has increased by 9 per cent. Since August—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —the overdue colonoscopies have actually—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I cannot hear the minister. I cannot hear the minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Well, if you controlled the house, we would be able to hear it.

The PRESIDENT: Well. The Hon. Ms Lee.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Unfortunately, The Hon. Mr Ngo, I couldn't hear your supplementary. Remonstrate with your own leader.

QUENTIN KENIHAN PLAYGROUND

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about an important initiative happening within the Adelaide CBD. Can the minister please provide an update to the council—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Just listen, opposition, because this is very important.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lee, I am the President.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Can the minister please provide an update to the council—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lee, please start that question again. I didn't hear any of it. Start again.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Thank you, Mr President. My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about the progress of an inclusive play space which will commemorate disability advocate, actor and filmmaker, Quentin Kenihan?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for her question. A week ago today, the Premier and I had the great pleasure of jointly announcing, in conjunction with the Adelaide city council, the establishment and the location for the Quentin Kenihan playground, which the Premier committed to after the sad loss to our community of Mr Quentin Kenihan. We were pleased to be there with the Lord Mayor of Adelaide, Ms Sandy Verschoor, and Deputy Lord Mayor, Houssam Abiad, who was a good friend of Quentin, as well as members of the self-proclaimed group Team Q, including Quentin's mother Kerry Kenihan, Mr Filip Odzak, Polly Metzger and Ian Kissock, who was Quentin's carer.

The Marshall Liberal government is providing \$1 million for the City of Adelaide to build an inclusive play space to commemorate Quentin. The regional play space will be integrated into the Rymill Park space, replacing the existing play space in the park. It is being managed by the Adelaide city council, Quentin's family and the construction is expected to start in 2020 following consultation.

The play space will include sensory elements, water play and features that encourage shared play and will be suitable for children and parents with wheelchairs. As Premier Marshall said on the day:

I am proud to announce the Liberal Government and City of Adelaide will see Quentin's vision become a reality and ensure his memory lives on, as well as provide a safe and fun play space for people of all ages and abilities to enjoy.

Quentin was a great South Australian. He captured the hearts of the nation and overcame significant challenges to live an amazing life.

This is in addition to the work that is being undertaken by my department in terms of inclusion. We have started the first state disability inclusion plan, which is currently being consulted on. We have an inclusive play working group, which is going to assist local councils to develop and ensure that their playgrounds, going into the future, are also inclusive. It forms part of a range of other activities, including employment for people with disabilities within the public sector.

We have also consulted, through DPC, on ensuring that South Australian government websites are inclusive as well, and threading through this element of a range of these things is the concept of universal design, which ensures that places, services, etc., are not just inclusive of people with disabilities but incorporate a range of people who may be frail, aged, mothers with prams, a whole range of people who may otherwise find it difficult to negotiate our community life.

QUENTIN KENIHAN PLAYGROUND

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): Supplementary: for this initiative, which the opposition commends the government for, which minister has provided the funding and which minister has ministerial responsibility for the project?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:50): It is a shared responsibility in terms of the policy by myself, and the funding came from DTF.

QUENTIN KENIHAN PLAYGROUND

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:50): I have a quick supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: It can be long or short.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: I congratulate the government on this initiative. There are thousands of playgrounds around the state. I was wondering whether the government is looking at funding some of those playgrounds to upgrade so that they have disability equipment.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary question. Our view is that inclusion is best practice. At the time when the Disability Inclusion Bill was first mooted, I think under the former government and feedback that we had also received from the local government sector, they had made their usual bid to say, 'If you are going to impose inclusion on us, then you might like to help us pay for it.'

Playgrounds, in and of themselves, are very expensive as it is. The advice that I have received from certain organisations that work in the universal design space is that universal design, if it is incorporated in the planning stage, should not lead to additional costs. This is a particular commitment which was given by Premier Steven Marshall to especially commemorate Quentin.

MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:51): Supplementary: if the minister is so happy to answer a question on a portfolio and a funding issue that belongs to another minister, why does she run away from answering questions on issues that are directly linked to the people she is supposed to represent in the disability community?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:52): The short answer to that is where the money flows from. The money has been directed from the department, and it has been committed. The matter of the transport subsidies is a matter for minister Knoll and his budgetary arrangements. Can I just remind honourable members, in relation to some of the questions that they asked me in the last sitting week, that the Labor Party signed the bilateral with the federal government about which services would transition to the NDIS.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, please, a running commentary is not helpful.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: If the Labor Party had concerns about the NDIS and transport subsidies going to the NDIS, then they should have sought to carve that out from the previous bilateral. It's pretty simple. It's pretty simple that they made arrangements that are now in train. The NDIS train has left the station. It left the station several years ago and it was designed—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I cannot hear. Minister, go on.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The NDIS train was a product of the former South Australian Labor government. We are now at the stage where we are close to full scheme and we are managing those issues as assiduously as possible, but it is quite rich for the Labor opposition to now complain about the transport scheme shifting to the NDIS when they were the ones who designed it.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (14:54): A further supplementary: given that there will be a program running out midyear, as the minister said in her original answer, and there will be, we expect—we are pretty sure—some people caught between the NDIS dream and the running out of the passenger transport scheme—

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, you are talking about the NDIS. The original answer was playgrounds. I have to rule that one out of order.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I am coming to my question, sir.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, but I am warning you.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: It points to the hypocrisy of the minister answering very willingly a question for which she has no portfolio responsibility or budgetary funding. She's happy to answer questions on another minister's budgetary funding but not one directly related to her own constituency: vulnerable people with a disability.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, this is turning into a speech. I am ruling it out of order. I have been very generous today. Sit down, the Hon. Mr Hunter. The Hon. Mr Parnell.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The member for the Greens has been sitting patiently listening to your diatribes. I wish to hear him in silence.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:55): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about the public health impacts of climate change.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: Around Australia last week, tens of thousands of students went on strike from school demanding greater action from governments and politicians over climate change. The students' demands included a rapid phase-out of current fossil fuel use and a stop to all new fossil fuel projects, including the Adani coalmine in Queensland and drilling for oil in the Great Australian Bight.

One of the key messages from the students was that climate change was a very real threat to health, both public and private. In fact, the concerns of the students were backed up by the Health Services Union, which issued a statement in support of the students' strike. National HSU secretary, Lloyd Williams, said:

Health professionals know that climate change is the greatest threat to health this century. Immediate action to reduce the impact of climate change is needed to protect and improve public health.

Climate change will have serious consequences for our public health system. This includes our ability to respond to increasing frequency of extreme weather events, the threat to the availability and quality of food and water, and the resultant mental health impacts.

Workers only strike as a last option, to get the attention of their bosses, to get fair pay or a safe workplace. Likewise, you the students of Australia are taking this action as a rallying cry to politicians to stop, listen, and act on our climate crisis.

You are our future, don't stop standing up for what you believe in.

My questions to the minister are:

1. As Minister for Health and Wellbeing, do you agree with the striking students and the HSU that climate change is the greatest threat to health this century?

2. What actions are you or your department taking to prevent climate change getting worse and further harming the health of South Australians?

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:57): Sorry, I thought I had the call.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I hope this is all getting into *Hansard*, you two, because the South Australian public would like to hear from the minister, as would the President and the person who asked the question, the Hon. Mr Parnell. I wish the minister to be heard in silence. Minister, respond.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I thank the honourable member for his question. I have no doubt that climate change is affecting health. I have already spoken about that in this house in recent weeks. The extreme heat event earlier this year, in my view, resulted in one of the most severe hospital demand events that we have had. The recent long hot spell again led to a significant increase in presentations.

What I am told by clinicians is that it is often the aggravation of underlying complex or chronic conditions, and that is particularly true of elderly people. That is why we have an extreme heat event policy within SA Health. I had cause to highlight the Labor Party's ignorance of its own policy; it introduced the policy in 2016, which clearly says that a response to an extreme heat event includes reducing activity in hospitals so that the hospitals can cope.

I think one of the things that SA Health will be doing as a result of the two significant heat events we have had this year is to look at, shall we say, the days after the heat event. What we observed, in my view, was that people were avoiding presenting to the hospital on the day of the heat event—in other words saying, 'I'll just cope at home because I don't want to go outside in such significant heat,' but in the following days when the heat was less threatening they would go out. So we had increased presentations after the heat event itself.

I have no doubt that we need, in our planning, to make sure that our hospitals cope with all of the external factors that impact on them, and that includes extreme heat events that may arise through climate change. There is no doubt that the environment, in its broadest sense, has a very significant impact on the health and wellbeing of all South Australians, and we need to account for climate change as part of that process.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Mr Parnell.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:00): Thank you. I thank the minister for his answer, which related to adaptation to climate change when my question of him was: what actions are he or his department taking to prevent climate change getting worse rather than simply responding to it after it has happened?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:00): Is there a question?

The PRESIDENT: Take it as a question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I would be open to be educated. I am not aware of any factors that Health can take to prevent climate change.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services a question about disability transport services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: The opposition has had numerous calls from people with disabilities who are going to be affected by a reduction in transport subsidies. We had an email sent to us from a particular support provider. He wrote:

Our customers need transport to be able to achieve their life goals. People with disability can't build their capacity if they are not able to get around. Access to transport has implications across all areas of our customer's lives. Reduced access to transport will affect their work opportunities, the time they can spend with their families, their access to the community. Ultimately lack of transport could have negative impacts on people's quality of life. Transport needs to be adequately funded to meet each individual's needs under the NDIS.

My question to the minister is: what representations or discussions has the minister had with her federal counterpart to ensure South Australians living with disability are not left behind when it comes to the transportation component of their NDIS plans?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his question. I meet with and discuss a number of matters through the Disability Reform Council—things which are on the future agenda—so the matter of school transport in particular is

one that is not yet in train. I have therefore been able to make representations on behalf of the South Australian government as far as that should be treated into the future.

Under the NDIS, there are three transport support levels, ranging from approximately \$1,600 to \$3,500, dependent on whether participants are working, looking for work, studying or attending day programs. In exceptional circumstances, participants may receive higher funding if they have either general or funded supports in their plan to enable participation in employment. Those are the facts of the matter. I continue to represent South Australia on a range of interface issues going forward as we continue to move to full transition of the NDIS.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:03): How many pieces of written correspondence have you had with your federal counterpart?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:03): I would need to go and check that detail, but there have been quite a number.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): Supplementary arising from the original answer: given that the minister has outlined that under the NDIS alone transport payment levels will be—I think the minister outlined from \$1,600 up to \$3,200, at the moment—can the minister inform the house, taking into account mobility allowances federally and the South Australian taxi subsidy scheme, what the yearly assistance totals for transport that people living with a disability in South Australia enjoy?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:04): I don't have those figures before me. I would need to take those on notice and come back with a response.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): A further supplementary: would it surprise the minister to learn that the total transport assistance provided can be up to \$6,759.40 per year, which, under the minister's reckoning for what will happen under the NDIS when the state refuses to provide any money, will be less than half of that?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, are you surprised?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:04): Mr President, it would be very unwise for me to accept any information provided by any Labor member of parliament.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:05): A further supplementary: in terms of your written correspondence to your federal counterpart, has it been specifically about the disability transport services?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:05): There's been numerous exchanges of letters between the federal minister and myself. I would have to doubly check just to see whether this was a matter in isolation or of some other nature, but I have certainly represented a range of matters, including school transport matters, through the Disability Reform Council.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, do you wish to take the call?

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:05): Thank you, sir, I will. Given that the minister, in her original answer, was very happy to say that she made representations to her federal counterpart on school transport matters—and presumably they are matters that are the responsibility of the Minister for Education—why then is she avoiding any responsibility for taking up the issues of taxi vouchers or other transport subsidy for people with disabilities instead of just handballing it to the minister in the other place?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, that supplementary was within standing orders. Minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Sorry?

The PRESIDENT: Minister, it was within standing orders, except for the last little bit.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:06): The Labor members are very fond of putting a whole range of comments into our mouths. For the benefit of anybody who may be reading *Hansard*, they should always examine what Labor members say very, very carefully because they are quite a duplicitous bunch in opposition, as they were in government. I will respond to the questions—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, go on, if you wish.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I will respond to the questions that I have taken on notice and bring back some replies for the honourable members and just remind them that perhaps they should have thought of this before they signed that bilateral agreement.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I remind the opposition that we are on the clock, so all this banter is taking your time away. Leader of the Opposition, do you wish to take the call ahead of the Hon. Ms Scriven?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven.

TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:07): Does the minister believe that the NDIS is providing adequate transport support to people living with a disability?

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: See if you can listen to the answer without talking.

The PRESIDENT: Oh, the Hon. Mr Ridgway, you wish to answer the question? You seem very keen. Show some respect to your fellow ministerial colleague and don't point to the opposition. It's in breach of standing orders.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for her question. There are a range of areas in which people receive various supports within their packages. I think you can always put an argument that people can receive more or that some are adequate. Without examining the specific packages of each of those individuals, if she has examples of particular individuals who are not happy with what's in their plan, then we are more than happy, through my office, to take up those individual advocacy requests on behalf of those people and see what we can do for them. But it is hard to say in isolation, without examining the specific packages of support, whether they are adequate or not.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding hospital demand.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS: This council will know of my advocacy for care in the community, whether in mental health and suicide prevention specifically or in health more generally. Will the minister update the council on programs to ease pressure on our hospitals?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his question. The member is right to raise the positive outcomes associated with community-based programs. Delivering health care in the community is increasingly a focus of public health systems. Care in the community provides better outcomes for patients, who usually prefer to be treated in their own home, in familiar surroundings and with the support of their family and loved ones. It also provides better outcomes for the health system, freeing up acute hospital beds for

patients who require that heightened level of supervision and care and consequently allowing for the provision of health services more efficiently and at a lower cost to the taxpayer.

One pilot program which has already shown significant benefits is a collaboration between the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and the community health group Pop-Up. The project provides support to GPs and community services to care for patients in the community so that they don't need to present to emergency departments. Patients being cared for in the community have recently presented to either the Lyell McEwin or the Modbury Hospital emergency departments.

The pilot has been extremely successful to date, with 66 people already being provided care—that was the latest figure available to me. This number is expected to rise to 100 by the end of the project. That's potentially 100 fewer ambulance trips and presentations to NALHN emergency departments and fewer acute beds being used. NALHN's partner, Pop-Up, will provide a GP for patients who don't have one themselves. The pilot ties into work already being done to support care in the community, provided as Hospital in the Home. In 2017, in NALHN, this program provided more than 2,000 episodes of care and is estimated to have saved 15,000 bed days. This is about the whole of the health system working together to support people before they get so unwell that they need to present to an emergency department.

These are only some of the range of initiatives the government has introduced to ease demand on the system and stop the ramping, which is the legacy of Labor's disastrous Transforming Health experiment. We know there was no panacea to address this complex problem. We are undertaking a range of initiatives. In addition to piloting care in the community, we have secured 40 beds at the Repat. We have launched a new criteria-led discharge policy. We have opened 10 PICU beds at the RAH. We have launched the ED Geriatric Syndromes 80 Plus initiative in CALHN, and we have committed to opening an additional 10 forensic mental health beds.

The Marshall Liberal government is continuing to undo the damage of Transforming Health, whether it is reactivating the Repat, reintroducing multiday surgery at the Modbury Hospital, opening new mental health beds at the RAH or reintroducing 24/7 cardiac services at The QEH. While Labor does its best to stop us fixing the train wreck of Transforming Health, the Marshall Liberal government is getting on with the job.

DOG FENCE

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:12): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, representing the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, a question about the Dog Fence.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: I understand that BDO EconSearch undertook a study to determine the net benefit of replacing approximately 1,600 kilometres of the Dog Fence at a cost of \$25 million. After conducting a cost-benefit analysis, the report found that replacement will generate a net benefit to the state of up to \$120.3 million over a 20-year period. I further understand that the minister has indicated that replacing the Dog Fence is the South Australian livestock industry's highest priority. My questions to the minister are:

1. Can the minister advise when the government intends to begin replacement of the priority sections of the Dog Fence and how long completion will take?
2. What consideration has been given to the electrification of parts of the fence that require replacement?
3. What consideration has been given to providing remote monitoring of existing and future electrified sections of the Dog Fence?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:14): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in regional South Australia, and in particular the outback pastoral areas and the Dog Fence. It is a responsibility of the Minister for Primary Industries, but I will make a few comments. Clearly, for some of the details that the honourable member asked for, I will have to take those on notice and refer them to my colleague.

In relation to the Dog Fence, it is a particularly important part of infrastructure to protect our pastoral industry. It was neglected during the last 16 years of the former government. It was not seen as a priority for them. In fact, they cut funding to the trappers and shooters. In fact, they really turned their back on that part of our pastoral industry.

Of course, once you let the dogs through, they start to breed, they start to grow in numbers and then they are much more difficult to control inside the Dog Fence in the more heavily populated areas but also where there is more vegetation and more cover for those particular wild dogs. In fact, every now and again they even get down as far as some of the settled country just north of the Barossa Valley towards the top of the river and into the Mallee area. The river does provide a pretty good natural barrier, but there are some particularly productive grazing properties specialising in sheep between the Dog Fence and the River Murray.

It is a vital bit of pastoral infrastructure that has been there for many, many years. I am not sure how many members opposite have been there. I know the Hon. Kyam Maher would have driven past it and through it when he is on the way to the APY lands, but I am not sure how many other members opposite have been to it. The Hon. Mr Wortley sticks his hand up. It is good to see that he was out there at some point. But it is a very important part of our pastoral infrastructure.

I thank the honourable member for his questions. We know it has a tremendous economic benefit. Parts of the electrification and some of the details he has asked for are really the responsibility of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to take that on notice and refer it to the Hon. Tim Whetstone.

KANGAROO ISLAND VISITOR CENTRE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:16): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment a question regarding the Kangaroo Island visitor centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: For months Tourism KI has raised the possibility of the closure of the visitor centre at Penneshaw. During question time yesterday, the minister said that he thought he had a meeting with the SATC on Thursday to possibly discuss the future of the Kangaroo Island visitor centre. The minister also advised that he was only made aware of the issue two days ago. It is also of note that the tourism centre's motto is 'Open all year'. My questions to the minister are:

1. Will the minister guarantee emergency funding to prevent the closure and possibly change the motto to reflect the centre's now non-existent opening hours?
2. When was the last time you spoke as minister to a representative of Tourism KI?
3. Are you embarrassed that the closure of the major tourism centre in one of our most important tourism regions happened on your watch but was only brought to your attention a few days ago?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. Just to refer to it, I will read the headline of an email, 'The temporary closure of the Kangaroo Island Visitor Information Centre', from 24 March.

The PRESIDENT: I am not going to let you read that from your phone. Otherwise, if a member asked for it to be tabled, it cannot be tabled.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: He can table his whole telephone. We can download all his songs

The PRESIDENT: Minister, you can reflect on that whilst I listen to the Leader of the Opposition's further objection. Do you have anything else to add?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Should I seek leave to table the whole phone?

The PRESIDENT: No, I am not going to grant that. It was on a warning to the minister. Minister, please continue.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I just wanted to make sure I got the date correct. I take your advice and I won't quote from my phone in the future. I have a copy of an email that says it was

closing on 24 March 2019. When I check my watch—I don't want to check it because I might have to table that—it is 20 March today, so it will be a temporary closure as of (must be) Sunday. It is disappointing. I have spoken to the mayor this morning. I have spoken to the South Australian Tourism Commission. I haven't spoken to Mr Pierre Gregor for a few weeks, but I was aware that there were some concerns about the ongoing operation and they were working through—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order: I appreciate your ruling about the entire telephone, but given that the minister has quoted from what could be a standalone document will the minister table the email which he read partly from?

The PRESIDENT: Minister.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I don't have that with me, so I'm not able to. It is my recollection of the email that I have seen.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Will the minister table the email from which he read?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I don't have it in front of me, Mr President, so it's a bit hard to table it. It's my recollection of an email.

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the Opposition is seeking clarification on whether you intend to table the email.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Mr President, I accept he doesn't have the email physically with him from which he read earlier, but I am quite prepared for him to seek a printed out copy of it and table it for the benefit of this chamber sometime later today.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: If I am able to print it from my phone. Technology is somewhat difficult.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I was trying to answer the question. The Hon. Mr Hanson asked a question, and I have had nothing but interruptions.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, what I will do is reflect on your point of order. I won't give a ruling today, but I will check the precedence and give a ruling possibly tomorrow. Go on with your answer, the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: As I said, I spoke to the mayor this morning about the issue and we are looking at a range of options. One of the questions was had I spoken to anybody from Tourism KI recently. I have spoken to Mr Pierre Gregor, the chairman. I can't recall how recently, but this has been an ongoing concern for the group on Kangaroo Island for a little while. Of course, it was built by the government and then handed over to the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, they can't help themselves. They just want to interject and interrupt all afternoon.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: See, here they go.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, I do point out that you have been doing the same thing. Continue with your answer, if you so choose. Opposition members, please restrain yourselves. I don't want to have a further discussion about his phone. The Hon. Mr Ridgway, please continue.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am exhausted just getting up and down all the time. As I said, I had some discussions with the mayor this morning. I know that he suggested there may have been some people looking to operate it as a private operation and do the visitor centre—some private interests. So I said that we will look at all of the options that are on the table. An important part of tourism is access to information. A vast majority of it these days is available online. So there are a

number of ways—I think the new airport at Kingscote has quite a large digital presence and some handouts. Certainly, we will be looking at all the options—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: They can't help themselves. Of course—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: They just can't help themselves.

Matters of Interest

COUNTRY PRESS AWARDS

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:22): On 22 February, I was very pleased to attend the Country Press SA awards dinner at the Vine Inn Barossa community hotel in Nuriootpa. The welcome was provided by the new president of Country Press SA, Mr Darren Robinson, a fourth-generation member of the Robinson family to work on *The Leader* newspaper at Angaston, which actually hosted this annual event. The master of ceremonies for the awards was the new vice-president, Mr Dennis Jackson, of *The Border Watch* at Mount Gambier.

Having been a trophy sponsor of Country Press SA since 2002, I was delighted to present the Best Community Profile award to the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* proprietor, Michael Ellis, on behalf of his journalist, Amie Price. Judge Paul Starick from *The Advertiser* said of Amie's profile on Karimi Manners:

This is a memorable story about an unusual and interesting person, who has started a thriving food business in a small country town.

The other awards at the presentation night included Best Advertisement (Image/Branding), which went to the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times*, Best Advertisement (Priced Product) to *The Courier* in Mount Barker, Best Advertising Feature to *The Plains Producer* and Best Supplement to *The Yorke Peninsula Country Times*. *The Loxton News* and Stephanie Thompson were awarded with the Best News Photograph, while Phil Williams from *The Bunyip* took out Best Sports Photograph.

Best Front Page went to *The Border Watch* and the Editorial Writing award was taken out by Raquel Mustillo and Fred Smith from *The South Eastern Times*. *The Murray Pioneer* from Renmark took out the Best Headline and Excellence in Journalism also went to *The Murray Pioneer* and its editor, Mr Paul Mitchell. Best Sports Story was won by Paul Mitchell from *The Murray Pioneer*. The Young Journalist of the Year Award went to Brooke Littlewood of *The South Eastern Times*.

We then progressed to the major awards of the evening. The two key categories for newspapers, depending on the size of their circulation: the Best Newspaper Under 4,000 Circulation went to *The South Eastern Times* at Millicent, and the award for the Best Newspaper Over 4,000 Circulation went to *The Border Watch* at Mount Gambier.

I was pleased that other members of this place, the Hon. Ms Scriven and the Hon. Ms Bourke, were able to attend the awards night. The Deputy Premier (the Hon. Vickie Chapman) was also there, along with the state members for Hammond, Narungga, Giles, Croydon and Light from another place, as was the federal member for Barker.

I have long had an association with Country Press SA. They represent some fabulous community publications that work very hard to make realistic and positive commentary on and advancement of their local communities. They vary in size greatly and some are weekly newspapers. *The Border Watch* is a multiple weekly paper. They represent salt of the earth people who are very proud of their local communities.

I reiterate the fact that the work of Country Press SA as an organisation is to be commended. They have a smaller membership of newspapers now than for most of the time I have been involved, and that is because of the withdrawal, unfortunately, of the Rural Press newspapers. One would hope that in the future the potential sale of those newspapers will mean that they will go into ownership that might bring that large group of papers back into the Country Press SA fold. I know that in New South Wales a similar organisation was decimated by the fact that some 80 per cent of their member papers were owned by Rural Press.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:27): I rise to speak on an important matter impacting our community: rental stress. SGS Economics and Planning's most recently published findings on the Australian rental market was reported in the November 2018 housing affordability index. Their discoveries about South Australia are alarming and concerning for all honourable members in this place.

Over the reporting period it was found that Adelaide had the greatest decline in affordability of states considered. Our rental affordability was described as comparable to Greater Sydney. I understand this index found Adelaide the third most unaffordable city after Hobart and Sydney, with our renters spending on average just over a quarter of their household income on rent.

Regional South Australia was found to have experienced the greatest decline in affordability, compared with all the 'rest of state' areas studied. According to the report, regional SA is at its least affordable since early 2016, with average households spending 23 per cent of income on rent. As representatives of South Australians, these statistics should greatly concern all honourable members in this and the other place, but this problem is not exclusively ours. Nationwide, I understand that households renting grew from 25 per cent to 30 per cent between 1995 and 2015. Renters spend 4 per cent more income on household expenses than do mortgaged owners.

Alarmingly, the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute estimates that 1.3 million households need housing assistance. The index key findings identify various factors causing the shift towards renting and its increased costs. Negative gearing and the reduction in capital gains tax have attracted investors, reducing owner-occupiers. Other factors include low interest rates and widening income inequality.

Another contributor to our nation's rising housing unaffordability is the decline in affordable housing over the last decade. This pushes low-income renters into the private market, driving up prices. The movement of low-income renters from public housing into private explains why 44 per cent of all low-income households are in housing stress, compared with 35 per cent in 2008.

Even more concerning is the mention in the index findings that, for investors, vacant properties are still valuable for their long-term financial gains. As I understand it, owner-investors will make money in the long run, regardless of whether their property is currently serving the rental market.

For these reasons, I commend the Labor Party federally for announcing their \$6.6 billion plan to pay \$8,500 to landlords who build new homes to rent to low and middle-income Australians at 20 per cent below the market price. This policy is a step in the right direction to ease the pressure on South Australian households and our most vulnerable citizens. I also congratulate federal Labor national conference delegates for agreeing to establish a bond aggregator so community housing providers can get cheaper long-term finance for new affordable and social rental housing.

Labor also pledged to work cooperatively with state and territory governments and appoint a housing minister and to re-establish the national housing supply council to ensure better assessment of general housing affordability issues, including supply. Labor will also work with state and territory governments to improve and increase the stock of public housing, while also looking to expand Indigenous housing. I am pleased that the federal Labor Party is tackling this issue seriously, and I welcome their policy announcements.

CLIMATE CHANGE STUDENT PROTEST

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:32): As we get closer to the next federal election, it is clear that the response from Australian political parties to the climate emergency will be more significant than ever. Across the nation, Australians are increasingly frustrated at the lack of real action to reduce our emissions and to do our fair share in dealing with a worldwide threat to our environment, our economy and our societies. Australians are looking for leadership from the federal Liberal government and the state government, but they are not getting it.

More and more Australians are saying that they do not want new coalmines, they do not want fracking for gas and they certainly do not want drilling for oil in the Great Australian Bight, which has appalling local consequences as well as the global climate implications.

In just a few months, most Australians will get to have their say at the ballot box, but what about those who are too young to vote? Last year, I moved a motion in parliament to congratulate school students who left their classrooms and went on strike to protest on the steps of state parliament about government inaction on climate change. As I told Parliament at the time, about 500 students participated in the 30 November strike and rally.

If we fast forward just 4½ months to 15 March this year, we saw that 5,000 students and other South Australians took part in the Adelaide rally alone. That is a tenfold increase. In over 100 places around Australia, students went on strike in far greater numbers than they had just a few months before. Young people are motivated and they are informed. As one of the students noted to a dismissive politician, 'If you don't want us protesting, either do your job properly or stop teaching us science, because the science of human-induced climate change is now beyond doubt.'

Young people know that we are in a climate emergency, and until they are old enough to vote they have to find other ways to get their message across. The young people who spoke at the Adelaide rally were articulate, they were passionate and they were determined that politicians should listen to their concerns. After all, many of these young people will still be alive in the year 2100, long after every current state and federal politician is dead and gone. One primary school student I spoke to will still only be 90 at the turn of the next century. Decisions we make now will determine the world that she grows up in.

When I last spoke about the school climate strike, I noted the dismissive and patronising response from the Prime Minister and other senior government figures. They were chastising the children and telling them to stay in school. This time, their reaction, whilst hardly encouraging, was a great deal more muted. They know that most of these kids have the support of their parents, and their parents do vote.

This coming federal election will focus on climate change like never before. As always, the Greens will be leading, with a comprehensive package of measures that moves Australia to zero net emissions faster than any other party. We Greens understand climate change, we understand the urgency of the situation, and we are prepared to offer leadership and to make the changes necessary for Australia to become part of the solution rather than part of the problem.

Just this week, we launched an election commitment for the rapid rollout of household batteries, which are the natural complement to rooftop solar. Storing solar energy for use at night or during peak demand is one of the best ways of ensuring that South Australian families have access to energy that is affordable and reliable.

However, despite a tripling of battery installations in the last year, the industry is still developing and prices are not yet low enough for everyone to be able to benefit. That is why the Greens want to see \$2.2 billion invested over the next four years in helping households, especially low-income households, to install home batteries. With appropriate incentives, the Greens believe we can get the payback period for these batteries down to a three-year period.

In many ways, this national scheme is the parallel to the scheme championed by the Greens in South Australia a decade ago in relation to solar panels. By providing appropriate support to households, we kicked off a solar energy revolution that ultimately saw nearly a third of houses in the state with solar panels. That feed-in scheme helped employ thousands of South Australians and it kickstarted an industry that is now able to stand on its own two feet.

Whilst we cannot possibly imagine what the world will be like in the year 2100, we know that it will depend in large measure on the decisions that we make today. Governments can make bad investments or they can make good ones. They can take climate change seriously or leave it to the next generation to try to sort out. We know, however, that by then it will be too late. So my commitment to the young people of South Australia is that the Greens are listening to you. We do take climate change seriously and we are taking action.

DOG ATTACKS

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:37): I rise to speak on something that some may view, initially, as a little trivial, but I do not believe it is trivial because the consequences of it being unchecked can be significant in the community. I talk about this matter from some unfortunate personal experience pertaining to a lack of responsible dog ownership in the community.

I am a dog owner myself, and a proud dog owner, I might say. I have a beautiful little cocker spaniel. His name is Watson, and he is a terrific part of our family. On a number of occasions, he has been set upon by other dogs that have been off lead. There are, in my view, far too many serious dog attacks, and they are almost always a result of those dogs being off lead. Sometimes, of course, these attacks can be quite serious, resulting in significant injury. There are even, as no doubt members are aware, occasions when it can actually result in a fatality.

I decided to have a look at some of the detail on this and I discovered that the Dog and Cat Management Board revealed that there were some 2,256 incidents of dog attacks or 'harassments', as they are categorised, reported to local councils across our state in the last financial year alone. They suggested to me that from that register their estimate is that councils are notified of only approximately one in five such incidents.

If you are doing some rough numbers on that, it is 10,000 or 11,000 incidents per year across South Australia where somebody reaches the category of 'harassment', however that is defined, by a dog, and as I say it is typically off-lead dogs. To put this into perspective, there are conservatively on average at least six incidents of significant dog aggression or actual attacks that occur every single day in South Australia.

The attack register I referred to enables victims to detail the circumstances under which the attacks occurred, and it appears that far too many involve dogs that were either off leash or well beyond the control of their handlers. It is evident that many South Australian dog owners are either unaware of their responsibilities under our current laws or deliberately choose to ignore them, risking the safety of other people and their pets. It is important to note that owners and handlers are required under law to keep dogs on leashes not exceeding two metres in length in all public places, as well as in private places in the absence of the express consent of occupiers that they may be off leash.

They must also be on leash when walking on public roads and footpaths unless signposts indicate otherwise. Of course, there are certain areas where dogs can appropriately be off leash. There are certain times in certain areas where they can be off leash and the councils have designated those spaces, and I support that. I am not saying that dogs should be on lead at all times but it is important that public safety is maintained, the safety of other dogs and the safety, most importantly, of other people.

The term that is used with respect to dog handlers is that their dog should be under 'effective control at all times'. That means that they reliably respond to commands and they obey those commands, and are also in close proximity to their owner or the handler of the dog. If a dog is not deemed to be under effective control it is required to be kept on leash even in those spaces where a leash is not necessarily required at all times.

The Australian government's Institute of Health and Welfare stated that in the 2013-14 year almost 4,000 Australians were hospitalised due to dog-related injuries. The majority of these victims were aged between birth and nine years old, with 74 per cent suffering injuries to the head. These are horrific statistics, particularly due to the susceptibility of babies and children sustaining life-threatening or fatal injuries which unfortunately, as per the statistics that I have just quoted, occur way too often.

Most dog lovers would regard their pet as being under control and that they are unlikely to respond in the way that would contravene our legislation. However, my personal experience is that when walking our pet cocker spaniel not far from our home down at the River Torrens, he was set upon by a very unlikely, I would have thought, breed of animal—it was a Labrador and they are very unlikely to set upon another dog. However, this Labrador was walking off lead next to his owner and then quite unpredictably, and without anything to indicate otherwise, it just took off and essentially tried to take on Watson and essentially kill him—I think that was the intention—it was very, very

violent. I am pleased for members to hear that Watson is okay but it was a nasty incident, and I urge all dog owners to take care of their animals and keep them on lead when they can.

INTERNATIONAL LYMPHOEDEMA AWARENESS MONTH

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:43): I rise today to speak in strong support of International Lymphoedema Awareness Month. I would like to start by acknowledging Alison Neilson, Vice-President of the Lymphoedema Support Group of SA, who I hope will be here soon, and the advocacy of Monique Bareham, President of the LSGSA who could not be here today.

Lymphoedema is a chronic condition that causes painful swelling, often in the limbs, which is estimated to affect over 2,300 people in South Australia—but that is only an educated guess based on UK statistics because in Australia there is no Medicare item number for lymphoedema therapy, rendering the condition statistically invisible. About 20 per cent of breast cancer sufferers will develop lymphoedema but the condition also affects men after treatment for conditions including cancer. Head and neck surgeries and other tissue damage can also trigger lymphoedema. When not well managed, increased swelling often results which can lead to skin deterioration, disfigurement, mobility difficulties and psychological problems, making it harder for the sufferer to maintain employment.

For reasons unknown, South Australia does not provide dedicated lymphoedema services. Further, South Australia is the only state in Australia that does not provide a compression garment scheme or compression government subsidy for eligible lymphoedema sufferers to help control swelling. It is completely and utterly unacceptable that lymphoedema sufferers in this state are discriminated against purely because of the state that they choose to live in. As a result of the lack of available support in South Australia, many lymphoedema sufferers cannot afford the necessary treatment to relieve their symptoms.

Individual measured and fitted compression garments are a necessary requirement in the management of lymphoedema to keep swelling under control and may need to be worn up to 24 hours a day. The necessary compression garments are very expensive and need to be replaced every six months, on average, to maintain their effectiveness. In correspondence last year, health minister, Stephen Wade, wrote and I quote:

SA Health hospitals provide a variety of high-quality services and treatment plans for patients who experience lymphoedema for both cancer and non-cancer related conditions. Nonetheless, the Marshall Government is mindful of the health need for a compression garment subsidy scheme and is developing a business case and looking for funding solutions.

I am advised by the LSGSA that the reality tells a very different story indeed. The LSGSA has made inquiries to SA Health requesting detailed information as to the range of 'high-quality services' referred to by the minister. In particular, it would like to know where the referral pathways to the services are so that it can direct its members to them. However, its efforts have been fruitless and it is yet to receive a formal response.

There is the Lymphoedema Clinical Research Unit located at the Flinders Medical Centre. However, the SA Health website is at pains to point out that treatment services are not currently provided within the clinic; it only runs a range of clinical trials from time to time and instead refers sufferers to private doctors. Sufferers are forced to seek treatment with specialist private practitioners at significant personal cost. Dedicated public lymphoedema therapists can diagnose and treat early lymphoedema so that symptoms do not worsen and cellulitis is less likely to occur.

Lymphoedema is incurable but the earlier it is detected and treated by a qualified therapist, the less likely it is that symptoms will worsen. In combination, dedicated public lymphoedema services and subsidies for compression garments would assist greatly in keeping lymphoedema sufferers out of our already stretched public hospital system, not to mention provide lymphoedema sufferers in our state with a better quality of life—the same as sufferers in other states, who are better supported than they are here.

Minister Wade has said the Marshall government is developing a business case for a compression garment subsidy scheme—that correspondence was some six months ago. I echo the appeals by the Lymphoedema Support Group of South Australia, supported by the Lymphoedema Action Alliance, for therapy funding and a compression garment subsidy scheme in South Australia;

again, the only jurisdiction that does not have such a scheme in place. I call on the Marshall government to implement those measures as a matter of absolute urgency.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:48): In July 2017, the ABC's *Four Corners* aired a story on the River Murray. The investigative report raised very serious concerns that the Murray-Darling Basin Authority had been undermined, with serious allegations about illegal water use, the pumping of waters from fragile rivers and persistent tampering with meters. The former state Labor government acted on these reports and initiated a royal commission, with former premier, Jay Weatherill, stating that it was 'clear some irrigators in upstream states have no regard for people who live and work downstream.'

At that time, the then opposition leader, now Premier, said he would, and I quote, 'fully support' the royal commission and that, and again I quote, 'if other states have done the wrong thing...we want to see that they're held fully accountable.' The then opposition leader went even further, saying, and I quote:

We've got to make sure that that water which is owed to South Australia comes down to our state.

These are strong words from an opposition leader during an election campaign. But what have we seen from the Premier's office since the state election?

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: He's gone to water.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: He has; he has gone to water—absolutely. The state Liberal government started out by undermining the process of the royal commission. Now listen to the facts: they sat idly by while the federal Liberal government took out an injunction to prevent staff from giving evidence to the royal commission. I note that this was in direct contradiction to the federal Assistant Minister for Agriculture and Water Resources, Anne Ruston, who said that the federal government would not stand in the way of the South Australian inquiry.

Poorly chosen words from our state Attorney-General led to the commissioner stating that a media release issued by the Attorney-General's office was, and I quote, 'Wrong, discourteous and inappropriate' and required a retraction and an apology. This is an unprecedented act and calls into question how serious the state Liberal government are about protecting the Murray. They should be ashamed of their conduct. This undermining of the royal commission process pales in comparison to the findings of the fate of the 450 gegalitres of water, which, of course, is in direct contradiction to Steven Marshall's previous comments that:

We've got to make sure that that water which is owed to South Australia comes down to our state.

Now we know exactly the opposite to be true. One of the Premier's own ministers agreed to a dud deal, which sold our state up the river. Labor has always stood up for South Australia and has never shied away from taking a fight to Canberra to defend the best interests of our state. In opposition, we continue to stand up for South Australia. The actions of minister David Speirs, who is directly responsible, are, and I quote:

...nothing short of a capitulation to the interests of the current Commonwealth Government, and those of Victoria and New South Wales...

And it is 'so antipathetic to the interests of South Australia' that it was a breach of the Ministerial Code of Conduct. These are quite strong words by the commissioner. I am reading from the findings of the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission. Labor has called on David Speirs to resign in light of his failure as a minister. I note not only his refusal to step down but also the lack of leadership shown by Premier Steven Marshall in refusing to sack his incompetent minister. How can minister Speirs continue to serve on the front bench when his actions have led to such poor outcomes for this state?

Various Liberal governments have had good form in undermining South Australia's best interests. We all remember when the federal Liberal government had such a contemptible position to the River Murray that they put Barnaby Joyce in as the water minister. Barnaby Joyce was famous for telling people that if they want water they should go to where the water is, which means, basically, go to Queensland. The attitude of many of these very strong conservative people is that any water

that goes past their farm is wasted water, and we saw this in an inquiry I was on when we went up the Murray River.

They have a contempt for the River Murray, and it is only by strong action by a Labor government that we will ever fix this. The actions of the government both in the undermining of the royal commission process and their responses to the findings have been appalling. They have betrayed the people who elected them to fight for their best interests and they should be ashamed of themselves.

STATE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:53): It is a great honour today to speak about the 12-month anniversary of the Marshall Liberal government. One year ago, on Sunday 17 March 2018, the people of South Australia declared their confidence in the Liberal Party's strong plan for real change and delivered a new majority Liberal government. Local community members I meet every day and delegates visiting from overseas have expressed to me that it is an incredibly exciting time to be in South Australia right now.

I am extremely proud to be an integral part of the Marshall Liberal government, and I am very honoured to serve as the Assistant Minister to the Premier. Under the strong leadership of the Premier, the Marshall Liberal government's first year in office has delivered real outcomes for South Australia. There has never been a better time to work and live in South Australia. Business confidence is rising to levels not seen in more than 10 years, and reports such as the recent ANZ report show that South Australia's economy was the stand out among all states and territories.

It is no wonder that our economy is looking set for a buoyant 2019 when we have delivered on a wide range of election commitments to support businesses and our community. The Premier, through his strong leadership and his determination to make South Australia a state to be envied, has ensured that our government embraces a new mindset in creating more productive and more beneficial relationships with the federal government. Some of the key initiatives will strengthen our state to be more competitive and a better place to live and do business in.

Some of our achievements in the first year of government include abolishing payroll tax for small businesses, thanks to the Treasurer; establishing the Skilling South Australia fund to create over 20,000 new apprenticeships and traineeships; and securing \$11.3 billion for new roads and infrastructure projects. We understand the rich potential of our regions and established the Regional Growth Fund to support businesses and create jobs for country South Australians.

Our government understands that South Australians were doing it tough under the previous Labor government. Therefore, the Liberal government put our focus on delivering lower costs at the grassroots and community level. Since taking office we have reduced emergency services levy bills for households, businesses and community organisations; we doubled sports vouchers for our children—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Doubled!

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Yes, doubled. We have also abolished DCSI screening fees for volunteers. Our government will continue to focus on delivering cheaper, more reliable power through the rollout of our Home Battery Scheme. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been working tirelessly to fix up the mess and failures in the health sector created under the Labor government. The minister is working with local communities to reactivate the Repat; upgrade The Queen Elizabeth, Noarlunga and Modbury hospitals; and invest in Country Health.

The Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment is on track to deliver five new offices overseas. The offices in Shanghai and Tokyo have already been opened. The other offices will be opening soon. South Australia will benefit from the increased activities and economic prosperity flowing from trade, tourism and investment.

Keeping our communities safe is critical. Not only did we extend police station opening hours but the Minister for Human Services has delivered a comprehensive domestic violence package to ensure that vulnerable members of our community, women and children are protected and kept safe. The Minister for Education has delivered a record investment in education, including capital works

upgrades to transition year 7 into high school, and has implemented our Literacy Guarantee package, including phonics screening checks to improve literacy and numeracy outcomes for all students.

I wish to congratulate the Liberal Marshall government, under the leadership of the Premier, on its efforts to reset our state's relationship with the federal government and on ensuring greater commonwealth investment into South Australia across a range of infrastructure and transport projects, and so much more. We have successfully secured the headquarters of the national Space Agency, proving that the sky is no longer our limit. Up, up and beyond!

Motions

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:58): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises the thousands of South Australians living with disability who are facing uncertainty regarding their ongoing care and support because of the Marshall Liberal government's failure to guarantee funding certainty for essential disability services;
2. Notes that this is the second time in less than 12 months the Marshall Liberal government has left disability support providers in the dark concerning block funding, leading to an avoidable drain of institutional knowledge and experience from the disability support sector;
3. Acknowledges that not all South Australians living with disability will qualify for the NDIS, and that the state Liberal government must stop ignoring disability support services; and
4. Calls on the Marshall Liberal government to guarantee funding certainty to disability support providers so that they can continue to provide quality care for South Australians living with disability.

I rise today to move this motion on behalf of the thousands of South Australians living with a disability who are plagued by this government's refusal to guarantee block funding until the NDIS rollout is complete. The Minister for Human Services has repeatedly said the full rollout of the NDIS will be complete by 30 June this year. That deadline is fast approaching, but we are yet to find anyone in the sector who actually believes that the rollout will be complete by that date.

Yet, according to the federal Minister for Families and Social Services, Paul Fletcher, the NDIS is already fully rolled out in South Australia. In correspondence sent to the South Australian shadow minister for human services on 16 January this year, minister Fletcher enthusiastically noted, 'As you are aware, the NDIS is fully rolled out in South Australia and is providing support to 20,800 South Australians with a disability'. No wonder there is so much confusion and misinformation when it comes to the NDIS in South Australia. Instead, we find organisation after organisation saying the same thing. They are worried that they will have to let their staff go or even close their doors because this government will not guarantee their funding certainty and commit to block funding until the NDIS rollout is complete.

The minister must take responsibility for the impending crisis occurring in the sector and take urgent steps to address block funding guarantees for the full transition of those currently receiving state-based services to NDIS agreements. Sadly, however, the minister refuses to take responsibility, as we saw today in question time. The minister refuses to answer questions, refuses to take responsibility and refuses to acknowledge the difficulties facing people with disability in our state today.

The NDIS has the potential to be of life-changing benefit to people living with a disability. That is its potential, but only if it is managed effectively and only if it is actually implemented. The Marshall government's refusal to guarantee block funding to funded disability service providers means that members of our community are at risk of missing out on much-needed services. This includes many state-based services that they are currently utilising.

Without these service guarantees, people living with a disability are less mobile and less able to live their lives with choice and freedom. This means they have less opportunity to spend time with family and friends. They are less able to get to work and therefore their quality of life is damaged. NDIS funding is meant to improve the lives, but mismanagement of block funding transition means that their lives are harder rather than easier.

People living with a disability in rural and regional areas are particularly vulnerable because their services are so specialised and specific to their needs. This means their anxiety about the continuity of their funding is particularly high. The government could take steps to ease this anxiety, yet this is clearly not a priority for this government.

It is not just South Australians living with a disability who are affected. This government and this minister's failure to guarantee block funding also hurts workers in the disability sector. Organisations big and small are having to review programs and in many cases let workers go because there is just no funding certainty going forward. We are now at the point where the continuity of services is at risk, and therefore thousands of jobs are at risk.

Everyone knows for themselves how central a job is to a person's security and life. For workers in the disability sector, who are some of the lowest paid in our community, the loss of their job would be disastrous for themselves and their families. The Liberal government likes to boast that they care about jobs and are concerned about unemployment. If this is true, then why are they not addressing the urgent crisis facing the disability sector by guaranteeing block funding to employers? The loss of jobs in this sector through mismanagement of the NDIS transition would be a tragedy not just for the individual workers involved who dedicate their lives to supporting people with disability but also for skills in the sector. The fact is that service providers are businesses and they cannot guarantee jobs if their block funding arrangements are not guaranteed.

This government is fast moving towards a funding cliff, with no solution in sight, and are therefore also moving quickly towards a jobs crisis in the disability sector, which is a major employer and a crucial skills base for South Australia. The service providers are the experts in the delivery of much-needed care and resources to people living with a disability. They are the ones telling us that their businesses are at risk. Without funding guarantees, these service providers risk not being able to deliver much-needed services. They risk not being able to guarantee the thousands of workers in their sector will keep their jobs and they are risking the very continuation of their services.

We are calling on the Marshall Liberal government to address this crisis immediately for the sake of South Australians living with a disability, for workers in the sector who are experiencing a crisis of job security and for the service providers who need continuity of funding to enable their services to continue to provide quality care. It is well past time for a solution to this impending NDIS funding cliff. I call on the minister to stand up for disability services in South Australia. I commend the motion to the council.

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

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN INDIAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (16:06): I move:

That this council—

- (a) acknowledges the ongoing contribution of the South Australian Indian Medical Association in South Australia in the areas of health care and philanthropic activities, promoting social cohesion and fostering a strong community spirit;
- (b) recognises the importance of the multicultural community in South Australia and their ongoing contributions to our state; and
- (c) wishes the organisation all the best in its future endeavours.

I am pleased to rise today to move this motion to recognise the extraordinary contributions of the South Australian Indian Medical Association (SAIMA). This organisation has made an enormous contribution in the areas of health care and philanthropic activities, which have promoted social cohesion and community spirit since the association was incorporated in 2008. I note the excellent work of community groups and SAIMA deserve recognition for their work. It is also important to recognise the extraordinary contributions that those of Indian heritage have made in South Australia, and we are far better for it.

The history of SAIMA began in December 2007, when a group of interested members first came together. They were driven by a simple goal: to create a common platform for health professionals with an interest in the Indian subcontinent and to engage with other groups within the medical profession to help provide the highest quality health care and promote goodwill.

SAIMA should be proud of their work in striving to meet this goal and they have created a platform that they have sought to achieve since their inaugural meeting on 23 May 2008 at the Calvary Wakefield auditorium. I am told that from their first meeting, SAIMA's main objectives were to enhance the delivery of high-quality health care in South Australia by promoting educational and scientific events among their members and to encourage philanthropic activities to promote social cohesion, camaraderie and interaction amongst various community and professional associations.

Since their first AGM in 2009, the growth of SAIMA has been extraordinary, and they now have the largest membership base of any medical organisation in South Australia, with currently over 300 active members who are all health professionals, and this is certainly a fantastic achievement. The current committee is comprised of a president, currently Dr Nimit Singhal, past presidents being Professor Suren Krishnan, Dr Krish Sundararajan and Dr Arvind Sehgal, a vice-president, treasurer, general secretary and six other ordinary members.

Various portfolio positions are filled by board members in areas such as education, health, allied health, GP liaison, sports, human resources and student representative. These portfolios attest to the range of areas in which SAIMA contributes to our state. One key feature of SAIMA is its recognition of the importance of scientific research and discovery, which is vital to our public health system. Each year SAIMA recognises excellence in the fields of health and medicine. The recipients of these awards have been pioneers in many fields. The awards presented at its annual charity gala dinner include the SAIMA president's award, lifetime achievement award and the Sabapathy Krishnan Memorial Award for academic excellence. To date, the list of recipients for various awards is long. There are about 17 recipients of these awards.

Another important area of SAIMA's work is its support for charities, which are particularly impressive, with some extraordinary contributions over the years and with a charity supported each year at its gala dinner. Among the charities they have helped over the years are: the Australasian Palliative Link International, Eye Play Support, Maranatha Health, Doctors for the Environment Australia, Catherine House and the May Gibbs Children's Literature Trust.

Without a doubt, SAIMA is a success story for medical professionals who hail from the Indian subcontinent and who have established a group to support each other, improve professional standards and participate in philanthropic activities. On behalf of this chamber, it is fitting that we wish them every success with their future endeavours, and may they continue to thrive and make this state such a significant place in which to live.

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

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF FORESTS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:12): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises Thursday 21 March 2019 as the International Day of Forests;
2. Recognises the establishment of the Parliamentary Friends of Forestry;
3. Acknowledges that forest industries are a significant contributor to the South Australian economy and provide significant employment, particularly in rural and regional areas;
4. Recognises that our forests provide a valuable resource through sustainable production of timber, a habitat for native flora and fauna, water catchments and community recreation;
5. Recognises the valuable contribution of forests and wood products to combating climate change; and
6. Recognises the importance of sustainable timber production and healthy forest management for future generations.

It is a pleasure to rise today to move this motion and acknowledge in the chamber the importance of the United Nations International Day of Forests, which is celebrated tomorrow. The United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution on 21 December 2012, which declared that 21 March each year is to be observed as the International Day of Forests. The theme this year is forests and education, and in particular 'learn to love forests'.

Forests help to keep our air, our soil and our water supplies healthy. So many aspects of our everyday lives are linked to forests. Technological advances, however, have enabled even more innovative uses of forest products, such as: engineered wood products, construction of high-rise buildings entirely from wood, food additives, pharmaceutical and medical applications, biofuels that can replace fossil fuels and wood plastics that can be used for anything from car components to recyclable plastic bags.

This special day raises awareness of all types of forests and all types of diverse uses of forest products. Of course, the sustainable management of all types of forests is vital for the benefit of current and future generations. In South Australia all plantation owners participate in internationally recognised voluntary certification schemes such as the Australian Forestry Standard and Forest Stewardship Council to prove that they meet the high standards of sustainable forest management.

To achieve certification under these schemes, plantation forest owners undertake a range of management activities to protect environmental values, such as managing remnant vegetation and riparian strips to maintain biodiversity and provide wildlife corridors, restoring and enhancing the habitat of species, controlling pests and weeds and limiting run-off to maintain or improve water quality. The certification schemes also require plantation owners to have a process for formal engagement with Indigenous and local communities on their management activities, when appropriate.

We also know that forests and forest products store large amounts of carbon. The sustainable management of forests and careful use of resources are an important component in combating climate change and contributing to the wellbeing of future generations. As members would be aware, CO₂ can be removed from the atmosphere by photosynthesis by trees. Carbon is stored in the leaves, stems, trunks, branches and roots when they absorb CO₂ from the atmosphere and use it to grow.

Trees are very important for carbon sequestration because they live a long time and therefore store their carbon for many years, but long-lived products, such as wood and other products made from trees, still contain the carbon absorbed by the plants that they came from. When a tree is utilised for wood, its ability to sequester carbon is extended and the carbon is not released until the product burns or decomposes.

Forests are not just an important resource for sustainable timber production, they also provide a popular place for play and recreation. Indeed, hundreds of thousands of visitors a year enjoy camping, bushwalking, mountain biking and cave diving. From Mount Crawford and Kuitpo in the Adelaide Hills to the Green Triangle in the South-East, forest recreation is an important feature for communities across South Australia and for visitors alike.

I had the privilege of visiting many of our forests and manufacturing facilities when I was employed in the industry before I entered parliament. I saw firsthand the cutting edge technology—yes, the pun was intended—in our sawmills, much of which was enabled through funding from the South East Forestry Partnerships Program and which helped ensure South Australia had an internationally competitive industry with a bright future. And, of course, in South Australia, forest industries are a huge contributor to our economy. More than 7,000 people work directly in the forest, wood and paper products industry, and a further 15,000 people are employed indirectly. Approximately \$2 billion is generated each year by the industry in this state and around \$23 billion nationally.

As parliamentarians and policymakers, it is vital that we invest in forestry education and support developing new technologies, support the livelihoods of communities who depend on forests and help our children understand the importance of trees and forests, as well as how responsibly and sustainably they are managed here. As I mentioned, the theme of this year's International Day of Forests is 'Forests and education', and this motion also acknowledges the establishment of Parliamentary Friends of Forestry.

One of the purposes of parliamentary friends groups is to increase knowledge and understanding around a particular issue or industry, so it is particularly appropriate that tomorrow we will formally establish Parliamentary Friends of Forestry here in the South Australian parliament—and I acknowledge the co-convenor of that group, the honourable Mr McBride, in the other place. I

invite members to attend the inaugural event and to celebrate the importance of this industry to our state. I commend the motion to the council.

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

END-OF-LIFE CHOICES

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:19): I move:

1. That, in the opinion of this council, a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on—
 - (a) the practices currently being utilised within the medical community to assist a person to exercise their preferences for the way they manage their end of life when experiencing chronic and/or terminal illnesses, including the role of palliative care;
 - (b) the current legal framework, relevant reports and materials in other Australian states and territories and overseas jurisdictions, including the Victorian and Western Australian parliamentary inquiries into end-of-life choices, Victoria's Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017 and implementation of the associated reforms;
 - (c) what legislative changes may be required, including an examination of any federal laws that may impact such legislation; and
 - (d) any other related matter.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
3. That this council permits the joint committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.
4. That standing order 396 be suspended as to enable strangers to be admitted when the joint committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.
5. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

I proudly move the motion standing in my name. Steps towards allowing individuals to have greater control and choice over the end of their life have a long history in this parliament. Since 1995, legislation has been introduced on 15 occasions by John Quirke, the Hon. Anne Levy, the Hon. Sandra Kanck, the Hon. Dr Bob Such on no fewer than eight separate occasions, the Hon. Steph Key, the Hon. Mark Parnell and Dr Duncan McFetridge.

The latest attempt during the last term of parliament was defeated by the vote of the Speaker of the House of Assembly one morning at 4.12am after a tied vote on the floor of their chamber. I pay tribute to those who have moved bills before and all those who have campaigned tirelessly on the issue, particularly the devoted folks from the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Association.

There is a very big difference in considering this issue once more. Every time the parliament has considered this issue in the past, it would have made South Australia the first Australian jurisdiction to have such laws. That is not the case anymore. Now the circumstances are very different. Victoria is just a few short months away from allowing terminally ill adults to apply for lethal medication up to six months before they are expected to die.

Victoria has done the legwork. They held a parliamentary committee and legislation was put before the Victorian parliament that provided numerous safeguards, including major ones such as patients must be of sound mind and the request must be approved by two doctors, and that there be three requests made over 10 days, including in front of a witness who is neither a relative nor stands to benefit from the person's will.

When the Victorian legislation made its way through parliament, there were further amendments and safeguards put into the bill. They included that voluntary assisted dying be limited to those whose death is expected within weeks and months, but no longer than six months, which is a reduction from the original bill of 12 months, allowing for exceptions for those who are suffering from neurodegenerative conditions whose death is expected within weeks and months but for a

period no greater than 12 months, and that a person must have lived in Victoria for 12 months before being able to make the request.

They also included that a person with a mental illness must be referred to a psychiatrist for assessment; that the assessing doctor must encourage the person to inform their regular doctor of their intention to access voluntary assisted dying if the assessing doctor is not the person's regular doctor; that the person is required to return any unsealed voluntary assisted dying substance within 15 days, and not the original 30 days; that the review board has a role to follow up with the contact person to advise on the safe return of any unused medication; that the coroner is to be informed of voluntary assisted dying deaths; and that death certificates for people who have chosen voluntary assisted dying will record the manner of death as voluntary assisted dying.

In addition, Western Australia is now nearing the point of introducing legislation as a result of its own parliamentary committee. The select committee this motion proposes will examine those other jurisdictions and how their schemes work. For those who in the past have held concerns that a voluntary assisted dying scheme could not work or was too hard to administer in an Australian context, comfort can be taken from the fact that a scheme will be up and running in Victoria from June. Voluntary euthanasia, assisted dying, death with dignity—whatever form it is called—is something that has widespread community support, and that support has increased over time.

Roy Morgan Research has conducted public polls specifically on this issue since 1962, when the community was 47 per cent in favour and 39 per cent against. In the seventies that level of support rose to around mid-60 per cent; during the eighties and nineties Roy Morgan Research found that level of community support in the 70 per cent range. The latest Roy Morgan Research poll on this issue in 2017 showed that Australian public sentiment had well and truly shifted, with 85 per cent of the country in favour and just 15 per cent in opposition. The public sentiment on this issue has well and truly shifted and the parliament is falling behind public expectation.

With the successful passage of legislation in Victoria I have renewed optimism that we can deal with the end-of-life process in a better way, as over 85 per cent of Australians and indeed 83 per cent of the South Australian public would like us to do so. I think most people, regardless of their views on this issue, recognise the inevitability of laws passing in this area eventually, and I reckon that now might just be the time to do so.

It is certainly an opportune time to consider this issue fully with a joint house select committee and then consider legislation in this session, informed by schemes that are operating interstate and the committee's deliberations. In my mind I envisage that the committee would be able to report perhaps by the start of November this year, with a view to having legislation drafted and before parliament for the start of the 2020 year. This is achievable because we now have working examples to consider.

At times in this place we deal with difficult and complex issues that shape the kind of society that we want to live in. Voluntary assisted dying is one of those issues. It will define how we deal with death and pain during the final stages of life. How we treat people in life should be no different to how we treat them when near and in death, with compassion, understanding and love. We are all shaped by our own lived experiences, and I recognise that each of us have our own experiences that shape how we view these issues that have long been considered, rightly by political parties, as matters of conscience.

I have always been a believer that if someone's pain and suffering is too great to go on at the end of their life they ought to have the choice to die with dignity and without undue suffering. This belief has been reinforced by my personal experiences on a couple of occasions. I want to quote from a person who gave me my first job in politics, a friend to many in this place, the late Terry Roberts, who spoke about voluntary euthanasia in this place in 2004. At the time Terry was a minister and he made this speech before he collapsed at work and was later diagnosed with incurable pancreatic cancer, a cancer that took under 12 months to take his life in an exceptionally painful way. At that time I was his chief of staff. Terry Roberts, in speaking to the then dignity in dying bill on 2 June 2004, said:

Doctors already make decisions based on their own personal judgments in relation to a patient's ability to withstand pain and discomfort, and sometimes it is discussed with relatives. More often than not, people who do not have friends or relatives are put in a position where their suffering continues unnecessarily. Secondly, if we were to

bring in some form of control for legalising voluntary euthanasia—and that is what it is: I think the word 'voluntary' often gets left out of the debate—under which people could make plans, talk to their relatives and their doctors and the procedure is conducted in a way which we would all hope is humane and painless, then I think that society would be much better for it. We do it to animals without any argument, but somehow or other we draw the line at putting together a package that would be humane in our society.

I am not certain that Terry would have taken advantage of assisted dying laws if they were in place, but I know for a fact that having the possibility would have given him a great deal more peace of mind.

A decade later, when my mum was also diagnosed with pancreatic cancer, I had a fair idea of what was coming. The unnecessary and unwanted pain and loss of dignity my mum suffered at the end of her battle in August 2017 was quite simply the most horrendous thing I have ever seen. My mum, Viv, was a proud, fierce, strong woman, a massive advocate and fighter for the marginalised and for her Aboriginal community, but after a lifetime of fighting for others she decided she had had enough and did not want the pain to go on.

On the afternoon of Wednesday 9 August 2017, my mum gathered her family together and told us that the pain had become too much and she wanted it to end. Her treating specialist gave her the night to think it over and the next morning my mum stopped all active treatment. It was a brave decision that I and the rest of the family supported her with. She was then forced to slowly waste away, drifting in and out of consciousness, often in half-aware states of panic, waking up and asking whoever was in the room, 'Am I dying? Am I dead yet?' It was absolutely painful to see.

A week after my mum's funeral, I spoke at a SAVES event and told the South Australian Voluntary Euthanasia Society of my recent experience and commitment to make sure people like my mum were able to have control at the end of their lives. That was in 2017, and my resolve to have such laws passed in South Australia has not diminished; it has only strengthened. I commend the motion to establish this select committee to the chamber.

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

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. K.J. Maher:

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 gegalitres 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 gegalitres 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.

(Continued from 13 February 2019.)

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:32): There are some issues that you anticipate debate on in this chamber, but when it comes to the Murray River this parliament has a history of being united in the fight against upstream states. Australia's longest river meanders across hot political state borders before reaching the Murray Mouth. We know that it is a tough fight being the smallest-populated state at the bottom of the river, but the battle to keep the upstream states honest has often been a bipartisan South Australian political fight.

We know, as a small state, that we stand a better chance of winning the fight against our thirsty upstream states if we stand together. When it comes to water, the lifeblood of this state, the community rightfully expects politicians to stand together to fight for what is best for South Australia, our irrigators, our communities and our great Murray River.

We all know in this chamber that the Murray is much more than a source of drinking water. We know towns like Renmark, Berri, Loxton and Meningie rely heavily on the river not only for irrigation but for tourism. We know that 450 gigalitres of water needs to be delivered back to the system, but what we had not anticipated was a dud deal negotiated not by the upstream states but by the government of South Australia. Those opposite and our Minister for Water boasted about their brilliant relationship with the federal government and their hardline negotiation skills, yet you have sold us up the river to your mates.

In contrast, the previous Labor government did not surrender to the federal government's political interests. We did not surrender to sandbagging the swinging federal seats in the Eastern States. The Labor government did quite the opposite. We shone a spotlight on the allegations of rorting and corruption by establishing the royal commission into the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, a royal commission presided over by one of the most respected legal minds in the nation. The royal commission report is in and it is damning of the conduct of the member for Black, the rollover minister. The royal commission found, and I quote:

...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.

He also found that the minister had acted 'so contrary to the interests of South Australians' that he almost certainly breached section 2.5, at least, of the Ministerial Code of Conduct. These words are unequivocal, they are not open to interpretation, and they are there in black and white. They are the words of an independent umpire, a record no minister wants nor no South Australian community wants or deserves.

When the Hon Ian Hunter was the minister for water and the River Murray he fought for the Murray. Honourable members will always remember the infamous ice cream incident. As the Hon. Ian Hunter put it at the time:

Mr Joyce has his eyes on \$1.77 billion allocated to buy 450GL for the River Murray's environmental health—and he's not going to get it...

We all know Mr Joyce has little to no interest in environmental flows or what happens in South Australia. Mr Joyce, his federal colleagues and, it now appears, the Liberal state government have no interest in backing the state at the bottom of the river but are more interested in sandbagging their political outcomes in Queensland and New South Wales in the lead-up to the federal election.

The Hon. Ian Hunter made his views known and was very clear about his interstate and commonwealth colleagues and the former federal minister's lack of commitment to the River Murray for South Australia. The same cannot be said for the current minister, the member for Black. The member for Black sold out our water to his thirsty upstream mates. He sold out our economy that relies so heavily on the Murray. He sold out our communities and he has sold out our state.

The message to the east coast and the commonwealth states is simple: yes, there is a new government in town, a government not willing to take up a fight, to hold the hardline. When you go to Canberra and politically agree with everybody in a way that is fundamentally contrary to the interests of South Australia, that is not standing up for South Australia. What is most disappointing is that the sell-out did not stop with the minister; it went straight to the top.

The member for Dunstan, the Premier of this state, decided to show leadership by walking into the other place to denounce the royal commission's recommendations and findings behind the safety net of parliamentary privilege, going as far to say, 'I think the minister has done an excellent job negotiating with the commonwealth'—hardly the actions becoming of a Premier. The extraordinary response from the government is hardly the actions of a Premier putting the interests of South Australia first. Given the government's reaction to these findings of Commissioner Bret Walker, we need a select committee to look into these issues. Clearly, we are not going to get answers from a government that has sold out our river, and that is why am very proud to support the establishment of this committee.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (16:37): The fact is, there is a growing tide of public opinion, royal commission recommendations and, now, Australia's leading scientists all supporting immediate action on supporting environmental flows into the Murray-Darling Basin. The environment and water minister, the member for Black, stands accused of no less than selling out South Australia's interest to pander to his Liberal colleagues in the commonwealth and New South Wales. It goes almost without saying that this is no small thing. In my time of following South Australian politics, and indeed federal politics, I cannot remember the last time a sitting minister kept his job despite a royal commission finding against them.

That said, there has been strange commentary from some government members in the other place that somehow the royal commissioner and the commission itself is less than proper. I find such commentary bizarre, given that literally the day after the member for Black and the minister for water and the environment faced a no-confidence motion against him in the other place, we saw new and damning evidence arise supporting the royal commissioner's findings. Very concerning court proceedings interstate have revealed evidence of the then New South Wales water minister in 2015 informing cotton growers in the Barwon-Darling that they could access water during a water embargo.

Further and somewhat more well-documented, of course, we know that the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission released by the government just a few months ago specifically highlighted minister Speirs' decision to give up South Australia's claim on 450 billion litres of water as being contrary to the interests of this state. Further to this, the counsel assisting the royal commission, Richard Beasley SC, has made some extraordinary commentary in the media that goes as follows:

What Minister Speirs said was that they're reason we changed that is we first got \$70 million for the Coorong. Now, I don't know what that means they're going to do with the \$70 million, but I do know, and I don't mean this flippantly, you can't give a \$50 note to a migratory bird or to the native fish in the Coorong. They need water.

Secondly, he said by agreeing to that change...I got New South Wales and Victoria back to the negotiating table. Now, that might be right, but it seems really odd that a plan that's meant to work through cooperation can only work for SA if SA capitulates on matters vital to it so that New South Wales and Victoria again sit at a table. To do what? What I'd be asking if I was a South Australian citizen...Premier Marshall and Minister Speirs, when are you are going to get this 450 billion litres of water, and how are you going to get it now? It's a strange negotiating tactic to capitulate on your own interests in order to continue a negotiation.

That is damning commentary from the royal commission counsel. The royal commission, for its part, clearly stated in its report:

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 Australia, and the South Australian environment.

Put simply, it is well past time that the state government accept the findings of the royal commission, accept that there is action that needs to be taken on how water is allocated in our state and interstate as part of that plan, accept that the government has given away 450 billion litres of water to just keep talking and accept that the government, through its water minister, has acted contrary to the interests of this state.

Had it been less than 12 months ago, we know that the existing minister and the member for Black would have agreed with all of these things. In March 2018, when he took over as the new environment and water minister, David Speirs said the following in an ABC radio interview:

I'm not going to be a pushover by any means, I'm going to be a strong voice and a loud voice for South Australia when it comes to the River Murray...I'm going to advocate very loudly for South Australia and in particular the rights of South Australians when it comes to the River Murray. I am 100 per cent committed to the royal commission.

Well, it plainly appears that he is not. It plainly appears that there have been decisions made interstate and decisions made by the water minister from here that require detailed scrutiny in the light of exactly the kinds of criteria that are in the scope of this proposed committee.

For months now, the minister, the member for Black, has rigidly stuck to his position that he did nothing wrong. He rejected the royal commission's criticism of him. Meanwhile, the Premier's only response—other than some bizarre comments made under privilege in the other place—and comments to the royal commission have been to write a letter to the Prime Minister, asking for an early meeting with the Murray-Darling Basin ministers, which appears to have been rejected.

It seems bizarre to say that the government's only response to the very important investigation into the Murray-Darling Basin appears to be nothing at all, but that is exactly what is happening here. So it appears that we need to take action ourselves again, in the same way that it was the Labor Party that established the Save the River Murray Levy, where we fought for and delivered the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. We secured \$1.77 billion for the River Murray to ensure that it received enough water after the last drought. We fought for and won an additional 450 billion litres of environmental flows for South Australia. We established a royal commission into water theft, and we will act on the recommendations received.

The fact is that, after the royal commission's findings, it is only Labor who is willing to head to Canberra to meet with scientists and federal decision-makers to make sure that our state gets a fair deal. Once again, in supporting this committee, we have to call on Labor, with our proven track record of fighting for our state and the river, to act once again, to establish the committee and to look into what happened.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:44): I rise on behalf of SA-Best to speak in support of this motion, which seeks to establish a select committee to inquire into and report on the South Australian government decision to endorse socio-economic criteria for efficiency measures to deliver 450 gegalitres for the environment.

It is clear to SA-Best and our federal colleagues, Centre Alliance, that the South Australian water minister chose to sell out this state instead of having the courage to stand up to the other state water ministers at the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council on 14 December 2018 to agree to terms on how environmental water would be returned to rivers. The meeting agreed to return up to 450 gegalitres of water to the environment, provided—and I stress, provided—it did not have negative socio-economic impacts on river communities, based on a criteria agreed to by the states.

In return, South Australia received \$70 million of funding from the federal government to spend on rehabilitating the struggling Coorong wetland—an absolute pittance and a contemptible deal which I liken to the 30 pieces of silver paid to Judas Iscariot for betraying Jesus. Our very own water minister fell like a pack of cards, and his reckless and disastrous decision will only be to the detriment of all South Australians but particularly those who rely on the River Murray. In his report that followed, the Murray-Darling Basin royal commissioner, Bret Walker, said:

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 a decision that defies explanation, because the deal with upstream states was totally against South Australia's interests. Commissioner Bret Walker SC was scathing about the decision of the South Australian water minister. He said:

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...

Just so we are all on the same page, clause 2.5 of the South Australian Ministerial Code of Conduct reads as follows:

Ministers should not make an official decision without first giving due consideration to the merits of the matter at hand and the impact the decision is likely to have on the rights and interests of the people involved and the citizens of South Australia.

The commissioner went on to say in his report:

...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.

Recklessly, I believe, but not surprisingly, Premier Marshall has backed his water minister, and members of his government and the Morrison Coalition government have attacked Commissioner Bret Walker. The attacks on the head of the royal commission are absolutely unprecedented. Minister Spiers took a swipe at Commissioner Walker, saying, 'His title does not elevate him to an untouchable deity.' I say this to the South Australian water minister: your title denotes that you must elevate the needs of South Australia and South Australians above all else.

I want to thank Commissioner Walker for undertaking a complex and detailed investigation on the issues in already difficult circumstances, but which were further hampered by the Marshall government and the federal Coalition government mounting a High Court bid to prevent it and Murray-Darling Basin Authority staff from giving evidence. Commissioner Walker's report is a damning indictment on the Marshall government and, as expected, the federal government and the upstream states that pillage the entire Murray-Darling Basin system.

It is clear to me that parliamentary scrutiny in the form of the proposed committee is absolutely essential. We must have answers regarding what advice the minister and the Premier were relying on when they took their decision on 14 December 2018. The state government campaigned on a platform of accountability and transparency and it continues to champion those lauded ideals. SA-Best intends to hold them to it. SA-Best stands with Labor and the Greens on this issue, which is so integral to the vitality of the state.

Briefly, it would be remiss of me not to acknowledge the tireless advocacy of our team's federal members, past and present, on the health of the Murray-Darling Basin. Indeed, one of our proudest achievements has been to secure \$900 million in extra funding for the Murray-Darling Basin. I commend my federal Centre Alliance colleague, Senator Rex Patrick, for taking the lead and working hard on this most important issue at a federal level for the benefit of all South Australians.

Finally, I have had discussions with the shadow attorney's office regarding an inclusion to the motion and I trust that they see the benefit of that inclusion and support it. To that end, I now move the following amendment to the motion, inserting an additional clause after clause (g) as follows:

- (ga) Any recommendation, finding or observation in the Productivity Commission's Murray-Darling Basin five year review, as deemed relevant by the committee.

With those words, I am extremely pleased on behalf of SA-Best to be supporting this motion.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:50): I rise on behalf of the Greens to support the establishment of this select committee and I echo much of what many of my colleagues have said. We all know that we are in the driest state on the driest inhabited continent on the planet. We are at the end of the line when it comes to the river and we are often in the dark when it comes to the truth.

The Greens strongly supported the state royal commission in lieu and in the absence of a federal royal commission, which should have been the rightful reaction of a federal government if they truly had the best interests not just of the environment but of the communities that so depend on this at heart. The Greens believe it is quite damning for a commissioner to write of any minister that their actions are:

...nothing short of capitulation to the interests of the current Commonwealth Government, and those of Victoria and New South Wales.

To continue:

...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.

It is fair to gain clarity on these words as to why the decision was made and as to how it might or might not be in South Australia's interests, and that is indeed why this select committee is needed.

The Marshall Liberal government has enjoyed telling us on many occasions that it will be a government that looks at the facts, looks at the evidence and it will be transparent in its decision-making. It seems only fair that all of these things now be required of the Marshall Liberal government, and certainly will be made possible through the establishment of this select committee.

I was recently at a community meeting in the Coorong in relation, of course, to the plight of the Murray River and the Lower Lakes. One of the many community members who attended noted that:

Science is the language of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, but those tasked with its implementation don't seem to speak it.

Another member of that community meeting, 'Bluey', noted that on his understanding it was like Tiddalik, the giant frog of the Dreamtime. Indeed, it seems more akin to fairytales and Dreaming stories as we see the Murray-Darling Basin Plan unfold.

As a child, I was very aware of Tiddalik, my mother hailing from parts of this country that Tiddalik was well known in. For those members who are not aware of Tiddalik, Tiddalik was the largest frog in the entire world. One very warm morning, he woke up with a feeling that he was very thirsty and he started to drink the fresh water. He drank and he drank and he kept drinking until all of the water in the entire billabong was gone. Jokingly, at the community meeting, I wondered if the former deputy prime minister, Barnaby Joyce, might actually be Tiddalik, but I digress.

The other animals at the billabong, seeking their morning drink and finding nothing there for them, came up with various ways to make Tiddalik laugh to try to coax him into releasing the water. The echidna and the wombat tried to entertain him, to tickle him, and eventually the kookaburra made Tiddalik laugh with her laugh. But this is no laughing matter, and making Tiddalik laugh will certainly not release the water.

What we need to know is who Tiddalik is in this case and base that on the science. That is why this committee is quite vital. We need to know what advice, if any, was made available to the minister and whether it was followed. However, it is not just the Marshall Liberal government in South Australia that has been responsible for the negotiation and implementation of this plan. We know from that report of the royal commission and from the Productivity Commission reports that the answers we seek are still not there, and there is still so much more to do. The fact is that the history of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan has been one of mismanagement, corruption, misinformation and the successive irresponsibility of governments.

The expanded scope of this committee in the government's amendments is supported by the Greens and, on the face of it, the expanded scope put today by SA-Best will be supported by the Greens, as will the amendment put up by the opposition to increase the number of members on the committee. We need to look for solutions and ways forward and find those essential ways for getting the water back for our environment and for our communities.

The Greens will be supporting the creation of this select committee and are willing to do the heavy lifting to make it happen. This parliament and the public deserve to know just why a government would capitulate, why other states act the way they do and that all of our interests are being served, as has been claimed, in the best interests of this state, for our river and for our communities that are crying out for help.

We do need to know who Tiddalik is here. As I said, I think that Barnaby Joyce fits the description, but perhaps there are a few more suspects that this select committee will uncover as we separate fiction from fact.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (16:57): Whilst the Hon. Mr Stephens might want to call the Hon. Ms Lensink to make her contribution, is it competent for me to now move my amendment?

The PRESIDENT: Yes, please, I ask that you move your amendment.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraph 2 and insert new paragraph as follows:

2. That the committee consist of six members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at three members, and that standing order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.

As noted by the Hon. Ms Franks in her contribution, I move that amendment because of the stampede of interest of honourable members who want to join this committee. It will expand the committee from the normal five to six and, just as we did when setting up the select committee into the Adelaide Oval, we are making the quorum three members. I commend the amendment to the house.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (16:59): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraph 1 and insert new paragraph as follows:

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the findings of the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission and Productivity Commission as they relate to decisions of the South Australian government, with particular reference to—
 - (a) the advice considered by the South Australian government in making the decision to endorse the equivalent of 3,200 gigalitres of environmental benefits and whether it represented an environmentally sustainable level of take under the Water Act;
 - (b) the rationale for the South Australian government supporting a package of measures at the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council on 14 December 2018, including the socio-economic criteria;
 - (c) the current and potential options for the best available science to inform such decision-making;
 - (d) the consideration given by the South Australian government 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;
 - (e) any recommendation, finding or observation in the report of the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission 2019, as deemed relevant by the committee; and
 - (f) any other related matters.

As the council would be aware, the South Australian government received the royal commissioner's report on 29 January 2019 and publicly released the report on 31 January. The 746-page report contains 44 recommendations and 111 key findings. Significantly, the report largely focuses on events, actions and decisions which occurred during a period when the Liberal Party did not hold office in South Australia.

The report included findings and recommendations on a broad range of themes, including the need for increased transparency, a new determination of the environmentally sustainable level of take, modification of the sustainable diversion limit adjustment mechanism, the need to redo the Northern Basin Review, better recognition of Aboriginal people, the need to factor climate change into the plan, recovering the remaining water through buybacks from the market, using compulsory acquisition to deal with constraints to environmental water delivery, the role and performance of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and establishment of an independent audit function.

We saw in parliamentary debate that the opposition wants to focus on one finding and commentary of the royal commission in relation to negotiation of additional socio-economic criteria for the assessment of efficiency measures projects at the December 2018 Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council meeting and, in particular, the decisions of the Minister for Environment and Water. This focus on one finding of the royal commission report out of 111 findings and which is related to only one of the 44 recommendations is reflected in the proposed terms of reference in the honourable member's motion.

The government proposes to amend the motion to broaden the terms of reference to also include decisions made by the former government in agreeing to the basin plan and the environmental water recovery amount. Findings in relation to the environmentally sustainable level of take comprise a significant proportion of the findings of the royal commission, and this approach

should ensure the select committee focuses on a broader range of issues. An examination of the royal commission findings as they pertain to decisions of both the current and former South Australian governments in relation to the basin plan provides an opportunity for the select committee to undertake a potentially useful and insightful inquiry and obtain maximum value from the effort and powers of a select committee.

Likewise, the select committee terms of reference should also be broadened to include recommendations of the Productivity Commission's Murray-Darling Basin Plan five-year assessment, which was released on 25 January 2019. The Productivity Commission points out that, although many positive achievements have been made, particularly in relation to water recovery and environmental water management, significant challenges still remain. For example, the Productivity Commission has found that current institutional and governance arrangements pose a risk to the next phase of implementation, and this is something that could be explored by our state moving forward.

It simply makes good sense for a select committee of parliament to consider the recommendations of both reports together. We are proposing that the terms of the select committee should be broadened to inquire into the findings of both the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission and the Productivity Commission as they relate to decisions of the South Australian government rather than a single aspect of a single event. This does not preclude the committee from investigating the decision reached at the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council in December. If we want to ensure that the select committee delivers a worthwhile service to the parliament and best uses its powers to investigate these issues in detail, these decisions need to be considered in the context of many years of decision-making by the current and former governments.

With reference to particular paragraphs, subparagraph (a) is to be amended to include the decision to endorse the equivalent of 3,200 gigalitres of environmental benefits and whether it represented an environmentally sustainable level of take under the water act. The royal commissioner has been particularly critical of what he sees as political compromises made by all jurisdictions in the formation of the basin plan, and as such the committee should look into what role the South Australian government has played in this compromise.

Subparagraph (b) is to be amended to the rationale for the South Australian government supporting a package of measures at the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council on 14 December 2018. The decision by the Minister for Environment and Water to agree to amend socio-economic criteria was not a decision made in isolation. It was part of a negotiated package to break the stalemate and included commitments for on-farm projects which previously New South Wales and Victoria had refused to participate in. It also included measures to address constraints to the delivery of environmental water, an issue that the commissioner himself identifies as being of key importance to the successful delivery of the basin plan.

It is proposed that subparagraph (c) be deleted. It is unclear what is intended by this subparagraph. We know that the minister has a department providing advice to him and these same resources were in place under the previous government. It is proposed that subparagraph (e) be deleted. This subparagraph is not warranted as there is clearly no legal overriding going on. The act specifically states that arrangements can be proposed by the states and approved by the ministerial council. Subparagraph (f) amends to South Australian government, and subparagraph (g) should be deleted, because it is superfluous given our proposed amendment to broaden the scope.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:06): Just very briefly, I wish in summing-up to thank all members who have made contributions on this important issue. The contributions that have been made, I think, reflect the absolute importance of the River Murray to this state. This is reflected in the contribution of many members. I look forward to the committee getting on and doing the important work as charged to do by this chamber.

The PRESIDENT: There are a number of questions that I need to put to members, given there is a series of amendments. The first question I am going to put is that all words in paragraph 1 down to, but excluding, subparagraph (h) stand part of the motion. If you support the Hon. Mr Maher's motion, you would vote yes to that, in the affirmative. If you support the amendments of the Hon. Ms Lensink, you would vote no.

Question resolved in the negative.

The PRESIDENT: The next question I put is that the new paragraph 1(a) to (e), as proposed to be inserted by the Minister for Human Services, be so inserted.

Amendment carried.

The PRESIDENT: I now put the question that the new subparagraph (ga) as proposed to be inserted by the Hon. C. Bonaros be so inserted.

Amendment carried.

The PRESIDENT: I now put the question that the new paragraph 2 as proposed to be inserted by the Hon. I.K. Hunter be so inserted.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. C. Bonaros, the Hon. T.A. Franks, the Hon. D.G.E. Hood, the Hon. I.K. Hunter, the Hon. T.J. Stephens and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

That the select committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and report on 3 July 2019.

Motion carried.

INTERNATIONAL HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. M. Scriven:

That this council—

1. Notes that 27 January was International Holocaust Remembrance Day; and
2. Rejects and condemns any form of racial discrimination and anti-Semitism.

(Continued from 27 February 2019.)

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (17:11): Today, I rise to support the motion moved by the Hon. Clare Scriven and in doing so I would like to commend her for raising this important topic. In moving her motion, the Hon. Ms Scriven spoke eloquently, if you can do that, about the atrocities committed by Nazi Germany in the period known as the Holocaust. She spoke about the murder of millions of Jewish people and of the dehumanisation of that community by the Nazis. She spoke movingly, I think, about the need to honour the victims of the Holocaust and to reject and condemn the language of racial discrimination, anti-Semitism and to remain vigilant to prevent atrocities such as these ever occurring again.

The Hon. Ms Scriven's speech, I think, was an excellent one and I do not need to cover the same ground that she has already done so well. However, I would simply like to add my voice to the many condemning racial discrimination and anti-Semitism, and I would like to also reflect on the lessons that we can draw from this today.

The Holocaust is, of course, an extreme example of what can occur when discrimination creeps into our language or actions and into the instruments of the state. It is the terrible endpoint that begins with a concerted program of dehumanisation of a section of our community. International Holocaust Remembrance Day is an important opportunity for the global community to remember that and to redouble all of our efforts to stamp out all forms of racial discrimination, including anti-Semitism wherever they might occur.

The villainisation of groups of people is unfortunately a pattern that we have seen far too often in too many places in too many times of our history. Just to pick a few examples, it has occurred in Tsarist Russia and, of course, the pogroms in Nazi Germany, in Bosnia and Herzegovina, in Serbia, in Turkey, in Myanmar, in China, in Sri Lanka and even in India and now again in Russia and many other places and many other times.

When society takes the step of accepting discriminatory language or just not opposing its use, or takes steps to socially isolate a group of people because of a particular characteristic, a step is taken down that same road that led to the Holocaust, that most horrific atrocity saw the deaths of millions of people. They were murdered simply because they were Jewish or because they were Roma or they were ethnic Poles or they had a disability or had been captured as prisoners of war, or had different political or religious beliefs or because they were homosexual.

In the same way as International Holocaust Remembrance Day is an important reminder of the need to stamp out discrimination against Jewish people so too it is a reminder of the need to stamp out discrimination full stop. No person should be discriminated against simply for being who they are. Whether by word or by deed it must be known to be unacceptable to target people simply for being who they are, for their cultural or ethnic background, for their political views or religious beliefs, for their physical or mental differences, or for their gender identity or sexual orientation.

The sad reality is that people are being targeted because of their identity even now. I have spoken in this place many times, as other members have as well, about the discrimination experienced by LGBTI people in this country and around the world. For all of our advances that we like to congratulate ourselves on from time to time, there are many examples of physical attacks on gays, lesbians and trans people in the streets in Australia even now, and in New Zealand, the UK, USA and various other places around the world. Worse still, we see state-sponsored terrorism against lesbians, gay men and trans people in Russia and Iraq right now.

Remembering the Holocaust, we would be negligent if we failed to remember the thousands of people who were targeted and murdered during that tragedy simply for being gay—or 'same-sex attracted' is a term often used these days—because it seems that that lesson has not been taken on by everybody in our community. In 1935, the Nazis tightened the laws targeting homosexuality in the German criminal code, so locking up gay men in concentration camps was in fact legal. Heinrich Himmler created the Reich Central Office for the Combating of Homosexuality and Abortion and the Nazis obtained police 'pink lists' of known gay men.

I use the term 'pink list' deliberately because it was not all that many years ago that our own police force in South Australia had its own 'pink list', which it denied it had, and I think the former police commissioner at the time also denied that it had, but it came out through the parliamentary process that indeed they did collate their own 'pink list' of homosexuals in our society.

The United States Holocaust Memorial Museum estimates that some 100,000 people were arrested for the so-called crime of homosexuality. The Memorial to Homosexuals Persecuted Under Nazism stands today in Berlin, approved by the German Bundestag, to remember them. A noticeboard at that memorial remembers those victims in this way:

A kiss was enough reason to prosecute. There were more than 50,000 convictions. Under Section 175, the punishment was imprisonment; in some cases, convicted offenders were castrated. Thousands of men were sent to concentration camps for being gay; many of them died there. They died of hunger, disease and abuse or were the victims of targeted killings.

Most of those convicted were sentenced to time in prison but historians estimate that between 5,000 and 15,000 of those people were incarcerated in Nazi concentration camps; 15,000 people marched into places of the most unimaginable cruelty, horror and suffering simply for wanting to love and to be loved. Eventually, the Nazis found a way to easily identify the gay men, labelling them with a pink triangle to single them out in these concentration camps. Many were guinea pigs for medical attempts at so-called conversion therapy. Gay men were castrated or they had testosterone capsules surgically inserted into their bodies or were just beaten to death by camp guards.

As all of us in this place and this time now recognise, these men did not choose to be gay; they were being punished for a trait as natural as brown hair or blue eyes. Yet, even the other inmates would often treat them with cruelty and severity, and they were encouraged to do that by their guards. Political opponents of the Nazi regime would find themselves accused of homosexuality to discredit them. It worked and it still works. We saw it in recent years in Malaysia when the opposition leader, Anwar Ibrahim, was arrested and imprisoned for the so-called crime of sodomy in 2015—in 2015.

We will never know how many of those gay men were killed in the concentration camps with absolute certainty but we know from survivors that they were killed in their thousands. Persecution

did not end with the defeat of the Nazis, the death of Hitler and the victory of the Allied nations; the Allies chose not to undo the tightening of the German criminal law which provided the legal basis for this imprisonment. Homosexual prisoners were not recognised as victims of the Nazis, nor did the German successive nations, and many were forced to continue their sentences under those regimes. They were not released when the camps were liberated. They were still held captive and required to remain in prison.

It was supposed to be a liberation but, for gay men and lesbians and transgender people, it was not at all. It was anything but liberation. We are still learning about some aspects of this history because those who lived through it were too afraid to talk about it, even in recent decades. The onus is on us, those who were born long after this awful event of the Holocaust, to seek out that history, to understand it, to speak of it, to remember it and to ensure that persecution never happens again.

However, as we all know, LGBTI people are still being persecuted in too many parts of the world right now. There is no greater example of this today than the disgusting persecution currently occurring in Russia, in Chechnya, where LGBTI people are being rounded up and assaulted, tortured and murdered by police or, indeed, their own families. In 2017, reports emerged of hundreds of LGBTI people being imprisoned by police. There were reports of secret prisons being used to house them in appalling conditions and of these innocent people being subjected to electric shock treatment, beatings and other abhorrent violence.

The strongest proponent of the so-called gay purge is the head of the Chechen republic, Mr Ramzan Kadyrov. He, of course, has denied these events ever took place, yet he had no hesitation in telling the Chechen media that gay people should be removed to 'cleanse our blood'. The echoes of the Nazi rhetoric towards Jewish people are chilling in President Kadyrov's words and his actions. Some brave victims have spoken out, and LGBTI groups around the world have organised to condemn what is occurring and help LGBTI people flee from Chechnya. The issue has never attracted the same international attention that other events have, and I think that is an oversight on behalf of the international media.

This year, there are reports of LGBTI groups in Russia, reported as recently as December last year, that the purge has started up once more, with gay men and women being detained because of their identity. In January, The Guardian reported that some 40 LGBTI people had been detained and two had been killed. What is even more revolting is the unconfirmed reports that the deaths were caused either by police torture or the victim's own families, who were threatened that, if they did not kill their children, the police would do it in front of them.

Targeting any group because of who they are, because of their identity, is plainly wrong, but it is wrong on so many levels that we need to remain cognisant of them because down this path is the sort of action that led to the Holocaust and leads to actions that we saw just recently in New Zealand. It is a denial of fundamental human rights. It is a crime of the worst order, but it continues to happen to innocent people because of who they love, their gender identity or the mere fact that they have the audacity to express themselves.

What is taking place in Chechnya is a reminder of where discriminatory language, schoolyard bullying or the normalisation of hatred can lead. It is the lesson the world ought to have learnt from the Holocaust. The actions we should have been guarding more vigilantly against have been creeping into the world's community once more. The price of failure of our leaders, of the community, of the media, to recognise this discrimination, to recognise what is happening, is clearly the persecution and death of innocent people. These failures have tragic consequences.

In Orlando, Florida, in 2016, there was a mass murder of 49 people at the Pulse nightclub, a fixture amongst Florida's LGBTI community at the time. In that nightclub, a place of celebration and pride and determination to live openly and honestly, hatred cut short 49 lives in one evening. Survivor Angel Santiago said after the attack:

...going to a club like Pulse, it's kind of like a safe haven...you can't go to [a normal] bar and be who you are, because there is hate everywhere...

The hatred that filled the gunman on that night and society's failure to build tolerance and respect for diversity violated that safe haven and ended 49 innocent lives. As I said, we have seen these tragedies occur even closer to home in recent times.

It was a strong statement by our parliament only yesterday, when both chambers passed motions condemning the terrorist attacks in Christchurch and expressed solidarity with the South Australian Muslim community, the Australian Muslim community and with our sister city of Christchurch and New Zealand.

It was a horrendous attack. Innocent and peaceful worship was interrupted by a pure act of hatred. It was the murder of innocent people and the devastation of a community. Yet again, it is a needless and tragic reminder of where the normalisation of hate and the proliferation of discriminatory language can lead us to. Innocent people paid the price for society's failure to stamp out discrimination. This did not occur on the other side of the world, as we have come to expect, for example, in the USA. It happened in our own neighbourhood—to our neighbour, a nation that could not be more similar to our own.

I call on all members of this place to consider the events that have happened around the world in recent years. They are not isolated events. There is a pattern to them, and that pattern often comes from unwise, ill-chosen words from the very top of leadership in those countries. We must take the opportunity of International Holocaust Remembrance Day to consider what happens when we excuse discrimination, when we look past discrimination and when we look past the words that seek out sections of our community to dehumanise them and treat them as the other, as different from us. We have to speak out when we hear these hateful words or when we see communities being discriminated against.

I believe it is our duty as parliamentarians to stamp this out wherever we see it, because the cost of failure has been made painfully and tragically clear in recent years and indeed in recent days. We continue to mourn the loss of those victims of the holocaust in their huge, unknowable numbers. We mourn the loss of those being killed in Chechnya. We mourn the loss of those who lost their lives in Christchurch. I hope that we can collectively renew our commitment to stamping out all forms of discrimination wherever we find it, because that suffering simply has to stop.

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

Parliamentary Committees

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

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

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

(Continued from 13 February 2019.)

The Hon. T.T. NGO (17:27): I rise to support the motion on the 2017-18 Annual Report of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation. Firstly, I would like to acknowledge the work of the committee of the Fifty-Third Parliament during the second session, namely, the former member for Ashford and presiding member of the committee, the Hon. Steph Key MP; the member for Hurtle Vale, Ms Nat Cook MP; the member for Schubert, the Hon. Stephan Knoll MP; the former member for Wright, the Hon. Jennifer Rankine MP; the Hon. Justin Hanson MLC; the Hon. John Dawkins MLC; and the Hon. John Darley MLC. I thank them for their tireless work during that session.

During the reporting period of that session, there were three reports tabled to both houses of parliament. There were also three reports that received responses from the relevant ministers, with one report going from the Treasurer to the committee. I commend the previous work of the committee.

The new committee consists of the member for Morphett, Mr Stephen Patterson MP, the current Presiding Member of the committee; the member for Davenport, Mr Steve Murray MP; the member for Taylor, Mr Jon Gee MP; the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC; the Hon. John Dawkins MLC; and myself. I hope to continue the good work of the previous committee.

We are currently undertaking a wideranging Inquiry into Workplace Fatigue and Bullying in South Australian Hospitals and Health Services. The committee has received 55 submissions so far.

As such, the inquiry has been extended to the end of May to deal with the volume of submissions. I look forward to considering all the submissions and tabling the report.

The new committee has also considered a referral from the Legislative Council from November 2017 regarding SafeWork SA prosecutions into workplace fatalities, largely focusing on the death of Jorge Castillo-Riffo. At its last meeting, the previous committee proposed that the incoming committee be assisted by the Coroner's finding into Mr Castillo-Riffo's death. The current committee decided it should wait for the Coroner's finding before deciding what to do next. The current committee also noted that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption was evaluating SafeWork SA activities and that this should be considered before proceeding with such an inquiry.

I also thank our parliamentary officer, Simon, and research officer, Eugene, and all previous staff members who worked tirelessly in terms of preparing the work for elected members. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (17:32): I thank the Hon. Tung Ngo for those words in noting the report. I know that current and past members of the committee are supportive of this motion, so I commend the motion to the council.

Motion carried.

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

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood:

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.

(Continued from 27 February 2019.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:32): I welcome the 41st report of the Social Development Committee, a review of the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013, as tabled by the Hon. Dennis Hood in this house on 13 February 2019.

I filed a minority report to the review because I am deeply concerned that the South Australian scheme has delivered super profits to CTP insurance companies, to the serious detriment of South Australians who have been injured in motor vehicle collisions or accidents. Many experts, including former Supreme Court judges, have labelled the Lifetime Support Scheme as one of the worst insurance policies for motorists in Australia. If the costs of premiums is compared to the benefits provided to motor accident victims, it becomes patently obvious that the insurance companies rather than injured motorists are the real beneficiaries of the scheme as it is.

It is of great concern to me, as I am sure it would be to all South Australians, that there are no indications that the super profits will be applied to reduce premiums payable in future or that there will be any increase in payments made to those injured motorists. The provision of lifetime care and support to catastrophically injured people is undoubtedly a positive step, but we need to make sure it is accessible and equitable to those injured in motor accidents.

This review illustrates that we need to make some further adjustments to this scheme to ensure that South Australians do not continue to face an uphill battle in addition to the physical and mental injuries they may have already sustained in a motor vehicle accident. Many South Australians who are injured on our roads are denied access to the rights and entitlements they would have previously been entitled to due to the changes implemented by the act. Others who would have suffered less than catastrophic but still significant injuries have completely lost their ability to claim for losses attributable to those injuries.

In 2015-16, the average payout of a CTP claim decreased from \$152,693 under the old scheme to around \$68,000 under the new scheme. Pain and suffering payments in SA are less than Queensland. In South Australia, an injured motorist with an injury scale value (ISV) assessed at 11 points will receive around just \$3,000. This is completely inadequate and is likely to be less than the cost of medical expert reports the applicant will need to obtain to claim the payment.

Our South Australian act was modelled on the Queensland scheme, but we have departed from that scheme in significant ways. The most significant of those is the imposition of the thresholds on the ISV. In Queensland, there are no thresholds on the ISV. While the review recommends small reductions to these thresholds, it is my view and that of many experts, including specialist doctors and lawyers, that the ISV thresholds be completely removed.

Compensation should be paid to motor vehicle accident victims under the act for economic and non-economic loss at an amount comparable to the Queensland scheme. Why should we settle for an inferior scheme for South Australian motorists? Why are some of the super profits of the insurance companies not directed to providing better care and support for those unfortunate enough to have their entire lives disrupted and often permanently impacted by a motor vehicle accident?

The CTP Regulator 2017-18 Annual Report notes that the rate of legal representation has increased from 2016-17 to 2017-18. However, the majority of claimants are still not legally represented. At present, applicants can only claim legal advice costs if the claim is more than \$25,000. Other civil claims, as we know, have a lower limit of just \$12,500. This lower amount should be applied to the Lifetime Support Scheme so that injured individuals do not have to battle it out alone, representing themselves against the often intimidatory tactics of the big insurers.

The right of victims to recover legal costs in pursuing their claims should be reinstated by removing the claim quantum threshold that currently applies. Constituents tell me that many injured motorists do not pursue claims at all now, because they cannot afford or justify the costs of legal representation. Their injuries are often so overwhelming and all-consuming that they cannot then face the challenges of dealing with the technicalities, the uncertainty of being able to meet the thresholds to obtain meaningful compensation and incurring legal costs that may not be ultimately met.

I agree with the Social Development Committee's report that the discount to economic loss of 20 per cent should be removed, as this is another inequitable and unfair measure. It is my view, however, that it should be completely removed. Limitations that allow for only pure psychiatric illnesses to be compensable also has the potential to cause undue hardship. All diagnosed mental harm should be compensable, just as physical injuries are. Mental harm can often be more disabling and persistent than a physical injury. I think we have heard enough in this place to know that to be the case.

I have recommended that the Social Development Committee undertake a full and independent review of the CTP insurance scheme, including a comprehensive analysis of the access to compensation and support that all those injured in motor vehicle accidents in South Australia receive to date, including those who have not qualified for LSS.

This independent review should also provide a comparative analysis of premiums paid to insurers as against compensation paid to those injured. I would like to make comment on two other committee recommendations specifically, the first being recommendation 2, which recommends the government undertake necessary actuarial scoping or modelling of the financial implications and expected time frame to expand the lifetime support scheme so that it is accessible to all South Australians who experience a catastrophic injury within the national injury insurance scheme.

Once appropriate levies have been identified, the committee recommends implementing the remaining National Injury Insurance Scheme recommendations in accordance with the agreement made with the commonwealth government, including those categories of accidents which can cause catastrophic injury, such as workplace accidents, general accidents and medical accidents. I disagreed with this recommendation, not because implementing these changes that are in line with the national scheme recommendations is necessarily a bad thing: I did so because the expansion of the scheme to a wider range of accidents is simply not a feasible option, unless the scheme that we have for motorists is functioning well and, importantly, not unfairly disadvantaging those injured.

It makes no sense at all to roll out an already problematic scheme that will result in more unfairness and more inequity. We need to get that scheme—the one we have operating now—operating properly and, unless and until we are willing to do that, we cannot contemplate subjecting more injured South Australians to the same sort of inequity and injustice.

Lastly, recommendation 10 of the committee report recommends that South Australia give consideration to setting up a no-fault scheme for all people injured in a motor vehicle accident, in line with reforms in New South Wales, Tasmania and Victoria. That scheme, the committee report says, should be a statutory benefits scheme with threshold amounts set for treatment, care, support and income cover.

As outlined in my report, I agree with the principle of all people injured in a motor vehicle accident being insured, whether at fault, or not. That is not in question. However, again, until the costs and benefits of the LSA scheme are more transparently disclosed, that is, we know the super profits from CTP premiums being retained by insurance companies, as compared with the benefits and payments made to those injured in motor vehicle accidents in South Australia, the fact remains that a no-fault scheme could be detrimental to the very people it is intended to assist. It could mean that more people receive even lower insurance payouts and face higher thresholds in order to receive any assistance.

All in all, there needs to be a much better balance between the CTP premiums paid by all South Australian motorists and the recompense and remedies provided to injured motor vehicle accident victims. I thank the many dedicated committee people who appeared before or made submissions to the committee. I note that it was the previous committee, and I am sure I am not alone in looking forward to the government actioning the 19 recommendations contained in the review by tabling comprehensive reform legislation for consideration in this place.

I can assure you, Mr President, that I will have much more to say on this issue at that time, and I am sure again the government can expect that piece of legislation to be thoroughly scrutinised by this chamber to ensure that South Australian motorists who sustain injuries in motor vehicle accidents are not denied access to appropriate rights and entitlements.

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

Motions

NEWSTART ALLOWANCE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. T.T. Ngo:

That this council—

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

(Continued from 19 September 2018.)

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:44): I rise today to speak on the Hon. Tung Ngo's motion regarding a root and branch review of Newstart. The motion calls on the Coalition government, now in the dying days of the Forty-Fifth Parliament, to immediately undertake a comprehensive review of the adequacy of the Newstart Allowance. We know that there are those in the state Labor Party, many across from me today—well, not too many today—who do not want to wait for such a review. Indeed, many of them, like me, want Newstart increased immediately. In fact, the Hon. Tung Ngo made an impassioned plea for such an increase in his speech on the motion.

It is disappointing that federal Labor cannot come out and say that, despite a strong campaign from within the party in the lead-up to its triennial conference in Adelaide last December to increase the Newstart Allowance. Ultimately, the federal Labor Party only committed to a review of Newstart within 18 months but no commitment to raise the payment itself. This was a disappointing

result and comes despite a formal declaration by federal Labor in its revised draft national platform acknowledging that the current rate of Newstart is too low and is a barrier to people finding work and participating in society. But at least it is better than the Morrison Liberal government's position, which refuses entirely to increase Newstart.

Newstart increased by a measly \$2.20 last September to \$275.10 per week as part of its twice-yearly adjustment to the consumer price index, but the fact remains that Newstart has not risen in real terms in 24 years. The \$2.20 indexed increase works out to a whopping 30 cents a day. It does not even cover the cost of an average loaf of bread. In real terms, the purchasing power of the Newstart Allowance has decreased so that Newstart recipients today are much worse off than those unemployed 24 years ago. Rent, groceries and transport costs have all increased as Newstart, in real terms, has stagnated for over two decades.

The situation is even more alarming for a single parent—overwhelmingly women—who are transferred from a sole parenting payment to the lower Newstart Allowance after their youngest child turns eight. Such a predicament only serves to increase their financial and social stress, their ability to properly cover the needs of their children and places an immense weight on children caught up in the cycle of poverty.

At the time of the indexed increase to Newstart, federal social services minister Paul Fletcher said the indexed \$2 boost per week to Newstart Allowance would help unemployed Australians keep up with increases in their living costs. Such commentary is a bit rich coming from a guy who gets \$288 per day in travel allowances when he is in Canberra—that is per day. That is more than someone on Newstart gets for the entire week. Fletcher's statement would be laughable if the situation was not so desperate and dire.

The Australian Council of Social Service has long advocated for an increase to Newstart and SA-Best and our federal colleagues Centre Alliance support ACOSS in its strong advocacy on the issue. ACOSS chief executive Cassandra Goldie has suggested a review is not needed to increase the payment. I quote:

The evidence is in. The support is across-the-board. It's been 24 years. This is years overdue. People can't afford to wait.

The current Newstart rate of \$275.10 per week for a single person with no children is well below the state-based poverty line of \$408 per week, as defined by the South Australian Council of Social Service. So if you are on Newstart, by definition you are living in poverty. An increase in payments by \$75 a week would assist 770,000 people across Australia. In South Australia, it would provide immediate and significant assistance to 65,755 Newstart recipients, with the majority receiving the single rate.

A report conducted for ACOSS by Deloitte Access Economics found that the increase would benefit regional communities the most and that, as the money flowed through the economy, it would increase consumer spending, create 12,000 new jobs and boost government revenue by \$1 billion. There is now widespread agreement that Newstart—which I remind everyone has not risen in real terms since 1994—is appallingly too low. It is not just ACOSS that is calling for an increase to Newstart. There is a growing coalition of advocates, political figures and business groups, including former Liberal prime minister John Howard, who have called the current Newstart rate inadequate.

I am a member of the Select Committee on Poverty in South Australia and have been both humbled and concerned by the evidence that we have heard so far. The reasons for poverty are complex, and the committee's work examining the issue will take time as we delve into the impact of poverty on a range of particular demographic groups, as well as socio-economic issues.

Because the Newstart Allowance is so indelibly linked to the very issue of poverty, it was the first focus area examined by the select committee and forms the basis of the first interim report. The recommendations of the interim report with respect to Newstart are that:

The Committee agrees with the overwhelming majority of submissions to the inquiry that the Newstart Allowance is far too low and falls well short of the state-based poverty line.

The Committee calls on the Federal Government to make a meaningful increase to the rate of the Newstart Allowance (and other base allowances) as a matter of urgency.

We do not need a root and branch review to determine the overwhelming need to increase the rate of Newstart Allowance or the fact that it needs to happen now. Last year, former Liberal MP turned Independent, the federal member for Chisholm, Julia Banks, callously remarked that she could live on the less than \$40 a day Newstart Allowance, in a pathetic and feeble attempt to defend the Coalition government's hardline position.

Those comments will, no doubt, come back to haunt her as she seeks to contest the seat of Flinders at the next election. It is very easy for us as politicians to be removed from the day-to-day lived experience of those trying to get by on the Newstart Allowance. Julia Banks's comments are testament to that. They were reckless and heartless. We are in a very privileged and unique position. It comes with significant responsibility and is one I take seriously and I am sure all my colleagues do. It is imperative that those battling on Newstart inform us of the immense challenges they face daily. To that end, I want to read to you an excerpt from submission 18 to the Select Committee on Poverty from Tracey. In achingly moving words, Tracey shares her experience:

My name is Tracey. I am a single woman...50 years of age and long term underemployed since 2009.

My early childhood and youth were spent in and out of out of home care, my step father having left the country when I was 10 years old, leaving my sisters and I with a mother with poor coping abilities.

Despite our childhood challenges, both my sisters and I strived to improve our lives through tertiary education. For me personally without family structure and support this was incredibly difficult. At the time I was living with undiagnosed depression which in turn affected my ability to complete my Associate Diploma in Community Development. I had 2 or 3 subjects left to complete to graduate but all the pressures of simply living on a limited budget, trying to find stable accommodation as well as completing assignments became too much to deal with.

To get ahead financially I started working in the Sex Industry. Earning a good income helped me get some stability in life, being able to pay rent and associated costs.

Working as a sex worker was not without its own challenges. Due to the intimate nature of the job, I burnt out and not having any skills to fall back on, went on...social security payments.

Not being able to pay the rent on my house, I moved to my mother's Housing Trust home whilst I awaited for my name to come up on the Housing Trust waiting list for my own house. (I had put my name down when I was 18 and living in a Youth Shelter). At age 28, I finally got my own Housing Trust home and have been here ever since. I still do not feel secure enough living here though.

Having been on a Centrelink payment for quite a few years now, as the years have gone on, the struggle to survive has increased, as the payment has not kept up with rising costs of living.

Food and electricity would have to be the two major items of cost. My budget for groceries has always been \$100 a fortnight. Imagine how empty my trolley must be these days on that amount. In recent years, I have started dumpster diving and this helps with my food bill.

To try and save on electricity costs, at least twice a week, I will turn my hot water service off at the mains switch overnight, and bathe only if I am to leave the house to interact with others.

This does not happen often because I have to limit my travel...due to cost saving measures...

As I age, my health is now starting to slowly decline. This became very apparent to me last year when I had some health issues that required an overnight hospital stay. There were associated costs with that period that I had to go and get assistance from charity to help cover.

I accept that as a 50 year old woman—despite my extensive experience within the community sector—I am highly unlikely to gain any kind of ongoing reliable employment. I feel that I have nothing to look forward to in my future and I have no hope of my situation ever improving.

People object to me saying this, but dying would be a welcome relief from the everyday struggle I endure. That is what I look forward to.

That is powerful, raw, honest lived experience. Tracey eloquently explains what it is like living on Newstart—a struggle every day to make ends meet, to go without meals, to not use hot water or heating or cooling, to go without, to feel lonely, isolated and depressed. Tracey's experience is by no means isolated. There are many stories like hers and I dare any politician not to be moved by her words or remain steadfast in their belief that the current rate of Newstart is appropriate.

Some of you may remember Tracey as she was featured as part of a series of profiles during the 7.30 program on the ABC last year, about what it was like to be on Newstart's \$40 a day. The broadcast also featured Jaieyre Lewis, a 26 year old from Adelaide who has been on and off Newstart

for a couple of years now. When that story aired last July Jaieyre had applied for 160 jobs over two or three months—160 jobs. The story reported that:

Jaieyre loves to cook but cannot afford meat because it is simply too expensive. Instead, he will buy a chicken carcass for about \$2.50 to make soups because they are cheap and nutritious.

Jaieyre would like to turn his passion for food into full-time work, but said hospitality jobs in Adelaide are in short supply.

Achingly, Jaieyre said during the report that:

I don't like to think of myself as a welfare or dole bludger. I like to think of myself as a person first who would like to survive and exist.

On 10 May 2018, Senator Rachel Siewert, on behalf of the Australian Greens, moved a motion in the Senate, supported by our federal colleagues Centre Alliance and one other crossbench senator, urging the federal government to increase the single rate of Newstart and Youth Allowance by \$75 a week.

Regrettably, that motion was voted down 45 votes to 12 when the Labor Party sided with the Coalition government to defeat the motion. The rate of Newstart does not need to be reviewed: it needs to increase urgently, and the ALP and the Coalition know this. Consequently, I will be moving an amendment to the motion that reflects the recommendation of the Select Committee on Poverty in South Australia but goes one step further by nominating the specific amount of increase to Newstart as recommended by ACOSS.

Even though responsibility for Newstart lies with the federal government, if there is no meaningful and significant increase to Newstart, then those payments will continue to decline well short of the state poverty line, and it will fall to those agencies who are increasingly asked to do more with less to help out the most vulnerable in our community. I move:

Delete paragraph 4 and substitute:

4. Calls on the Morrison Liberal government to increase Newstart by \$75 per week as a matter of urgency.

With those words, I conclude my remarks.

The PRESIDENT: Before I call the Hon. Ms Franks, the Hon. Mr Pangallo, I note that you have quoted expansively from a committee proceeding. As I understand it, that committee on poverty in South Australia has produced an interim report, which is why I let you go on, but if that interim report had not—and I am not sure whether it has—included those submissions, because sometimes the submissions are left until the final report, then you cannot technically quote from them. So I have been generous, in summary. In future, for good practice, and this is for the benefit of other members, if you are going to quote from an interim report and the submissions of those reports, the submissions should be tendered. That is for your benefit and for the edification of other members.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Okay, thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (18:02): I rise to speak to this motion, largely in support but not entirely in support, and foreshadow that I will seek to amend it. I commend the Hon. Tung Ngo for bringing this issue before this place. I commend all members who are turning their attention to the issue of poverty, the growing inequality in our country and, indeed, the absolute fact that the Newstart Allowance has not been raised in real terms since the 1994 federal budget. Newstart is now somewhere around 18 per cent of the average wage, 41 per cent of the minimum wage, and that low rate is profoundly affecting the wellbeing of many people in our state, making it harder for jobseekers to seek work.

When 40 per cent of Newstart recipients are unable to pay their bills, when 46 per cent are only able to afford second-hand clothes most of the time, when 44 per cent have unsustainable levels of debt and owe more than they can afford, when a majority turn off their heating and cooling to save money, when 32 per cent skip meals, when 25 per cent are suffering from housing stress and a housing crisis, spending more than half of their income on that housing, when 20 per cent report not having enough money for those essentials like housing, food and electricity, and when 63 per cent

report that their income has fallen well beyond the cost of their living in the past two years, those people are left in an incredibly precarious position.

I note and foreshadow the fine work of the Anti-Poverty Network. When this motion was first put, there were 13 South Australian councils. There are now 15 South Australian councils that have taken on the issue of poverty in their advocacy, well beyond roads, rates and rubbish, as this state body, this Legislative Council, can also do on behalf of those in our community who are currently being failed by federal policies.

I note and foreshadow that I will move the Greens amendment that echoes the first part of the Hon. Tung Ngo's motion but deletes 'Supports a root and branch review and measures which seek to increase and enhance Newstart and other welfare related payments, which adequately addresses the current level of poverty among Australian jobseekers' as unnecessary and a stalling tactic, a very unfortunate outcome of the national Labor conference recently to recommend within the first 18 months of a Shorten government a so-called root and branch review, when we all know we need to raise the rate not undertake another review.

My amendment would also acknowledge the specific call of Anti Poverty Network, that its advocacy in this area calls for an increase of \$100 a week to Newstart and other related welfare payments. It would not call upon the federal government to also take a root and branch review; it would delete that provision. I indicate that the Hon. Frank Pangallo's proposed amendment is not in any way in conflict with ours, and we will supporting that as an addition.

Finally, I note—back in the seventies, think it was, certainly in the eighties—some of the old political posters—and I still have one on my wall—which I cannot repeat all of in this place because I am sure it would be most unparliamentary, and unfortunately is quite true, which is: 'If these people are dole bludgers, then what the...are the idle rich?' I have to say that I am sick of the demonisation of people as dole bludgers when we know that jobseekers are facing only one vacancy for every eight people looking for that position. There are not enough jobs to go around, but there is enough wealth to go round.

Should we look at that increase of \$100 per week to Newstart? It would cost quite a bit: \$4.5 billion per year. Yet, if we scrapped negative gearing, that could gain us \$15 billion. If we eliminated superannuation tax concessions for those on high incomes, that could gain us \$10.5 billion. You would have more than enough to raise the rate of Newstart with no root and branch review, but simply redefine and reprioritise those we support the most in this community. With those few words, I commend the intent of the motion and look forward to further debate. I move:

Leave out paragraph 2;

In paragraph 3 leave out 'in this policy area' and insert 'for an increase of at least \$100 per week to Newstart and other related welfare payments';

Leave out paragraph 4;

In paragraph 5 after 'last' insert 'real';

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (18:07): Social payments are an important part of Australia's social security system and are in place to protect our most vulnerable. We know that the best form of welfare is a job. At a federal level, the Morrison government has overseen the largest increase in jobs since the global financial crisis, with more than 1.2 million jobs created since the Coalition came into power. More Australians are in work that ever before, with unemployment at 5 per cent, the lowest level since 2012. The Morrison government's plan for a stronger economy is working, but we know there is much more to do at all levels of government.

There are 230,000 fewer working age recipients on income support payments between June 2014 and June 2018. The proportion of working-age Australians now dependent on welfare has fallen to 14.3 per cent, the lowest level in more than 25 years. Prominent labour market economist Professor Mark Wooden, director of The Household, Income and Labour Dynamics in Australia Survey, says that growth in wages has far outstripped inflation over the last decade.

Over the decade to June 2018, wages have risen by 31 per cent, whereas inflation has risen by 22 per cent in that same period. Accordingly, Australians have experienced real gains in their living standards. We also have one of the most targeted and efficient welfare transfer systems in the

world. Australia applies means testing to a bigger share of its cash benefits than any other Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) country. Indeed, approximately 80 per cent of cash benefits are means tested.

A recent Australian Bureau of Statistics study found that in 2015-16, households received, on average, \$76 more per week in total benefits (cash and in kind) than they paid in taxes. The data shows how effectively our tax transfer system targets assistance to those with the lowest incomes. The bottom 20 per cent of households by income received the highest amount of social assistance benefits in cash (\$517 per week, on average), with the highest 20 per cent of households by income receiving the least (\$28 per week).

The government remains committed to ensuring family assistance and social security payments are well targeted and sustainable into the future. Currently, the federal government spends over one-third of the total federal budget on welfare payments and services. Newstart, just one of the social security payments available, is specifically aimed at supporting jobseekers while they look for work. Like other social security payments, it is the responsibility of the commonwealth government, not the state government. The Newstart Allowance increases in line with the Consumer Price Index on 20 March and 22 September each year to ensure that it keeps up with increases in the cost of living.

The Morrison federal government is committed to ensuring family assistance and social security payments are well targeted and sustainable into the future. It is essential that we have a welfare system that supports the most vulnerable, encourages those capable of work or study to do so and reduces intergenerational welfare dependency. The Morrison government is focused on helping people from welfare into work and it is succeeding, as the statistics I have just read out acknowledge.

Two decades ago, 25 per cent of working age Australians were on welfare and today, with job growth, that has dropped to just 15.1 per cent—the lowest level in 25 years. Newstart was never designed to be a long-term replacement for employment. It is primarily a payment designed to assist people transition through the labour market. For this reason, Newstart recipients can earn income from work or other sources before their payment is affected. In general, that is how it is working.

Many Newstart recipients do not remain on the support payment for a long period of time, with around two-thirds of individuals exiting the payment within 12 months. It is also important to recognise that over 99 per cent of Newstart recipients also receive a number of other benefits in addition to the base rate of Newstart, including the Energy Supplement, Rent Assistance and Family Tax Benefit, which substantially increase recipients' weekly income.

I commend the work of the Anti-Poverty Network of South Australia and acknowledge its active role in advocating to raise the Newstart Allowance amount. I also acknowledge the various South Australian local councils that have called for a raise in the Newstart Allowance and thank them for their advocacy. While social security payments are the responsibility of the commonwealth government, I acknowledge that the South Australian government has a conflict of interest in the matter. Public housing rental rates, which are collected by the South Australian government, are calculated based on income, including Newstart payments, and any change in Newstart would therefore affect the government's revenue.

I note that, in recent years, under the previous Labor administration, South Australia has seen essential living items substantially increase in cost. This has resulted in people who are already struggling becoming even more vulnerable to financial disadvantage and experience bill shock pertaining to food, health, education, housing, utilities and transport.

We have also seen the former state Labor government's failure to maintain affordable and reliable electricity add to the cost-of-living pressures for families. The most expensive electricity in the National Electricity Market has contributed to South Australians facing higher levels of household hardship, compared to other states.

The Marshall Liberal government believes that individuals should be empowered to make decisions and take responsibility for their own future, while also identifying opportunities to help vulnerable South Australians make positive changes in their lives, where appropriate. It is committed to delivering more jobs, lower costs and better services to South Australians and is cleaning up

Labor's mess through implementing a suite of policy and legislative initiatives to deliver on all of our election and budget commitments.

This state government supports the Morrison government's ongoing consideration and monitoring of Newstart and other related welfare payments to ensure that social security payments are at adequate rates to support Australian jobseekers. We, like the commonwealth government, know that the best form of welfare is a job and commend our federal counterparts for working to improve employment opportunities for those on Newstart.

Independent South Australian Senator, Tim Storer, recently moved a motion in the federal parliament calling for an immediate increase to Newstart rates. I note that Senator Storer's motion was negatived and Labor voted with the government against such a measure. Similarly, the government will not be supporting Ms Franks' similar motion in its current form—although I understand that it is perhaps now off the *Notice Paper*.

Federal Labor's policy to undertake a root and branch review of Newstart and other allowances is a commitment to do nothing. The only difference between Labor and the Coalition on Newstart payments is that the Coalition is able to maintain the sustainability of the welfare system into the future because of its strong budgetary management and the work that the Morrison government has done in reforming and rebalancing the system.

We suggest an amendment to Mr Ngo's motion to recognise the ongoing consideration and monitoring undertaken by the commonwealth government in this space. In responding on behalf of the government to the Hon. Mr Ngo's motion, as has been circulated, I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraphs 2 and 4 and substitute:

2. Supports ongoing consideration and monitoring of Newstart and other related welfare payments to ensure they adequately address the current level of poverty among Australian jobseekers.

In relation to paragraph 5, the government notes that no real increase to Newstart has occurred in over 20 years under either Liberal or Labor governments. Just to be clear, I have moved that amendment so that the motion would now read:

1. Recognises that all Australian jobseekers deserve adequate income support to maintain a decent standard of living and have access to resources to look for work, which enables and supports recipients to transition to paid work as soon as possible;
2. Supports ongoing consideration and monitoring of Newstart and other related welfare payments to ensure they adequately address the current level of poverty among Australian jobseekers;
3. Acknowledges the work of the Anti-Poverty Network South Australia for its advocacy in this policy area; and
4. Recognises that the last rise in Newstart occurred in 1994 under the Keating Labor government.

I also place on record that the government is unable to support the amendments of the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the Hon. Ms Franks.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (18:16): I stand to speak in favour of the Hon. Mr Ngo's motion. From the very beginning, I would like to make quite clear that all Australian jobseekers deserve dignity and a decent standard of living as they look for work. In real terms, Newstart has not been increased since 1994. At \$275 a week, this is a system that does not support and enable people to work; it condemns them to poverty.

For many people, this means that they simply do not have enough money to top-up their Metrocard so that they can catch public transport for a job interview. \$275 a week means that people cannot afford to top-up their phone credit, which is a problem when you are also searching for a job and need to be contactable by phone. \$275 per week means that people must choose between refilling their prescription medication or buying basic groceries to see them through the week. Living this far below the poverty line is not only inadequate but is also an isolating barrier to finding purposeful employment.

I was at the ALP National Conference and I would have preferred to see a monetary sum being committed to immediately. There are a number of amendments here today, which I would

normally support, but the reality is that Labor have committed themselves to a review of the system, if they were in office. Judging by the mood of the national conference, I would hope that there are significant changes to the Newstart Allowance and also a mechanism by which we allow it to keep up with the cost of living—not just inflation but the real cost-of-living increases into the future. I support the motion but also have sympathy with the amendments of the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the Hon. Ms Franks.

It is a bit rich when our basic salary is probably 15 times that of someone on Newstart. I often wonder how on earth a person can live on that, especially if they have to pay rent. It is all very well if you are living with your parents or living on the back of somebody else, but if you do not, life is very difficult. I think there should be a lot of sympathy for this.

I must say that I am very disappointed with the attitude of the government over there: they seem to believe that if you want to improve your life you should get a job. However, how many times have we all heard about the plight of people looking for jobs, where they have put in dozens and dozens of applications and have gone to dozens of interviews but have heard nothing back? It is demoralising and demeaning, and it is really up to the political leaders to ensure that they at least have a decent, basic standard of living while looking for a job. So I support the Hon. Tung Ngo's motion and I hope it is supported.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (18:19): I thank all honourable members for their contributions: the Hon. Mr Wortley, the Hon. Mr Pangallo, the Hon. Ms Franks and the Hon. Mr Hood. Firstly, I would like to concur with the contribution in terms of personal stories from people like Tracey and Jaieyre, whom the Hon. Mr Pangallo mentioned, and the struggle they have to endure every day, living on \$40, considering the cost of living and the bills that have to be paid.

Unfortunately, because the federal government election is just around the corner, it is very hard for the opposition to consider a figure in terms of an immediate increase. At this stage, I am hoping that both major political parties, if they happen to win the federal election, will make some kind of commitment to increase Newstart and related welfare payments to those people on Centrelink. Therefore, at this stage, we cannot support the amendments, but I concur with what has been said by the Hon. Mr Pangallo and the Hon. Ms Franks about the immediate increase. Therefore, at this stage, we cannot support the amendments.

The PRESIDENT: I have a series of questions to put to the council. The first question is phrased as follows: that paragraph 2 as proposed to be struck out by the Hon. T.A. Franks and the Hon. D.G.E. Hood stand part of the motion. If you support the motion being unamended you would vote in the affirmative. If you support the propositions debated by the Hon. Ms Franks and the Hon. Mr Hood you would vote in the negative.

Question resolved in the negative.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I seek clarification of your advice to the council. You have indicated that it stand part of the motion, so the ayes are supporting the current drafting staying part of the motion and therefore if you are opposing the Hon. Mr Pangallo's and the Hon. Ms Franks' amendments—

The PRESIDENT: No. The question is paragraph 2 as proposed to be struck out by the Hon. Ms Franks and the Hon. Mr Hood stand as part of the motion. So the Hon. Ms Franks and the Hon. Mr Hood are seeking to take words out. The question is being put that the words remain in, they stand.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: So if you are opposing the Hon. Mr Pangallo—

The PRESIDENT: No, I have not got to the Hon. Mr Pangallo yet. The Hon. Mr Pangallo's amendments are coming and they are going to be put later. As I have called it, I called it that the noes were successful. Does anyone wish to call for a division? I am being very fair. So I now put the question that the new paragraph proposed to be inserted by the Hon. D.G.E. Hood be so inserted. If you agree with the Hon. Mr Hood's sentiments, you would vote in the affirmative; if you do not agree with the Hon. Mr Hood—I understand, the Hon. Mr Ngo, that you do not—you would vote in the negative. Does anyone require any further clarification? I am going to put the question as I have now expressed.

Question resolved in the negative.

The PRESIDENT: The next question is that the amendment moved by the Hon. T.A. Franks to paragraph 3 be agreed to. The question is in the positive. If you agree with the Hon. Ms Franks' sentiments, you vote in the affirmative; if you do not, you vote in the negative. I am going to put the question as expressed.

Question resolved in the negative.

The PRESIDENT: I now put a further question: that paragraph 4 as proposed to be struck out by the Hon. T.A. Franks, the Hon. F. Pangallo and the Hon. D.G.E. Hood stand as part of the motion. The question has been put in the positive. This question is saying that the wording remain as is. If you want the wording to remain as is, you vote in the affirmative. But by the nature of the question, I would imagine that the Hon. T.A. Franks, the Hon. F. Pangallo and the Hon. D.G.E. Hood will be voting in the negative. The Hon. Mr Ngo, I suspect you will be in voting in the affirmative. I do not want to prejudge members' views but on what the President heard. I put the question as expressed.

Question resolved in the negative.

The PRESIDENT: That means that paragraph 4 has been struck out. The next question is that the new paragraph 4 as proposed to be inserted by the Hon. F. Pangallo be so inserted. This is a positive. If you want the Hon. F. Pangallo's amendment to be inserted, you vote in the affirmative; if you do not, you vote in the negative. I will put the question.

Sitting extended beyond 18:30 on motion of Hon. R.I. Lucas.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes 4
Noes 16
Majority 12

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Parnell, M.C.

Franks, T.A.

Pangallo, F. (teller)

NOES

Bourke, E.S.
Hanson, J.E.
Lee, J.S.
Maher, K.J.
Scriven, C.M.
Wortley, R.P.

Darley, J.A.
Hood, D.G.E.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Ngo, T.T. (teller)
Stephens, T.J.

Dawkins, J.S.L.
Hunter, I.K.
Lucas, R.I.
Ridgway, D.W.
Wade, S.G.

Amendment thus negated.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! There is series of other questions that need to be put. The next question is that the amendment moved by the Hon. T.A. Franks to paragraph 5 be agreed to. Again, if you agree with the Hon. Ms Franks, you will vote in the affirmative; if you do not, you will vote in the negative.

Question agreed to.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I have only called on the voices. Does someone wish to call a division?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Honourable members, order! This is the last amendment from the Hon. T.A. Franks. This is the insertion of the word 'real'. Does any member wish to call a division?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: It is not a debate; I am putting the questions. If members wish to find a copy of the motions, they are more than welcome at the moment. I will pause in proceedings if honourable members wish to revisit the written motions. The next question is that the motion moved by the Hon. T.T. Ngo and as amended by the Hon. T.A. Franks and the Hon. D.G.E. Hood be agreed to.

Motion as amended carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LIQUOR LICENSING) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 18:37 the council adjourned until Thursday 21 March 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***CRYPTOCURRENCIES**

In reply to **the Hon. J.E. HANSON** (28 February 2019).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): I have been advised the following:

The South Australian Government Financing Authority (SAFA) and other government agencies that make investments, such as HomeStart Finance, ReturnToWork SA, Public Trustee, SA Water, SA Lotteries, Arts Gallery and Funds SA, have not invested in cryptocurrency.

SAFA participated in the world first issue of a fixed rate bond issued by the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) using blockchain technology via the Commonwealth Bank of Australia.

Whilst blockchain technology was used to issue and register the buyers of the bonds, payment by SAFA for the IBRD investment did not involve cryptocurrency and settlement was made in Australian dollars via a standard payment application.

I will be confirming with other government departments as to whether they have used or invested in cryptocurrency and I will advise the honourable member if this is the case.