

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 15 May 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 19th report of the committee, 2018-19.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWER TABLED

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

Question Time

CYCLING EVENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment on the Tour Down Under.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Last sitting week, the minister was informed in this chamber about the excellent work of the member for Mawson, Leon Bignell, and how the calendar of cycling events in South Australia could continue to grow if the ideas of the member for Mawson were taken up. They included a white road one-day race for UCI tour points, the elevation of the Women's Tour Down Under to World Tour status and a criterium or single day race for Pro Tour points after the TDU, possibly on Kangaroo Island or in Mount Gambier.

We have learnt that the president of the UCI, international cycling's governing body, was in Australia earlier this month, as well as in January last year. My questions to the minister are:

1. Did the minister meet with the UCI president when he was in Australia this month?
2. Did the minister meet with the UCI president when he was in Adelaide in January last year?
3. At either of those meetings, did the minister discuss the proposal formulated by the member for Mawson in his meetings overseas with the president of the UCI?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:19): I thank the honourable member for his question. As members would recall, I made some comments around the member for Mawson, the sort of shadow shadow shadow minister for tourism. I made comment that I met with officials.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am trying to give them an answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister wishes to answer.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I made it clear that I met with the officials from the UCI during the Tour Down Under when they were here. I can't remember his exact title, but I had dinner and a meeting with him. We had a lengthy discussion.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, please stop baiting the minister and allow him to answer.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, I will sit down and not give them an answer if they keep this up.

The PRESIDENT: It's within your—

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We discussed all the potential opportunities for the women's tour to be a UCI World Tour. We discussed white road events, we discussed what in Europe they call the monument races, all the discussions that former minister Bignell raised via the media last week, or the week before, undermining the hardworking Zoe Bettison, the shadow minister. It was—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Yes, we work as a team. Something you know nothing about.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: That's not what I hear about your team members, what they say about you.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, you do not respond to interjections. Through me.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, I will direct it through you. We are fully aware of it. Representatives from the South Australian Tourism Commission, the heads—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Have you met the president?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I met with—

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I am very kind in allowing a reasonable number of supplementaries. Restrain yourself and maybe pursue your energies through the supplementary process.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Thank you, Mr President. The head of EventsSA was in Europe, I think in November last year but I will check the date, to go to the UCI meetings to actually have proper in-depth discussions around the future of this event. That's one of the reasons that Santos was very keen to re-engage. They want to see the women's tour lifted to a World Tour event.

Those discussions I had with the officials during the Tour Down Under. I didn't meet with the president when he was here last month. We are talking about 2021, so we are two years away from when those things will become a possibility. We are still working through it. We have had all the meetings we need to have. The information former minister Bignell gave we already knew; we already knew.

CYCLING EVENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: can the minister inform the chamber who is the president of the UCI?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:22): Mr L'appartient.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary, Leader of the Opposition.

CYCLING EVENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): In his time as opposition tourism spokesperson, did the minister ever have a meeting with Christian Prudhomme? For the minister's benefit, because he is looking very vague, he is the head of the Tour de France.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:23): No, I didn't.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, please! I don't need the narrative.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It was the aggressive way in which the minister ran his department. I tried to meet, for example, with Formula E in London. I went to the meeting and they said, 'Sorry, we can't talk to you. We've had a contact from the minister's office in Adelaide. We can't do that.'

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, Leader of the Opposition.

CYCLING EVENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Is the minister playing catch-up with the member for Mawson after suggesting remarkable events could come to South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:23): That's true. You couldn't get two more different individuals than me and the member for Mawson.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, through me.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Be careful. Members should be very careful. I am not playing catch-up. We have already had discussions with them.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Sit down. Minister, sit down. The Hon. Ms Scriven.

ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS GROWTH FUND

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment regarding the Economic and Business Growth Fund.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: According to the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment website, the government has developed a framework to provide financial assistance to private sector entities to be delivered through three new designated funds. This framework includes the \$100 million Economic and Business Growth Fund, a fund which the minister claimed during estimates last year that he is the lead minister for.

There are three publicly known initiatives from this fund: \$2 million for a new head office for Mitsubishi Motors; \$4 million to the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment for the South Australian Landing Pad; and \$3 million to the South Australian Tourism Commission for a winter tourism campaign. My question to the minister is: are his agencies so cash-strapped that they have now decided to raid industry assistance funding?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. The Economic and Business Growth Fund is designed to support our sector approach to growing the state's economy. As we know, as we have said in this place, we will occasionally reserve the right to invest in individual businesses when we think it is sensible and prudent, and we did that with Mitsubishi Motors. The good friends of the members opposite, the Victorian government, were trying to steal that from us. In fact, I think we probably managed to retain Mitsubishi for a fraction of the cost that the Victorian Labor Party were trying to drag them away for.

We look at a sector approach. The Landing Pad is for all sectors—any business; new ones, as long as they have traded for 12 months in any particular area. We were happy to fund that Landing Pad through the Economic and Business Growth Fund. The former government might have just had a few million dollars sitting round in small change; we don't. We are prudent. We manage our money.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: How do you explain that to industry? You are taking their money for your own internal programs.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, you are not answering a question; the minister is.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We went to the election saying we would have a sector approach. That's what we are doing. If that is not a sector, I'll go he for chasey. It's a sector that employs thousands—I think it is nearly 36,000 people across South Australia. It is the only labour-intensive industry left in regional South Australia, and the members opposite don't think that we should be actually investing in marketing and promoting it. We are about supporting sectors, and that's what we are going to do.

ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS GROWTH FUND

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:27): A supplementary arising from the answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, please show some respect to your own front bench.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, you are not assisting. You are a minister. The Hon. Mr Hunter, you are not helping me either. The Hon. Ms Scriven.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Given the—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can the members of the opposition benches show respect for their own frontbencher. I cannot hear the Hon. Ms Scriven's question.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Our teamwork is overflowing. Given the government has already taken 7 per cent of this fund, will the government introduce a cap on how much funding government will take from this fund, which is intended for private sector entities?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary. No; we will administer the fund and invest it in the sectors or the businesses that we as a cabinet see fit to grow our state's economy, to lift it out of the doldrums that we inherited—some of the lowest growth in the state's history.

ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS GROWTH FUND

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:28): A further supplementary: how many entities, government or private, have applied for money from this fund so far?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:28): The honourable members obviously weren't listening when we explained it. You don't apply to the fund. It's an opportunity for ministers to bring it forward as they go to departments. We have a range of discussions. It's a cabinet discussion and I am not prepared to disclose them here today.

ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS GROWTH FUND

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:28): A further supplementary: have any other grants been awarded from this fund at all? If so, how much and to which companies or agencies?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:28): That's subject to a range of cabinet discussions. When the government is ready to disclose if we have made any further contributions from that fund to other sectors, we will inform the chamber.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, this will be the last supplementary on this topic.

CYCLING EVENTS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): I refer to the member's original answer where in his answer he referred to the Victorian government trying to steal events from South Australia. Is the minister concerned that, if he doesn't act upon the suggestions of the member for Mawson for extra cycling events, Victoria may steal these events from under his nose?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:29): No. I thank the honourable member for his fishing question. What they have to understand is the Tour Down Under is actually owned by the South Australian government. I will just remind members opposite it was an initiative of the former Olsen government. I have met with people from Cycling Australia, some of the most aggressive people in trying to secure other events.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Leader of the Opposition, please! It's your own question. I can't even hear the answer to your own question.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: The way the former government operated was to be at war with everybody.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, I can't hear you because the Hon. Mr Stephens is now shouting. The Hon. Ms Bourke.

JOYCE REVIEW

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment regarding the Joyce review.

Leave granted.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment is in a state of chaos. Termed as a bureaucratic bloodbath, the acting CE of the department—

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order: the honourable member has used opinion, stating that the department is in a state of chaos. It is not fact and I disagree with it. It's an opinion and I ask her to withdraw.

The PRESIDENT: I would rule on it, the Hon. Mr Hood, but members of your own back bench were talking and I could not hear.

The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I don't need your advice, Treasurer. Start again, the Hon. Ms Bourke, and take your time.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Thank you, Mr President.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: Because it's your time you are wasting.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, I am going to allow this question if you continue to interject from the back bench. I can hear you clearly and it displeases me greatly.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Great acoustics in this place. The Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment is in a state of chaos. Termed as a bureaucratic bloodbath, the acting CE of the department has effectively disbanded—

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order: the member has just stated that the department is in a state of chaos. That is an opinion. I ask it to be withdrawn.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: You may restrain yourselves—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The point of order has some foundation, so please restrain the language you are using—

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: For the purpose of proceeding, I will withdraw the comment; thank you.

The PRESIDENT: —and limit the brief explanations to simple factual matters.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The acting CE of the department has effectively disbanded the entire senior level of management—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bourke, just hold there. Leader of the Opposition, if you could be quiet—I cannot hear the Hon. Ms Bourke. Please start again.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: And nor can I, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I don't need your advice, the Hon. Mr Ridgway. You should be listening to the question yourself because you are about to answer it.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway: If I can't hear it, what do I do?

The PRESIDENT: When you address me, you stand as well. The Hon. Ms Bourke, start again. We are going to be here all day, but we are going to hear this question.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Perhaps we could stop the clock just to help out a little bit. The acting CE of the department has effectively disbanded the entire senior level management less than one year since the department came into being. The acting CE said that he 'did not propose these changes as a result of any discussion with the Premier or the minister'. During this state of crisis late last year, South Australia suffered its worst trade performance in 30 years as a proportion of national share and was the worst performing state in the entire country. My questions to the minister are:

1. How many separation packages have been offered to staff in the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment?
2. How many experienced trade staff have lost their jobs so far under your watch?
3. Given the CE made the decision without consulting the minister, can the minister explain why he was not included in any conversations about significant changes in his own department?
4. After more than a year of being in government, why does the minister have no functioning department structure?

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: Under your watch, trade is going south.

The PRESIDENT: Are you finished, the Hon. Mr Wortley? I would like to hear the minister's answer. Minister.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. I certainly don't have a list or a number of packages on any of the restructure of the acting chief executive. Of the members opposite, two have been ministers. They know that that's not a role for the minister to be involved in. That's actually the chief executive—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: You might have been deeply involved with what—

The PRESIDENT: Minister, number one, it is through me; two, just stay there. Opposition benches, I cannot hear the minister. If you want an answer, you are going to have to listen to him in silence. Minister.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, I don't know how involved with—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, I have just given you a warning.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am uncertain as to what the former government used to do. We have three former ministers. I forgot the Hon. Mr Wortley was a minister for a little while. I am not sure how they ran their departments. They obviously were a lot more hands on, as the Labor Party would be. They would be—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, sit down. The Hon. Ms Lee.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, no, the Hon. Mr Ngo, there's no supplementaries. We are moving on.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:34): Thank you, Mr President. My question is to the Minister for Human Services about the government's progress on addressing domestic and family violence. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about the government's election commitment to deliver new crisis accommodation for South Australians escaping violence in their homes?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:35): I thank the honourable member for her question. Excuse my voice; I'd rather be in bed. It gives me great pleasure to discuss another tranche in the delivery of our commitments in this very important space: the much anticipated locations of the 40 new crisis beds for domestic and family violence.

We took a rather specific policy to the election of 40—it is often called beds; it probably should be more known as properties, and for 20 to be located in metropolitan South Australia and for the other two lots of 10 to be in two regional locations. The advice we received from the sector, particularly through our roundtable approach, was that probably those specific large numbers of 10 for regional areas would be too many for most regions' needs.

We also have relied on data to advise us about where those locations should be. As I have spoken about previously, we had a statewide round table; that was within our first 30 days. We have had a series of regional round tables where we have been able to discuss all elements of our package, particularly the safety hubs as well, and we have been very deeply involved in receiving that feedback and ensuring that that informs our process going forward.

In, I think, November-December 2018 there were some first response consultations held jointly between Housing and the Office for Women that also looked at these matters. One of the things that the member for Elder, Carolyn Power, and myself heard when we were at these round tables was that people often said, 'Well, we don't know what to do with the perpetrators, so why don't we remove the perpetrators?' So that again has been factored into the resulting announcement in terms of what we should do.

The 40 places will be Housing Authority properties that will have security upgrades to ensure that they are safe for women and families to live in independently. Some of the properties will also be available to house the perpetrator, because what we know in this space is that there is often not a line of sight on perpetrators, particularly if the police are not involved and there is not an immediate intervention order. So we need to be able to know where they are to manage the safety risk.

This has been very well received, particularly by people with lived experience—and I am grateful for the two advocates who were part of our press conference. Their language is very much that the perpetrators need to take responsibility for their actions. This provides an opportunity for workers to intervene in that situation and to start providing counselling, depending on the level of risk, of course; sometimes the police are involved at that point, but we also believe that there are earlier points of intervention that would be appropriate for when people contact the crisis line and things haven't escalated to that particularly unsafe end.

The locations are northern and southern Adelaide, the Murray Mallee, Eyre, the eastern region, and particularly the regional centres of Berri, Murray Bridge, Ceduna, Whyalla and Port Lincoln. So we look forward—75 per cent of those places will be delivered by the end of this calendar year, with the rest of them by 30 April 2020.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister provide an update about the implementation of the government's policy and initiatives regarding the Modbury Hospital, and can the minister also provide details regarding the estimated time frame for implementation of these policy initiatives?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his question. Modbury Hospital was one of the many casualties of Labor's disastrous Transforming Health experiment. Services at Modbury Hospital were downgraded as they were—

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Point of order, Mr President: is that an opinion or a statement?

The PRESIDENT: It's actually the minister's opinion, so he can give it. You may not agree with it, but it is his opinion.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Twelve months in, we will learn something soon.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are we all finished on the opposition benches, because I would like to hear the minister's answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Opposition members should show some respect to the crossbench. This is a—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! This is a crossbench question, and it should—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Show some respect!

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Yes, Mr President, I am entitled to give an answer to the question that has been asked and I would ask honourable members opposite to show a bit of respect to the Hon. Mr Darley; he at least cares for Modbury Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Sit down for a moment. The Hon. Mr Darley does not get many questions, given he is on the crossbench. It's an important question; I want it answered in silence. Minister.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It's hardly surprising, the embarrassment of the Labor Party, in this house when we talk about the Modbury Hospital—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You're the one that needs to be embarrassed.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, please!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —because of their shameful—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —degrading of the Modbury Hospital—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —under the Transforming Health experiment.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: After this question, I am going to the crossbench, so crossbench get ready.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Thank you, Mr President. Modbury Hospital was one of the many casualties of Labor's disastrous Transforming Health experiment. Services at Modbury were downgraded, as they were across the metropolitan area at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Noarlunga Hospital, along with the closure of the Repat. The Marshall Liberal team committed before the 2018 election to support improved service delivery at Modbury Hospital through an upgrade which would include the establishment of a high dependency unit, an extended emergency care unit, an acute medical unit, an acute surgical unit and a purpose-built palliative care unit.

In November last year, the government delivered on the first stage of the commitment, with the return of the 72-hour surgery services to Modbury Hospital, allowing for surgery of greater complexity to be performed at the hospital.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: If honourable members were not interjecting, saying I have not delivered on anything, they would have heard that I have just said that last November this government returned 72-hour surgery to the Modbury Hospital, allowing for surgery of greater complexity to be performed at that hospital. This will also support the delivery of services to older patients who might need more time to recover but who were not able to be given the care following the downgrades of the hospital services under Labor's disastrous Transforming Health experiment. At this stage, I am advised that the surgical specialties provided are: colorectal; gynaecology; ear, nose and throat; orthopaedic; and general surgery.

Last year, the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network established a clinical working group to develop a plan for the delivery of the high dependency unit. The group has made significant progress towards developing a model of care, which has recently been taken up by the HDU steering committee, which is providing recommendations to the CEO of NALHN in the middle of the year.

The re-establishment of the HDU is occurring as part of a \$96 million capital upgrade of Modbury Hospital. Delivering a major upgrade to a working hospital is a very complex process. NALHN is working to ensure existing services continue to operate safely throughout the upgrade and that staff and consumers are not unnecessarily inconvenienced by having to be relocated a number of times over the course of the upgrade.

Accordingly, I am advised that, managing the transition, NALHN expects the HDU will become fully operational in early 2021. The entire upgrade, including the extended emergency care unit and the specialised palliative care unit, was approved by the Public Works Committee in December last year. Construction work has begun, and the construction phase of the extended care unit is expected to be completed midyear.

The government remains committed to undoing the damage of Labor's Transforming Health. As we do, we will ensure that clinical safety is maintained while delivering quality services to residents of Adelaide's northern suburbs, cut loose by Labor as they wrecked our public health system. We will deliver upgrades to Modbury and make sure that the people of the north get the services they deserve.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:44): A supplementary arising out of the answer: can the minister advise the names of those clinicians who are on the high dependency steering committee?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Wortley, I am going to allow you to ask that supplementary again because your own benchers and the backbenchers of the government were talking and the minister did not hear.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Thank you for your very kind treatment, Mr President. Can the minister give us the names of the clinicians who are on the HD steering committee?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:45): I will take that on notice.

UNLEY ROAD

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:45): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer, and also the minister representing the Minister for Transport in another place, about small business and a new government policy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: A month ago, the transport minister announced extensions to clearway times on several main roads into the city, in particular Belair and Unley roads, which I travel on every day along with about 30,000 other cars, in order to save drivers a measly 40 seconds to a minute. However, unlike many of the other roads, compact Unley Road is in a unique situation in that the decision will have major economic consequences on more than 450 businesses reliant on it, especially between Cross and Greenhill roads.

While I was discussing the issue with minister Knoll on Leon Byner's FIVEaa morning talk program last Friday 10 May, I had to do a double-take. Here is some of what the minister said in response to loud protests from the Unley Road Association, which has a very large membership base:

In early March, all of the councils whose roads feed off...the state roads were consulted and asked about what their feedback was.

In relation to Unley Road, the council came back...supportive of these proposals...and there is a bit of a chicken and egg thing here where you've got to announce something to be able to consult on it and...on 16 and 17 April the department went out to consult with businesses along all of the areas where changes are being made.

He then went on to say:

...and the feedback we've received and...the brief I've got is a few days old now, suggested there wasn't much feedback from individual traders.

There wasn't much feedback because there was no consultation, not even with the Unley council, which denies it supported them.

The Unley council tells me that the first they heard about the set-in-concrete decision was in an impersonal email from DPTI on 5 March, which opened with the greeting, 'Hi, City of Unley.' This was followed by a fact sheet sent to the council, residents and traders in early April. My question to the Treasurer and the Minister for Transport is:

1. Is this new Marshall government policy to make binding decisions first without undertaking any consultation with affected stakeholders?
2. Why, after the failure of his shopping hours bill, does the Treasurer and his government continue to treat small business with contempt?
3. What evidence can his government produce that it did engage and consult with all affected councils and traders before making their decision?
4. Will the government and transport minister defer and review extended clearway times on Unley Road until there has been proper consultation with the council, traders, landlords and the community?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:49): I won't be diverted by the comments in relation to shop trading hours. I think that issue has been addressed on innumerable occasions in the past. But the substance of the questions which relate to transport-related issues, I will very happily take on notice and refer to my colleague in another place and bring back a reply.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, that question was well and truly pushing the envelope of standing orders. Can we please restrain ourselves and keep it brief.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:49): My question is to the Treasurer as the minister responsible for the public sector. Can the Treasurer outline the current targets and goals for Aboriginal employment in the public sector, the work, programs, policies and progress towards those goals and any additional information that might be of use to the council?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:50): I am happy to consult with my very wise colleague the Premier and minister with responsibility for Aboriginal affairs, together with the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, for which I have responsibility in terms that she reports—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order: the Treasurer is, in fact, misleading the house. There isn't anyone who has the title of minister for Aboriginal affairs.

The PRESIDENT: The Treasurer was saying who he is going to consult.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: He said the minister for Aboriginal affairs and there's no such person.

The PRESIDENT: He is entitled to say who he is going to consult.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order: the Treasurer is the minister responsible for the public sector and the office of public sector employment is the department responsible for this.

The PRESIDENT: I am waiting to listen to the Treasurer's answer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am indebted to my learned colleagues the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Ms Franks for their erudite explanations of the portfolio responsibilities of the government. We are indebted to them for their advice; we are always grateful for advice.

Having received that erudite advice from my learned colleagues in the opposition and from the crossbenchers let me repeat myself. I will consult with my very wise colleague the Premier and the person who has ministerial responsibility for Aboriginal affairs and—as I was about to say, or I was saying—with the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, who does report to me, albeit that she does have an independent position in relation to some of her responsibilities as the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

I will very happily bring back the specific targets and also what progress the government has made towards meeting those particular targets, and indeed the other aspects of the honourable member's question, and bring back a reply.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:52): A supplementary: how can the community have faith that the minister responsible for these targets can't tell this council very simple numbers of 4 per cent and 2 per cent and what they apply to? How can we take you seriously when you set those goals and you come to this place with no understanding of your own goals that you have set? No wonder you need crossbenchers and the opposition to actually tell you who the minister responsible is.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:52): If the question is how can the community have confidence, let me assure the honourable member that I am sure the community will have great confidence not only in the whole government but also regarding my responsibilities in relation to Treasury and issues relating to the public sector.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:53): A supplementary: what does the 2 per cent figure set as a goal by this government apply to with regard to Aboriginal employment in the public sector?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:53): I have taken the questions on notice and I will bring back a reply.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:53): A supplementary: what does the 4 per cent figure apply to with regard to Aboriginal employment in the public sector in this state?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:53): I have taken the questions on notice and I will bring back a reply.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL REHABILITATION SERVICES, MOUNT GAMBIER

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:53): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about drug and alcohol rehabilitation services to Mount Gambier.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Last week I, together with a number of my colleagues, spent some time in our famed South-East, predominantly in picturesque Mount Gambier, on official parliamentary business. While there I met with a number of people desperate to have a stand-alone drug and alcohol rehabilitation unit established in Mount Gambier.

One brave woman I met with, a reforming drug addict trying to get her life back on track, said she was completely abandoned by Mount Gambier hospital staff and left to fend for herself earlier this year when she presented to the hospital one night in a drug-induced state, desperately seeking their help. I am advised this woman was abandoned purely because she had presented with an apparent drug problem and not a mental health problem.

This was on the back of the city once having the unenviable label, as I mentioned before, of being Australia's ice capital and that the city hosted the federal government's National Ice Taskforce community meeting in 2015. We know that last year the federal government announced that Mount Gambier, for reasons not clearly stated, wasn't eligible for direct funding from a \$720 million over four years program aimed at reducing the impact of drug and alcohol misuse on individuals, families and communities by boosting local drug and alcohol services.

The federal health minister, Greg Hunt, announced a \$20 million funding package for drug and alcohol treatment across the entire state, which will provide grants of up to \$2.5 million to substance abuse services in regions considered in greater need of services. My questions to the minister are:

1. What is the state government doing to ensure a much-needed stand-alone drug and alcohol rehab unit is established in Mount Gambier as soon as possible?
2. Has the minister had any discussions with his federal counterpart prior to or following the announcement to negotiate any future funding that would guarantee the establishment of such a facility?
3. Does the minister agree that Mount Gambier needs such a facility?
4. Given the widespread economic, social and health impacts of ice addiction to a community, does the minister acknowledge such a facility would lead to cost savings to the broader Mount Gambier community?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her question and acknowledge her interest in the needs of the Mount Gambier community. I was fortunate to facilitate a meeting for her with health personnel in Mount Gambier. The Morrison Liberal government investment in drug and alcohol services across South Australia was greatly welcomed. I acknowledge the role that some federal colleagues played in facilitating that investment. After all, it was a commonwealth investment. It was up to them as to where they distributed it. My understanding is that there was engagement with state officers in that process.

In terms of where we spend limited resources, it always will be a challenge about balancing the need and responding to emerging trends. We have seen drugs such as ice having a more significant impact in country South Australia and, particularly as supply waxes and wanes, those impacts can increase and decrease. The honourable member talked about the challenge of dealing with health, mental health and substance abuse issues in the hospital, in the health context. Certainly, when I have been in Mount Gambier, I have met with emergency department clinicians who have talked about the challenges of providing services to that group.

It is an expectation that, as people present at the emergency department and at our health services, they are dealt with in a holistic way in terms of all of their needs. In terms of shortfall of services versus demand, I will certainly take on notice that detail for the honourable member and bring that back.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL REHABILITATION SERVICES, MOUNT GAMBIER

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:58): I thank the minister for his answer. Does the minister believe it is acceptable that people with drug and alcohol dependence and compounding mental health problems are being turned away from designated mental health beds in Mount Gambier?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:58): If the honourable member is suggesting that people's level of mental health acuity might be such that they might be admitted but they are not being admitted if they have a comorbid alcohol or drug issue that would surprise me, but I will certainly look into that. The decision about whether a particular patient is admitted to an inpatient unit is a matter for clinicians, not a matter for me as minister. I have visited the mental health facility at Mount Gambier and, of course, not every person who seeks admission to a mental health inpatient facility will have the clinicians agree with them on that wish. We have community teams as well as inpatient teams. Emergency departments and clinicians within the inpatient units have to make the best judgement as to where the support can be best delivered.

LAND ZONING

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, representing the Minister for Planning. It is my understanding that zoning is based on the highest and best potential use of land. If this is the case, why are non-viable broadacre cropping and grazing properties within the peri-urban areas of the state zoned as primary production when the land is not viable if used for that purpose? Can the minister advise whether this zoning principal of highest and best potential use has been taken into consideration during the development of the design code and, if so, will rezoning be undertaken and, if not, why not?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in matters planning, and I will take that question on notice. It is an issue that both he and I have looked at a number of times, but it is a matter for the Minister for Planning, the Hon. Stephan Knoll, and I will take that question on notice and bring back a reply.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Michelle Lensink. Could the minister indicate how many disabled children have had to be put in child protection care because families have been unable to get NDIS funding?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his question. In terms of the number of children who are in out-of-home care, I think the most likely source of that data would be my colleague the Minister for Child Protection, so I will consult with her and seek an appropriate response.

VIDEO GAME INDUSTRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:01): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Treasurer on the topic of tax breaks for industry funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The council no doubt has welcomed, as we all do, the announcement that the action film *Mortal Kombat*, based on the famous video game, will be the largest movie ever filmed and produced in South Australia. The Premier has in fact stated that the state government's investment in *Mortal Kombat* will enhance the scope and reach of our production and post-production capabilities, bringing the promise of fantastic new jobs for the local film industry.

Yet, the games industry, on which the movie is based, continues to struggle. My question to the Treasurer is: why is the Marshall government happy to give tax breaks and invest in films about video games, but specifically excludes video games from screen funding?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:02): I am happy to take the honourable member's question on notice and bring back a reply. I do know in relation to film that there are existing provisions within the payroll tax legislation that have existed for many years, and as Treasurer I get to see those aspects of industry assistance that relate to film. I think those provisions have existed

possibly for decades, and probably predated games of the nature that the honourable member is talking about, and they have just continued within the legislation for a very long time.

In more recent times, further payroll tax concessions in relation to post-production work have, I think, again been longstanding, but whether they predated the advent of video games and the sorts of projects to which the honourable member refers I would have to check. This was previously the responsibility of the minister with responsibility for the arts, but most of those areas have been, with machinery of government changes, transferred across to minister Pisoni, who is now the Minister for Innovation and Skills.

I will consult with minister Pisoni and his department in relation to whether there are supports or initiatives that support that particular industry and, if there are not, what is the thinking of the current government and—I am assuming that it is a position inherited from the former government—what the thinking of the former government administrations were in relation to assistance or not for this particular part of the industry.

VIDEO GAME INDUSTRY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): Supplementary: will the Treasurer also take on notice and bring back a combined total of the cuts to the games industry development fund and other funds which existed under the former government but which were not continued by the current government, specifically for the video game industry?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:05): Mr President, if you have ruled that as a supplementary, I am happy to take that particular question on notice.

The PRESIDENT: Take it on notice.

The Hon. S.G. Wade: It's either in order or it's out of order.

The PRESIDENT: I don't need advice, minister.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: You don't know what's going on in your own portfolio.

The PRESIDENT: Have you finished? The Hon. Ms Franks.

VIDEO GAME INDUSTRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:05): Supplementary: can the Treasurer outline the scope and breadth of the cuts made to the games industry in this state since the Marshall government came to power?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Well, he said take it on notice.

The PRESIDENT: It's a supplementary. Treasurer.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:05): I think the question the Hon. Ms Franks has asked is the one that I have just taken on notice in relation to the honourable Leader of the Opposition. I am happy to take it on notice twice and bring back two answers, in duplicate.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:06): My question is to the Treasurer as the minister responsible for the public sector. What goals and targets has the Marshall government set for the employment of women within the public sector?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:06): I am happy to take that particular question on notice. I am not aware of a specific percentage target in relation to the percentage of women, other than equal opportunity. I think there are ongoing broad targets that the government talks about in relation to boards and committees, but that is not the question that the honourable member has asked. She has asked a question in relation to the percentage of females employed in the Public Service.

Having come, some 20 years ago, from a previous government in which the percentage of women vastly outnumbered the number of men in particular departments and agencies, I think the

honourable member will, if she looks at the workforce reports that the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment produces on an annual basis, see that there are some departments and agencies where in terms of numbers—schools, for example, are desperate to try to employ male teachers, particularly in junior primary and primary schools, because of the lack of males teaching in those particular areas.

Some departments and agencies have significantly more females than males. Some departments and agencies have significantly more males than females. I am happy to take on notice the question in relation to a specific percentage target. I am not aware that there is a specific percentage target other than, to the extent possible, equal treatment of everybody in terms of employment. There is certainly information available publicly on the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment's website, and I am happy to extract from that factual information in relation to what the current situation is.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:08): A further question: my question is to the Treasurer as the minister responsible for the public sector. What goals and targets have the Marshall government set for the employment of people with disabilities within the public sector?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:08): I am happy to take that particular question on notice and bring back not only what the target is but also what the government's performance has been.

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:09): Supplementary: why did the minister not need to consult with the minister for disabilities or the minister for women on the target set in those areas, but felt the need to consult with the minister for Aboriginal affairs on Aboriginal employment within the public sector?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:09): I choose to consult on some questions; on others, I choose not to consult. I choose on occasions to indicate that I am going to consult with various people for some answers to questions; on others, I choose not to. It's just a question of choice as the minister in terms of answering the questions.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:09): I seek leave to ask a question of the Leader of the Opposition and shadow attorney-general regarding the Keogh matter.

The PRESIDENT: Are you going to have a brief explanation?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order: the relevant standing order must be cited.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, did you seek leave to make a brief explanation?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: No, I sought leave to ask the question.

The PRESIDENT: You don't need to seek leave, but the question has to be something that relates to the Leader of the Opposition's responsibilities to the council.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: It relates to the Keogh matter.

The PRESIDENT: Just ask the question and I will rule.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Can the shadow attorney-general explain why his government withheld for nine years the advice containing the crucial evidence by the state's own forensic expert, Professor Barrie Vernon-Roberts, that no murder had been committed and was more likely accidental and ultimately led to the conviction of Mr Keogh being quashed and compensation payment being made; why the state Ombudsman found that the Crown and the government did not act as model litigants in the matter; and does he agree his government, through the Crown, had a duty of disclosure regarding the release of crucial information to the defence, or are they still in denial about the outcome of the Court of Appeal decision?

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Point of order, sir.

The PRESIDENT: Before I hear the point of order—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The first thing, before I hear the point of order, I would like to hear from the member whether he wishes to answer the question in the first instance and then I will hear any point of order. Do you wish to answer the question?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: I would prefer to hear the point of order. No, I don't have responsibility to the chamber for—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, when you address me you do so on your feet.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: No, I don't wish to answer.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: The point of order is, sir, that quite plainly on the face of it the question cannot be asked of the Leader of the Opposition. He has no responsibility to this chamber for the matters raised in the honourable member's question.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Point of order, Mr President.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are we all finished with our conversation? I would like to hear the Hon. Mr Hood's point of order.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: Thank you, Mr President. I appreciate your protection. The Leader of the Opposition is the shadow attorney-general. He has exact responsibility for this area.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are we finished with our informal debate? The standing orders say that the individual has to have a matter of special responsibility to the chamber. Therefore, the question is out of order. I remind the Leader of the Opposition that in a previous life I did actually answer the question that his bench asked me. He may wish to reflect on that.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Point of order: could I ask which standing order you are referring to?

The PRESIDENT: Standing order 107.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I draw to your attention, Mr President, that there is no reference to responsibility to the chamber in standing order 107.

The PRESIDENT: They are matters that may be specially concerned.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: It says 'to other members', making it clear that it is not members of the Crown.

The PRESIDENT: I have already ruled, minister. We move on. The Hon. Mr Hanson.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:14): It feels like it's been so long, Mr President. My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. The chair of the South Australian Tourism Commission has publicly announced that he will not be renewing his term, which expires on 30 June this year. My question to the minister is: will the minister have any say on applicants for the chair position?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:14): I am happy to answer the question, but I couldn't hear him. The honourable member was mumbling and facing downwards as he finished his question, so could he repeat the question?

The PRESIDENT: Don't reflect on the member. Just ask him to say it again.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I couldn't hear it.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson, please restate your question.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: Will the minister have any say on the applicants for the chair position?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I thank the honourable member for his question and note the service of Mr Sean Keenihan, who has indicated to me he doesn't wish to continue on as the chairman of the South Australian Tourism Commission. It is a job he has done for four years and he has done a very good job, but Mr Keenihan, who is the chair of StudyAdelaide and does a fabulous job in StudyAdelaide, has indicated he would like to do a few other things with his life.

Naturally, when the member opposite talked about the potential applicants, the cabinet will consider some potential applicants in due course. Mr Keenihan will be in that role until 30 June and he will continue to do a fabulous job. We will look at a range of applicants in due course.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:15): Supplementary: has the minister or his chief of staff met with any applicants for the chair position?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:15): I meet with a stack of people every week of the year. There is a whole range of quality people who could do the job. We are refining our thinking and I will take some recommendations to cabinet in due course.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:16): Further supplementary: given the minister hasn't actually sort of answered the first two, I will make it really simple with the third—

The PRESIDENT: Don't make a commentary. Ask the supplementary.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: —will he take any role in the process at all?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:16): Members opposite would I think understand that the appointment of boards to statutory authorities is a responsibility of the cabinet and the minister, and we will be, as I have said twice already, canvassing a range of quality applicants. There is a number of very good people, in fact, a lot of very good people in our great state of South Australia who would make excellent candidates. We will canvass a range of those and I will take some recommendations to cabinet in due course.

As I repeated, Mr Keenihan is in the role until 30 June and, I repeat, he has done a fabulous job. I am looking forward to farewelling him when I join the board in the next few weeks because I do want to make some comments around his service to the South Australian tourism industry.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:17): A further supplementary: is the minister willing to rule out any applicants being either members of the Liberal Party or having attended Liberal Party fundraisers?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:17): We will be appointing the best possible applicant for the job. As I said, a range of applicants will be canvassed and I will take that to cabinet and we will make a decision. We won't be running a microscope across the potential candidates that the honourable member has talked about. They will be quality people who will actually add value to the South Australian tourism industry.

As we know, we are on track to achieve our goal of \$8 billion by 2020. We will have a further target for 2030, I suspect, and the new chairman and the new board will be tasked with, if you like, chaperoning and escorting the Tourism Commission through the journey from 2020 to 2030 to grow our tourism sector and support the thousands of South Australian small businesses. As I said earlier in my contribution, tourism is now the only industry left in regional South Australia that is labour-intensive, so it is a really important industry for the future of our regional economies. We will be choosing candidates—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Through me, just answer the question, the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: We will be choosing candidates who understand how to grow the sector and deliver more jobs and more prosperity to hardworking South Australians.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:18): Supplementary: does the minister have any concerns that the act only requires that two of the up to 10 members of the board be women? Will this be addressed, given it's 2019 and also given the nature of both the tourism industry itself and the market that they seek to attract?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:18): I think currently we have more than two members of the board who are women and it would be my intention to have as balanced a board as possible. I value the contribution of women. In fact, in my own ministerial office, I was just doing a count before, I have more women than men in that particular office and it is a well-functioning, successful office. I have no problems in giving the honourable member a commitment that we will try to have a balanced board.

I think it is important to canvass a range of views, because of course the tourism sector is there for everybody, men and women, and we are trying to promote and grow that sector. They have played an important role. I would also add that we will certainly be looking to make sure we have the proper business acumen on the board as well, so there is a combination.

I would be very happy to have a chat to the honourable member offline around women who she thinks might be suitable, who will have the business acumen and who would be happy to be suggested for a role. They are the sort of things we would like to do in government, to canvass the widest range of people to be on that particular board. It is important to the future of the state. It is a very important role they have, so I am very happy to canvass any suggestions that the members in this chamber would like to put forward.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:20): Supplementary: I repeat my question, because the question was about changing the act not the minister's intentions or his office structure.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:20): Sorry, I misinterpreted the question. I didn't realise the honourable member talked about changing the act. I guess the answer I was giving was that we already have more than two women, and I expect we will have more than two women. I have always looked at some sort of gender balance, wherever possible, so—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Except—well, of course, if I was able to preselect everybody, maybe if I was that powerful, if I was like Peter Malinauskas or Don Farrell or somebody that controlled the Labor Party—

The PRESIDENT: Refer to them by their proper title.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: —in the Liberal Party, I might. We have a robust preselection process in the Liberal Party—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order: the minister breaches standing orders frequently by not referring to people with their proper titles or their electorates, as you regularly remind us.

The PRESIDENT: There are many sinners in this place. Would you like to finish your answer, minister?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I do apologise. I can't recall whether—I think it is Mr Peter Malinauskas, member for Croydon and Leader of the Opposition, I don't believe he is honourable, and Senator the Hon. Don Farrell, but I was referring to him when he was controlling the Labor Party as a union official. But I think we have had enough today.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (SCREENING) BILL***Final Stages*

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

*Matters of Interest***WINE INDUSTRY**

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:22): Last month, I had the very arduous task of representing the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development at the Jim Barry Wines cellar door makeover celebration. Sometimes you just have to take one for the team, Mr President, and I was forced into this arduous position. The cellar door had not been renovated since the winery was founded back in 1959 by Jim Barry and his wife Nancy and, sir, I can tell you it is absolutely superb and their efforts will no doubt enhance the venue's appeal as a fine tourist attraction in the beautiful Clare Valley region.

To provide members with some history of Jim Barry Wines, its founder and namesake Jim Barry graduated in 1947 as the 17th qualified winemaker in Australia and was the very first winemaker to work in the Clare Valley. He is considered a pioneer of Australian table wine and is regarded as having played a pivotal role in defining the Clare Valley as a benchmark region of riesling, shiraz, cabernet sauvignon and Malbec. As well as starting his own label, Jim established Taylors Wines for the Taylor family in 1969.

The Barry family-owned and operated business is now overseen by Jim and Nancy's son Peter and his wife Sue, as well as their children Tom, Sam and Olivia, who fulfil the roles of director of winemaking, sales and marketing director and brand ambassador respectively. Their winery became the first in Australia to have three generations of its winemakers graduate from Roseworthy and the Waite school of oenology. It is quite remarkable that each generation developed a passion for the industry, applying their unique talents to continue the family legacy, a quite substantial one.

One of the Barry family's firm beliefs is that the best wine is made in the vineyard. Over the last 60 years, it has established 11 vineyards spanning 260 hectares in the Clare Valley, two of which cover 35 hectares in the Coonawarra. Maintaining full control of their crops enables them to cultivate fruit of an exceptional standard, with quality that is retained in the winemaking process to ultimately craft some exquisite wines. I do note that I have personal experience; I can vouch for that, sir.

As one would expect, Jim Barry Wines has received numerous accolades for its world-class produce, some of which include: being listed as one of the top 10 Australian wineries for 2018 and 2019; receiving the honour of being named the Best Exhibitor of Show in the Clare Valley Wine Show for the years 2018, 2017, 2015, 2014, 2012, 2011 and 2010; Peter Barry receiving the viticulturist trophy at the 2017 Clare Valley Wine Show; and, further, Tom Barry receiving the title of Young Winemaker of the Year. This is indeed just a snapshot of the Barry family's vast and impressive achievements.

South Australia is certainly renowned for its wine industry, and that is stating something that is absolutely obvious. It has generated more than \$2.5 billion in revenue in the last financial year through domestic sales and exports to over 100 countries. Our industry alone accounts for almost 80 per cent of Australia's premium wine production, yielded from some of the oldest vines in the world, with just under half of our entire nation's vineyards situated right here in our state.

Jim Barry Wines has played a pivotal role in shaping South Australia's reputation for creating some of the best wines in the world, and the family's commitment to excellence and innovation will no doubt ensure it continues to do so. I had the privilege of spending some time with Peter and Sue at their celebration. They are rightly proud of their family's remarkable accomplishments. I would encourage members to take time out of their busy schedules to visit the Jim Barry cellar door to enjoy some wine tasting and a platter in our picturesque Clare Valley, which is particularly beautiful this time of year.

I have a minute left, sir, so I might just finish with an anecdote, if I may. Some years ago, I was in Beijing, well before I was a member of parliament. I was doing a tour from Beijing out to the

Great Wall of China. Members who have been there would know that that is about an hour and half on a bus. I took the bus with a group of colleagues I was travelling with at the time as part of a work trip I was doing; we had a day off. I was on the bus with a few colleagues, probably half a dozen or so of us, and then there was what was obviously a tour group, presumably from China.

I asked the tour guide what these people were doing, what their plan was for their trip. They were obviously heading out to see the wall that day, and I asked them what was next. He said, 'Well, today we are going to the Great Wall of China.' These people were from all over China and, indeed, some were from outside of China, but mostly from China itself. Most of them had not seen the Great Wall of China, so they were heading out to the Great Wall of China from Beijing.

What he said next I thought was astounding; this is back in about 2002 or 2003, or thereabouts. The next stop for this tour group, after they had gone to the Great Wall of China, was the Barossa Valley in South Australia. He said, 'Have you ever heard of it? Do you know where it is?' I explained that I lived very close to it. I thought that was interesting, sir. We should be proud of our wine regions.

INTERNATIONAL DAY AGAINST HOMOPHOBIA, BIPHOBIA, INTERSEXISM AND TRANSPHOBIA

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:28): I remind the chamber that this Friday marks International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia, Intersexism and Transphobia (IDAHOBIT). It used to be called IDAHO, but they added the BIT to the end of it to make it a much more inclusive day. It is indeed a lengthy name, but the message is pretty simple: no person deserves to be discriminated against for their innate characteristics and nor should they be targeted for daring to be who they are. Indeed, it takes quite a bit of courage, sometimes, to identify in the wider community who you really are inside, and that is a very important struggle that many people go through for many years, and some, Mr President, as you may well be aware, do not come to a result of that struggle until their later years of life.

I have spoken many times in this place about discrimination suffered by LGBTI people and, sometimes, discrimination suffered by elders in our community and the insidious effects that discrimination has on their lives. Also, I have meditated on the actions that we have taken as a community to fight that discrimination and what sort of actions we are expecting to take next.

One of the actions that I think we need to focus on in this state now is one of the most insidious and harmful practices that I have ever been exposed to being inflicted on the LGBTIQ people, and that is so-called conversion therapy. Last year, the Australian Human Rights Law Centre released a report entitled 'Preventing harm, promoting justice'. It was a detailed account of conversion therapy practices in Australia, particularly in Victoria, and gave recommendations on how to stamp out such practices in that jurisdiction. The report makes for some difficult reading. On page 30, it describes:

Media headlines have focused on the most immediate and shocking of conversion therapy practices including 'exorcism' and electro-shock aversion therapy. However, for most of our respondents it was the insidious and unrelenting ex-gay messaging that ate away at their wellbeing and self-worth.

The report describes so-called counselling and advice where religious counsellors would tie same-sex attraction or transgender identity to perceived trauma in a person's upbringing or other issues in their childhood. To be same-sex attracted or transgender, according to this mantra, is to have something wrong with you and that there must have been something done to you in your upbringing that is creating these symptoms that need to be stamped out and controlled.

Victims have described the self-hatred and shame they have felt because of this awful treatment. They were barred from their faith communities or they were made to live as if they were something they were not. That was the only choice that was given to them. Many were isolated from their relationships of any kind, other than with their faith community, which was harming their mental health. Too many suffered depression, thoughts of self-harm and suicide, and deep psychological scars.

The Human Rights Law Centre has documented the abuses of this so-called conversion therapy for the first time. We know that so-called conversion therapy continues to harm people right up to this day. Last month, I was pleased to host—'pleased' is not exactly the right word but I was

honoured to host—a forum here at Parliament House where survivors of conversion therapy told their personal life stories. They explained to us just what it felt like to be told you were broken, that you were wrong and that you need fixing. They explained what it is like not only to be told that but to be made to believe it as well.

It has been heartening to see moves being made towards ending these practices in many jurisdictions across this country. Victoria has led the way under the Andrews Labor government, initiating an investigation by the Health Complaints Commissioner and pledging to ban these practices. New South Wales Labor was not far behind, taking a policy of banning conversion therapy to their recent state election. Most recently, the federal Labor Party has announced that a Shorten Labor government will outlaw these dangerous practices nationwide.

The contrast is pretty important. Federal Labor has acknowledged the facts laid out before them and taken a stand to prevent further abuse of vulnerable people. Compare this with the position of the Prime Minister, who last year said that conversion therapy was 'not an issue' for him. When pressed on the issue, after Labor's announcement, Mr Morrison would only say that it was not his problem and he wanted to leave it to the states and territories to decide. If that is the case, I hope there will be a change of government on Saturday so that the federal Labor Party can put in practice its promise to ban this outrageous abuse of people.

The Human Rights Law Centre's report contains a full page of recommendations for the federal government to take action against conversion therapy practices. The time for action on so-called conversion therapy practices is well and truly upon us. I note very happily that the Leader of the Opposition in this place has recently expressed his support for a review of conversion therapy in our state, as in Victoria, and for legislative action if required, which is the same model being successfully followed by the Victorian government. I look forward to a change of government on Saturday to implement a ban on conversion therapy and I look forward to us doing so in this state as well.

Time expired.

HELLENIC PRESIDENTIAL GUARD

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:33): As many of my colleagues in this chamber will attest, a trip to Athens in Greece is simply not complete without a visit to Syntagma, or Constitution Square, home to Greece's Parliament House, the Presidential Palace and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, which is guarded by Evzones, or the Presidential Guard. It is the highest honour for a Greek guard to be selected as an Evzone. I, too, have very fond memories of my visits there, both as a child and as an adult. Every hour on the hour the Presidential Guard performs the mesmerising changing of the guard ceremony in a stunning display of synchronicity and choreography.

Last month, 12 elite soldiers belonging to Greece's Hellenic Presidential Guard, accompanied by Mr Grigorios Prezerakos, their Lieutenant General, and Head of the Military Office of the President of the Hellenic Republic, Prokopis Pavlopoulos, visited South Australia at the invitation of the Foundation for Hellenic Studies. The visit was funded purely out of the tireless fundraising efforts of the local Greek community.

Of course, this was not their first visit—it is, in fact, their third—but it was the first time South Australia was able to have them here as part of our ANZAC Day commemorations in recognition not only of the proud history Australia and Greece shared, and continue to share, as allies in World War I and World War II, but also in recognition of the role of the soldiers in the Battle of Crete, an historic event that will forever bind our two great countries.

As with every year, a growing number of Australians rose to honour war veterans at hundreds of dawn services across Australia. For Adelaide's Greek community the event was even more moving with the presence of the Evzones, who marched proudly alongside their Australian friends commemorating the shared values of freedom, independence and friendship. It was an extremely moving, momentous and memorable occasion.

Much to the delight of the Greek-Australian community, the Presidential Guard also participated in this year's Greek Orthodox Easter celebrations at churches around Adelaide. This included St George church in Thebarton, the Nativity of Christ at Port Adelaide, and of course Prophet

Elias in Norwood, where I joined in Easter celebrations into the wee hours of Sunday morning. It was 3.30am before I left the midnight feast, and I know the Premier himself outlasted even me.

I am also grateful to the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Peter Malinauskas, and the member for West Torrens, Mr Tom Koutsantonis, in another place for hosting a public reception at Thebarton Theatre where the Evzones were a star attraction. It provided a rare opportunity for South Australians to bear witness to this prestigious and time-honoured event in our own backyard, and watching these young men practise such discipline in standing absolutely motionless for hours on end is truly mesmerising.

Such is their global appeal and reputation that many Australians who travel to Greece for holidays make a special point of visiting Syntagma, or Constitution Square, just to see the Presidential Guards in action. Conversely, thousands of Greek Australians who immigrated to Australia over the decades are unable to return to their homeland for a whole host of different reasons. As such, many have not seen their world-renowned Presidential Guards perform for many years, and it was an absolute delight to see many of those very same people rejoice at the opportunity to see the Evzones perform right here in their new homeland in Adelaide.

National pride is not unique to Greece or Australia. Indeed, it is a trait that many multicultural groups have clung to since immigrating to their new homeland in the diaspora. There is a sense of connectedness to their birthplace and their familial roots. In the case of Greeks who immigrated abroad, I daresay nothing represents that more than the Evzones and the Presidential Guard.

On behalf of SA-Best I too would like to extend my heartfelt thanks to the President of the Hellenic Republic, Mr Prokopis Pavlopoulos, for allowing Greek Australians to experience a bit of Greek national tradition right here in South Australia and, of course, for sharing those traditions with the broader South Australian community.

ARAFURA CLASS SHIPBUILDING PROGRAM

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:38): Today, I rise to celebrate the ceremonial keel laying of the first Arafura class offshore patrol vessel. I was proud to witness this important milestone on behalf of the Premier last Friday, 10 May 2019, at the Osborne Naval Shipyard. This event marked the official start to the life of the first of two naval offshore patrol vessels to be built in South Australia. The commemorative ceremony signified the commendable progress made by the Arafura class shipbuilding program thus far.

Last year, the federal Liberal government committed to a \$90 billion shipbuilding program to modernise and strengthen Australia's naval forces. The program aims to build a strong and sustainable sovereign Australian shipbuilding industry over the coming decade. It is a great initiative, set to benefit the South Australian economy through the creation of jobs and a new shipbuilding industry.

The program has already seen the employment of over 150 shipbuilders on the Arafura class program, looking to create upwards of 600 indirect jobs in South Australia over the coming decade. In addition, upgrades to the Osborne Naval Shipyard and the commissioning of the nine Hunter class frigates are set to create and sustain over 5,000 jobs across BAE Systems and the wider Australian defence supply chain over the course of the project.

Arafura class is named after the Arafura Sea between Australia and Indonesia. The name acknowledges the importance of the coastal regions around Australia and their significant role in the nation's security and economic prosperity. It also honours the significance of the northern Australian waters to Australia's maritime security and the importance of the continuing work of the Navy across the top end.

The Arafura class program marks the commencement of continuous naval shipbuilding in Australia, which will see major warships and submarines constructed in Osborne, South Australia, and other ships in Henderson, Western Australia. Construction of the first of 12 Arafura class offshore patrol vessels commenced last November as part of the initiative headed up by prime contractor Luerksen Australia and shipbuilding subcontractor ASC.

Notably, the project commenced on time and, thanks to the collective efforts of defence industry counterparts and Defence's Capability Acquisition and Sustainment Group, the project is

currently tracking ahead of schedule and on budget. Luerssen Australia chairman, Tim Wagner, said that, as the prime contractor and designer for the program, they are delighted with progress so far. He remains confident that all 12 vessels will be delivered on time and on budget for the Royal Australian Navy.

The keel laying ceremony is a longstanding naval tradition that, in effect, marks the birth of a ship. The ceremony invites good luck in the construction of the ship and throughout its life. The event typically proceeds with the most senior naval representative laying a coin under the keel before it is laid, together with the sponsor or youngest tradesperson of the shipyard. On Friday, the commemorative coin of the first Arafura class offshore patrol vessel was placed under the keel by Chief of Navy, Vice Admiral Michael Noonan, accompanied by the two youngest shipyard workers: boilermaker Kane Ramsay and document editor Lauren Pitman.

The coin was placed on a wooden block and laid under the keel. The block was then hammered into place by the young shipyard workers and the Chief of Navy, which created a permanent commemorative imprint of the coin on the wooden block and signified the official laying of the keel. The master of ceremonies, Peter Croser, Assistant Secretary Ships Acquisition Specialist Ships at CASG, defence department, paid special thanks to the shipbuilders and employees on the project. A large number of workers attended the event despite being on a rostered day off.

The turnout of the Osborne workers goes to show the level of dedication, commitment and passion for the shipbuilding industry and the Arafura project. It further emphasises the success and benefits that strengthening the defence industry has already brought to our great state.

FEDERAL ELECTION

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:42): With just three days to go before we decide who will govern the country for the next three years, I want to take just over three minutes to ponder the promise of Australia, and ponder it I do because, to be honest, I have no idea what is meant by 'the promise of Australia'. This is from the man who created the phrase, 'Where the bloody hell are ya?', it certainly makes one scratch one's head and say, 'Where the bloody hell are we going as a nation?'

As a nation, when we look to our leadership in this federal election, it is no surprise that it is in fact Jacinda Ardern, the Prime Minister of New Zealand, who tops the pops when it comes to popularity. This is little wonder when over there, across the ditch, New Zealand is about to produce their very first and the world's first wellbeing budget. In this New Zealand wellbeing budget child poverty, domestic violence and mental health will be priorities.

The finance minister—

The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins interjecting:

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: —was no doubt listened to in silence when he gave his speech on the budget, but we are not afforded the same consideration here. The New Zealand economy has been named a rock star economy by Grant Robertson, with no New Zealanders to be left behind. Yet there, of course, they are facing the same predicament that we are. They have home ownership at a 60-year low, the suicide rate climbing, homelessness and food grants on the rise, but their response is not to waffle on about a promise of Australia that nobody can define but, indeed, to tackle poverty.

The most pressing area of this federal election, other than climate change, should be the tackling of poverty and inequality, yet we know that the silver bullet in that is a raise to Newstart. The most obvious, immediate and effective policy response would be to raise the level of unemployment payments. That is something that has very broad support. It has been recommended by cross-party parliamentary inquiries, the Henry taxation review, which recommended at least \$50 a week, and the Business Council of Australia. Even our former prime minister, John Howard, has argued that the 25-year freeze on the rate of Newstart in real terms has probably gone on too long. Frontbencher Arthur Sinodinos recently expressed his personal view that it should be higher.

The Labor Party has yet to come to the party on tackling poverty. While they have promised a root-and-branch review within their first 18 months, that is not good enough. So should they be fortunate enough to cross the line this Saturday, the Greens will certainly hold them to account on

what we believe the promise of Australia would be, that is, that promise that Bob Hawke once made that no child need live in poverty.

The voters of Australia, however, have not had a great deal of leadership on this. They have been convinced that there is no cause for compassion, with the blaming of those who are in poverty for their predicament, with talk of neutral obligation, with increasingly onerous requirements placed on those living not just under the poverty line but so far entrenched in poverty that they cannot even see the poverty line.

We need a real fair go, not this so-called fair go for those who have a go. It is hard to have a go when you cannot even afford to take up the opportunities that are out there. I note that Prime Minister Morrison, who grew up not far from where I did in the shire, was offered a scholarship at Sydney Boys High. I was offered a scholarship at Sydney Girls High. My mother has reminded me, in these past few weeks while she has been visiting, that in fact the \$800 fee that went along with that scholarship was too much for her to afford as a single mother.

So while Prime Minister Morrison may boast about being the man who gives a fair go and for being able to support those who have a go, he was given a go and he could afford to have that go and attend Sydney Boys High. Many people in this country are not in that same place and it is to the detriment of our politics. We are poorer for it in our nation when we continue these punitive punishments of those we should be supporting.

BARKER ELECTORATE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:47): I rise today to talk about the federal electorate of Barker, in particular the south-eastern part of that electorate where I live. Labor's candidate for Barker, Mat O'Brien, has been working extremely hard across this electorate, which covers more than 65,000 square kilometres. He has travelled from his home city of Murray Bridge to the Riverland, the Barossa and throughout the South-East, sincerely listening to people's concerns.

Mat joined me at many community corner meetings last week, in places such as Millicent, Mount Gambier (where he ran the gauntlet with *The Border Watch* journalist Raquel Mustillo), Mount Burr (where he survived a grilling from local *The South Eastern Times* journalist Fred Smith), and Port McDonnell, where I live. We also attended a number of events in Naracoorte and had the opportunity to speak to many residents about the issues that matter to them.

One thing was very clear: people in Barker want a local member who is focused on the area, not someone who is focused on Canberra game playing, the Canberra chaos that is otherwise known as the Liberal Party caucus room. The member for Barker, Tony Pasin, continues to duck and weave about his role in creating the Canberra chaos that we have seen over the last few years. After all, it was not just Nicolle Flint from South Australia who signed the party room petition to roll Malcolm Turnbull as prime minister and attempt to install Peter Dutton. No; we know the member for Barker played just as much a role and has been central to the chaos and dysfunction that we have seen in Canberra since that time.

While the member for Barker plays political games in Canberra, his residents miss out in the regions. We have seen nothing from the member for Barker, while residents of Keith have had to beg for their hospital to remain open. In fact, it has now got to such a poor state that the local council has had to step in while the federal and state Liberals shuffle and obfuscate.

Of course, we saw from the very first Abbott budget that the Liberals will cut funding for health at every chance. For the residents of Keith, that now means cost shifting to their local council, which means they are paying more through their rates. Yet, we had promises before the last state election that there would be no cost shifting—clearly just another broken Liberal promise.

While the member for Barker is adding to the Canberra chaos, the Labor candidate for Barker is actually out in the community talking to people about Labor's positive plan for the South-East. People value Labor's commitment that every public school in the South-East will receive a boost in funding, from the smallest schools to the largest. Unlike the Liberals, Labor believes in education as a top priority, and every one of the public schools in Barker, will receive better funding under a federal Labor government, if elected on Saturday, than under the federal Liberals.

I was at McDonald Park primary school recently with Labor Senate candidate Emily Gore, and parents there were pleased to hear that their children's school will receive \$810,000 extra in funding. Mount Gambier High School will receive over \$1.3 million extra; Naracoorte High School, which I visited last week with Mat O'Brien, \$730,000; Grant High School over \$1.2 million; Millicent High School \$840,000 extra; Millicent Newbury Park Primary School, which we also visited last week, \$180,000 extra; Reidy Park Primary School (my old primary school, which I visited also with Mat O'Brien and another Labor Senate candidate, Marielle Smith, last week) \$740,000 extra; and Mount Burr Primary School \$90,000 extra.

In total, more than \$35 million extra will be directed to schools in the electorate of Barker should a federal Labor government be formed after Saturday. Residents in the South-East have also welcomed federal Labor's announcement that it will boost funding and give local people access to a specific prostate cancer specialist nurse. Labor's Medicare cancer plan will invest \$2.3 billion in cancer care and dramatically slash out-of-pocket costs for cancer patients.

Health and education, after all, are areas that a Labor government cares about, whereas a Liberal government just cuts, with South Australia's regional hospitals set to lose \$21 million under a Liberal federal government. That is 14 doctors and 30 nurses from regional hospitals.

An honourable member: How many?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Fourteen doctors and 30 nurses from regional hospitals, and regional residents should rightly be outraged by that. The people of Barker need a member who will listen to them. Labor's Mat O'Brien was warmly welcomed at the meetings across the South-East last week. Even those who do not support Labor's policies appreciated that Mat was out in the community willing to listen to their concerns.

I believe the residents of Barker are well and truly sick of having their vote taken for granted by the Liberal Party. They deserve better than that. The Labor candidate, Mat O'Brien, is focused on the people of Barker, not on game playing in Canberra. Let us hope that Tony Pasin's Canberra chaos is resoundingly defeated on Saturday.

MULTICULTURALISM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:52): Today, I am delighted to speak about multicultural affairs, the portfolio that I am passionate about and honoured to serve in my capacity as Assistant Minister to the Premier. I have been very fortunate to have been entrusted by the Liberal Party, in opposition and now in government, to work directly in the portfolio of multicultural affairs since I was elected in 2010.

Being a migrant myself, I know from my own experience that when people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds have a greater sense of connection to their family and are able to readily access their community with shared values, cultures and trust, individuals, children, young people and families from a multicultural background can feel a strong sense of belonging and inner worth that helps them to build resilience, confidence and pride at home and within the community.

With this in mind, I am very proud that the Marshall Liberal government is showing great leadership and commitment to ensuring that South Australia's multicultural communities are well supported through quality services and programs. To ensure funding better meets the needs and aspirations of our growing multicultural communities, the Office of Multicultural Affairs, which is now a unit of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, has completed a comparative review across all jurisdictions of Australia and designed an equitable funding structure that is more integrated and better suited to meet the needs of our multicultural communities.

All honourable members of parliament and multicultural community organisations in our state were duly informed by the Premier, the Hon. Steven Marshall, and I about the new multicultural grants program for 2019-20 on Friday 5 April 2019. It is my privilege to highlight the four streams of the multicultural grants program today in parliament. The underpinning principle and key theme about each grant is the word 'together'. Together is a powerful word because it is about fostering strong partnerships between government and our community. By working closely with multicultural communities we can achieve better outcomes and deliver more benefits to our community.

I would like to take this opportunity to briefly outline the four streams of multicultural grants. The first grant program is Advance Together. We appreciate that multicultural organisations were established to advance the interests and status of members of their community. Our government wants to ensure they have the right structure, knowledge and acumen to sustain the growth and development of their organisations. Therefore, the Advance Together grant is to assist multicultural organisations to improve their governance and strengthen their capacity-building skills. This is a new program which is designed to meet the critical need within the community to build the internal capacity.

The second grant program is Celebrate Together. Celebrate Together grants will assist multicultural organisations to host festivals and events which showcase their rich diverse culture and customs with the wider South Australian community and to build a visible profile to highlight the unique cultural brand of South Australia.

The third grant program is Expand Together. This grant program assists multicultural organisations to expand their capacity by upgrading community facilities or purchasing equipment to meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse communities. Expand Together grants aim to ensure that there are community hubs, facilities and equipment for community members to come together to access the services and programs they need and connect with the wider network of the local community.

The fourth grant program is Stronger Together. Stronger Together grants assist multicultural organisations to develop and deliver projects that strengthen families and communities and improve their access to better social and economic opportunities. Through this grant program, the government is prioritising funding for initiatives that will strengthen relationships for families and communities to work together, foster healthy family relationships and improve wellbeing and outcomes for community functioning. We encourage diverse communities to develop socially inclusive strategies to embrace new opportunities and to solve problems readily.

The Marshal Liberal government is committed to building a stronger multicultural South Australia. I encourage all eligible multicultural organisations to apply for these grants and wish them every success.

Time expired.

Motions

NATIONAL FAMILIES WEEK

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:57): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises that National Families Week is being held from 14 to 20 May 2019;
2. Recognises that the United Nations International Day of Families is celebrated on 15 May every year; and
3. Recognises the vital role of families (in whatever form they take) to the Australian society.

I am pleased to rise today to move this motion to recognise National Families Week and the United Nations International Day of Families. These two events are an opportunity for all of us to contemplate not only the importance of family to any one individual person's life but the contributions of family to our community. This special week is also an opportunity to celebrate the role of families not only in our own lives but across the broader community.

National Families Week is observed from 15 May through to 21 May. This is a time to reflect on what family means. This week is also a reminder to find time in our busy lives to appreciate time spent with our family and friends. To celebrate this important week, there are events held all over the country and, indeed, South Australia. They range from movie nights to teddy bear picnics for the young ones. These events are organised and attended by well over 100,000 Australians each year, and more than 100 organisations take part in the celebrations in South Australia. Businesses, councils, community groups and sporting clubs are all encouraged to hold events and celebrate the special role of families in all of our lives.

The 15th of May is also a special celebration as it is the International Day of Families. In 1993, the United Nations General Assembly passed a resolution which established 15 May as the International Day of Families with the intention to increase the understanding of economic, demographic and social changes that affect families and as a mechanism to encourage communities to reflect upon the significance of families around the world.

The symbol for the International Day of Families embodies the spirit of the day, represented by a heart that stretches upwards and forms the roof of a house. The heart is then engraved in a green circle to signify that the family is the centre of society and provides stability and support. The theme of International Day of Families changes each year. The theme for this year is Families and Inclusive Societies. This theme explores the role of families in advancing the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals, particularly the aims of building peace, justice and strong institutions in areas that have been impacted by conflict, war and natural disaster.

While the theme and focus changes each year, the enduring aim of the day is to continue to raise awareness of the issues that families face around the globe and what can be done to address these concerns at a government and community level. This is a particularly important message for all of us to consider here in this chamber. We are privileged to have the power to change the world for the better and we should ask ourselves what we are doing in this place to help solve the issues that families face in their own community.

One of the most important roles that each family in our community can have is the role of educating the next generation. For all of us, our families, in whatever form they may take, are our first educators. Our families teach us about the world and, through the power of education, families help to build our society. It is my privilege to commend this motion to the house.

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

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:02): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that from 20 to 26 May 2019 we celebrate National Volunteer Week;
2. Acknowledges the valuable contribution that volunteers make to the economic and social wellbeing of local communities; and
3. Calls on all South Australians to thank and show their appreciation to all volunteers in our community.

I rise to speak today about National Volunteer Week. They say that politicians never agree and that we fight and maybe sometimes act a little bit like children. Perhaps today was an example of that, but—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: There is no need for you to apologise.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: No, I am not apologising. But there are many issues we in this chamber agree on, and the invaluable role volunteers play in enriching the lives of our fellow South Australians, I believe, is one of those issues. Volunteering is more than just doing a good deed. It is a gift of something that feels increasingly limited in our busy society. It is the gift of time—time to extend a helping hand to others just because it is the right thing to do.

In South Australia alone, Volunteering SA believes the volunteering efforts in this state is valued at \$5 billion annually. But it is not the economic value that we are celebrating. The gift of volunteering is far greater than that. National Volunteer Week is from 20 to 26 May and celebrates the dedication of our volunteers across the nation. The theme of 2019 is Making a World of Difference. This year marks the 30th anniversary of National Volunteer Week.

This week provides an opportunity to highlight the role of volunteers in our communities. Events will be held across the state to thank the six million Australians who generously give their time. In 2018, more than 900,000 South Australians volunteered, with an estimated contribution of 1.73 million hours per week. Whether volunteering to help those in need or to lend a helping hand to a neighbour, regardless of their cause, volunteering is always representative of the Australian way.

In this role, I am privileged to work alongside some outstanding volunteers, one of them being Carolyn Meridew, who has been a volunteer for the past 44 years, largely being involved in her children's school, up until they attended university, and continuing this tradition today as she volunteers for her grandchildren's school.

Carolyn spends roughly four hours a day volunteering, as she believes it is 'important to be involved'. When asked what volunteering meant to her, Carolyn simply said, 'It's about making people feel welcome and making them feel as if they have a sense of belonging.' Carolyn enjoys engaging with local communities and is always learning by interacting and talking to people from different walks of life.

Another volunteer whom I am lucky to know is Levi Hughes of Kadina. He has been a member of his community's local Neighbourhood Watch for the past 18 years. He has also walked the streets of Kadina for the Heart Foundation, raising funds for the past 12 years. Levi originally joined Neighbourhood Watch after his home had been broken into. However, he now attributes his passion for Neighbourhood Watch to the feeling that he has participated in a good service to the community in educating them and creating a safer community.

Just up the road, in another beautiful region, on Yorke Peninsula, Margret Pope of Wallaroo volunteers for a youth support group in the Copper Coast community as well as volunteering for the local sailing club. Some weeks Margret spends up to 10 hours volunteering her time, simply to support her town, as it gives her satisfaction to know that her time is benefiting others.

Although most volunteers would say that volunteering makes them feel satisfied, volunteering is a selfless act that fosters great contribution to our society. Our state's volunteers spend tireless hours to better their community and are pivotal members of our society who generate the true meaning of community spirit. Volunteers like Carolyn, Levi and Margret provide for a safe and welcoming community that is creating a more inclusive society.

In the volunteering for South Australia in 2018 report, regardless of whether those surveyed were volunteers or not, an overwhelming majority of the participants could recognise at least one benefit to the community from volunteering. Over a quarter said that volunteering 'builds community spirit and facilitates social cohesion'. Volunteers are the backbone of our state. Whether it is volunteering for our medical services, assisting in emergencies, volunteering in the school canteen, coaching a football team—regardless of the service—volunteering is at the heart of South Australia.

While I am on my feet, I would like to highlight another special day that recognises volunteers in our community. Wednesday 22 May is Wear Orange Wednesday, a day to recognise the State Emergency Service volunteers who work tirelessly, giving up their time to serve local communities in floods, storms and other emergencies. Orange is the official colour of the State Emergency Service and wearing orange on this day is a fantastic way to demonstrate your support for our local SES volunteers.

I have been humbled by the volunteers I have stood shoulder to shoulder with over many years, volunteers who have given countless hours to stand for something they believe in. From sizzling a sausage to turning the pages of a student's reader, they are all giving the precious gift of time to advance our great state. Thank you to our volunteers for making a world of difference.

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

WALK SAFELY TO SCHOOL DAY

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:09): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises and supports Walk Safely to School Day on 17 May;
2. Works to promote better attitudes to road safety, public transport and the environment; and
3. Calls on the state government to continue the work of the previous government in promoting road safety around our schools.

This Friday marks the 20th National Walk Safely to School Day, when all primary school children are encouraged to walk and commute safely to school. Walk Safely to School Day is an annual national

event seeking to promote road safety, healthy living, public transport and the environment. Getting our children out the door, dressed, fed and their bags packed sometimes feels like an achievement in itself, but there is one last vital step: getting to school.

School mornings are a busy time in any household but, this Friday, parents, carers of students are being encouraged to rise a little earlier so they can take steps towards a healthier start to the day by walking safely to school. Thousands of students across the nation will once again be taking part in this active campaign to not only remind us to think twice about jumping in the car, on the bus or on the train for the trip to school but also about ensuring we arrive safely at school. This Friday is also an important day for motorists to take extra care on the roads, particularly near busy school crossings and zones, as students pound the pavement to walk to school.

Like most days, my family will be making the short walk to our public school this Friday. It is a short walk but a very busy one. While we probably will not be discussing the physical benefits of the short walk to school, we will, as we do most days, discuss road safety. We live near a popular inner-city school and our school drop-offs are a maze of distractions for motorists, parents and students. We have seen many near misses, as busy parents, carers and students make a last-minute dash to the school gate without the use of the school crossing.

We have all been there, with the rush and panic of being the last family through the school gate, but statistics tell us we need to practise what we preach to our children because kids do not bounce. One in seven road deaths in South Australia is a pedestrian. On average, 68 pedestrians are seriously injured and 241 receive minor injuries on South Australian roads each year. These statistics highlight why students, families and motorists need to be vigilant around our busy schools, especially this Friday on Walk Safely to School Day. The previous Labor government understood this, which is why, prior to the last election, Labor made a \$9.6 million commitment to road safety improvements around schools to enhance road safety education in primary schools.

Why is this day important? The 2016 ACT Chief Health Officer's Report showed that just 19 per cent of kids are achieving the recommended 60 minutes of activity each day. Walk Safely to School Day was established not just to be words on paper but to get kids out of their car seat and to be active, with the aim that families could build regular walking to and from school into their daily routine. Walk Safely to School Day may not be achievable for many students, especially our regional students, but it is a timely reminder to be active.

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

INTERNATIONAL NURSES AND MIDWIVES DAYS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:13): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises both International Nurses Day and International Day of the Midwife;
2. Acknowledges that International Day of the Midwife 2019 is celebrated annually on 5 May worldwide;
3. Acknowledges that International Nurses Day 2019 is celebrated on 12 May worldwide; and
4. Sincerely thanks all nurses, midwives and care assistants for the important work they do in our communities, hospitals and homes.

In the past week, there have been two extremely important events. As I mentioned, on 5 May it was International Day of the Midwife. This day highlights the vital role that midwives play in the health and wellbeing of mothers, children and their families. The theme of the day was Midwives: Defenders of Women's Rights, celebrating and advocating for the many ways that midwives defend, protect and stand up for the rights of women, girls and midwives around the world.

Sunday, which was also Mother's Day, of course, was International Nurses Day. This day is celebrated on 12 May every year all around the world to commemorate the birth anniversary of Florence Nightingale and to mark nurses' contributions to people's health. The International Nurses Day theme was Nurses: A Voice to Lead—Health for All.

The 2019 SA Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards were held on Friday 10 May, with nurses and midwives acknowledged and celebrated for their exceptional contribution to their

professions and their compassionate care for the South Australian community. I would like to congratulate all winners in those awards, but in particular Rachel Yates from Mount Gambier who received the Excellence in Leadership Award.

I thought I would take the opportunity to put on the record Rachel's story. Rachel told *The Border Watch* newspaper this week that she was humbled by the award and that she has had wonderful support, guidance and mentoring over the years. Her current role is the Country Health SA Advanced Midwife Manager, Maternal and Neonatal Services, in the Nursing and Midwifery Directorate where she supports best practice and perinatal service delivery across 20 birthing sites in Country Health SA. Ms Yates is also the executive officer for the Country Health SA Maternity Services Committee.

She is based at Mount Gambier and Districts Health Service where she has worked as a midwife for 18 years. Ms Yates has established country health midwifery forums for all midwives and service delivery leaders. The focus is to improve communication, collaboration, networking, engagement of midwives, professional learning and ensuring consistent and accurate advice is given. She sees her role as a clinical support for all midwives and leaders working in country health, maternal and neonatal services.

Her role requires a strategic approach to the governance, workforce capability, resource management, development of procedures, auditing and review, benchmarking and professional development. Ms Yates also monitors and supports compliance for safety and quality of maternal and neonatal services and for safe maternal and neonatal outcomes for women and families living in country South Australia.

Of course, that is the official description of her role. Any of us who have had the pleasure and honour of being involved with midwives knows what that really means in practice. Having had six children, I have had quite a deal of experience in this and have been very fortunate to have had excellent midwifery services and some wonderful women supporting me. In fact, at one stage, there was a sole male midwife in South Australia, who I think assisted with my first pregnancy.

We need to remember when we are talking about all the position descriptions, if you like, of the amazing midwives and other health services in our state that what that means is real people helping real people, and in this case real people helping real parents as they go through a huge and exciting and sometimes frightening time of their lives. Ms Yates says that she hopes that, moving forward, birthing sites will remain connected to support each other to deliver the best care to women and families in our country communities so that they can be as close to home safely with positive birth experiences.

South Australia's nurses and midwives are amongst the best in the world. Obviously, there are clinical differences between the services they deliver and the skill sets that midwives and nurses possess that also have a strong thread of commonality. It is the humanness, it is the care, the connector of ultimate best possible outcomes. I am told the world of the professional midwife is as interesting as it is challenging, rewarding and inspiring. It has been described like this:

The chance to assist women, families, in the birthing of their children at the most intimate time of life, the opportunity to provide love and reassurance to women with antenatal crises, and to undertake my work with very tiny babies watching on from their cots while newly anointed parents took a well-deserved rest, were some of the most special times in nursing for me. The role is privileged, satisfying and held in the utmost regard.

Nurses comprise the largest single component of hospital staff and other primary providers of hospital patient care. They deliver most of the care prescribed by and in consultation with physicians. Not only are nurses vital to patient care, they are also integral members of the research, administration and management team. I am sure that every one of us here would have at least one story, if not many stories, of excellent care provided by nurses known to them or to their families or friends.

However, not everyone has the same amount of respect for nurses and midwives. We know that without the proper resources, nurses and midwives cannot do their vital and important work. Therefore, it is necessary to consider the plans of the main parties ahead of Saturday's federal election because if we are to value the work of nurses and midwives, we need to ensure that they are properly resourced to be able to carry out that work.

In 2014, Tony Abbott's \$50 billion budget cuts to health had a devastating impact on services for South Australians. Abbott's budget ripped \$600 million from the South Australian health system over four years and, because of the Abbott government, at the end of those four years—which was 2018—South Australians lost the equivalent of 600 hospital beds. Tony Abbott's budget also cut Medicare Locals, slashing services like after-hours GPs, counselling, immunisation and Aboriginal health. That put more than 3,000 front-line health jobs at risk. The Liberals lied to South Australians when they said they would not cut health. Clearly, South Australians cannot trust the Liberals.

In contrast, a Shorten Labor government will invest more in every single hospital in the country with its \$2.8 billion Better Hospitals Fund. In 2013 the Liberals promised there would be no cuts to hospitals, but in 2014 they cut funding from 50 per cent of the efficient price to 45 per cent. Labor's Better Hospitals Fund will reverse, in full, the government's unfair cuts to public hospitals and help reduce waiting times.

It will improve services in every hospital around the country. Labor's \$2.8 billion Better Hospitals Fund will benefit every hospital and every patient in the country by restoring every cent of the core funding cut by the Liberals. That will mean more doctors, more nurses and more midwives, more hospital staff and more beds.

I understand that people often feel, in a motion such as this that honours nurses and midwives, that it is perhaps unwise to talk about the political aspects. Many times I would agree with that; however, on this occasion, as we are several days out from an election, we need to be realistic. We need to acknowledge the fact that whether a party has a major commitment to health care, as the Labor Party does, will affect the work that nurses and midwives can do. I can see some of those opposite groaning and shaking their heads—and indeed they should.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Labor's Medicare Cancer Plan is the most important reform to Medicare since it was introduced by Bob Hawke. It is a sad fact that one in two Australians will be diagnosed with cancer, which means that 150,000 Australians every year will be given the confronting news that they will have to fight cancer. I would be surprised if anyone listening to this does not know someone who has faced that harsh fact, and for many people huge costs are also part of that devastating news.

Slashing out-of-pocket costs for cancer patients is part of Labor's commitment, which also includes \$63.4 million for several initiatives to support patients with lung cancer, reduce the number of new diagnoses, and reduce healthcare costs. That includes funding for the Lung Foundation Australia, for metastatic cancer nurses located across Australia, and for an additional 42 prostate cancer specialist nurses to boost care and support for men and their families, including in my home area of Mount Gambier.

With this suite of improvements on the table to assist nurses and midwives to deliver excellent health care, I hope we can see a great future in our hospitals and healthcare system. I sincerely thank all the nurses, midwives and care assistants for the important work they do in our communities, hospitals and homes. I commend the motion to the council.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (16:22): I am pleased to rise today to support the motion moved by the Hon. Clare Scriven, recognising both International Nurses Day and the International Day of the Midwife. Having said that, I am disappointed that in joining what I thought was a bipartisan recognition of the contribution of nurses and midwives which included no political content, she chose to take the opportunity for a political speech.

For my part, I thank all our nurses, midwives and care assistants for the increasingly complex health services they deliver with compassion and skill in our hospitals, our homes and a multitude of other settings. Each year, International Nurses Day and the International Day of the Midwife provide us with the opportunity to stop and recognise the contribution nurses and midwives make in healthcare settings right across South Australia, and indeed across the world.

As Minister for Health and Wellbeing I frequently receive letters from South Australians who were admitted to one of our hospitals or who needed access to government-operated health services

and who were overwhelmed by the care, compassion and understanding of members of the nursing and midwifery professions. In expressing, on their behalf, my thanks to both professions today I know that I echo the thanks of even more, tens of thousands of South Australians, who, each year, benefit from the care and comfort that nurses and midwives provide.

Yesterday, a question from the Hon. John Dawkins afforded me an opportunity to update the council on the contribution of midwives in South Australian hospitals and speak about some of the activities that have taken place this month in connection with International Day of the Midwife. Accordingly, I will focus my comments this afternoon on the nursing profession.

Nurses are highly skilled and caring professionals who we depend upon at some of the toughest times in our lives. When our future looks bleak, when we have more questions than answers, when we are in pain and cannot get comfortable, when we are frightened or confused about the treatment we are receiving and whether it is having the desired effect—in all of these circumstances and in a legion of others nurses are there to comfort us, to help manage our pain, to calm our confusion and to speed our recovery.

International Nurses Day is celebrated each year on 12 May, the anniversary of the birth of Florence Nightingale, the trailblazing matriarch of the modern nursing profession. Each year, celebrations have a theme, and this year's theme is Nurses: A Voice to Lead—Health for All. As I see it, though, there are two elements to the theme: firstly, the leadership that the nursing profession can and does offer and, secondly, the universality of nursing care and the right of every person on the planet to be able to access the care that they need.

In terms of nursing leadership, South Australia is well placed and well served by SA Health's Nursing and Midwifery Office and the strategic leadership it provides both in supporting the profession as it operates today and in planning to meet South Australia's future nursing needs. A common difficulty across Australia is a shortage of mental health nurses. This shortage is likely to become more acute as thousands of mental health nurses retire in the near future. In South Australia, the average age of a mental health nurse is 58, 14 years older than the general nursing workforce.

To address this, the Nursing and Midwifery Office has worked with education providers in the South Australian local health networks to develop the South Australia mental health nursing workforce strategy. It will provide a framework to address current issues within mental health, identifying barriers within the system and giving recognition for a sustainable mental health nursing workforce model.

I am delighted to be able to inform the council that, following this collaboration with education providers and LHNs, the University of South Australia has advised that there has been a doubling of applications for its Graduate Diploma of Mental Health Nursing. The Nursing and Midwifery Office is providing study assistance support for nurses who are eligible to undertake this program of study, while the LHNs have provided additional places for clinical placements. This is tangible evidence of what nursing leadership is doing to ensure we are ready to face tomorrow's challenges.

The delivery of health services is going through dramatic change in terms of not only clinical tools but also technology, health informatics and digital health. These are areas of growing importance for the health sector and nurses and midwives, as the largest workforce in SA Health, need to be equipped to respond to these challenges. The Nursing and Midwifery Office has worked with Health Informatics Society of Australia, the peak professional body for digital health, to develop a targeted education program for nurses and midwives. This is a national first.

I am delighted to say that 20 of our nurses and midwives have been nominated to form the inaugural group in this program. These are just two of the ways that the leadership of the Nursing and Midwifery Office, under the guidance of our Chief Nurse, Jenny Hurley, supports the delivery and ongoing development of the high-quality patient care that South Australian nurses and midwives provide every day.

The second part of the theme of this year's International Nurses Day is 'Health for All', that is, the universal right of every person to be able to access nursing care when they need it. Last Friday, it was my honour to attend the 2019 Nursing and Midwifery Excellence Awards and to present awards to some outstanding South Australian women and men whose work and professionalism embodies the theme of 'Health for All'.

This year's event included the presentation of humanitarian awards. There were four winners in this category. One award went to Alice Every, the nursing director of aged care, rehabilitation and palliative care in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network. In 2016, Alice took a year off and offered her skills as a volunteer with Australian Volunteers for International Development. Another award went to Margaret Maloney, a founder of the Overseas Specialist Surgical Association of Australia. This is an association that provides surgery for poor people in Timor-Leste and eastern Indonesia who suffer from burns, cleft palates, congenital defects, leprosy disease, cysts, tumours and trauma.

The third of the awards went to Mr David West, a manager and mental health nurse based in Victor Harbor who provides specialist mental health care for the surrounding rural communities. David has had significant involvement in humanitarian aid, both internationally and locally, providing psychological support to serving defence personnel, veterans and those affected by disaster. The fourth and final humanitarian award went to Joy Booth, who works as a nurse education facilitator at the Royal Adelaide Hospital. Joy has been a key member of the volunteer plastic and reconstructive surgical team to Timor-Leste, delivered by the Overseas Specialist Surgical Association of Australia and the Royal Australasian College of Surgeons.

The commitment of these and other nurses to provide universal health care is not only evidenced in the developing world, it can come to the fore at any time in any place, and the cost to the nurse and their loved ones can be extraordinarily high. In this context, I again honour the memory of the South Australian nurse Kirsty Bowden, who in 2017 gave her life when, in the midst of the London Bridge terrorist attack, without hesitation she stepped forward and ran towards danger. Kirsty's reflex was a nurse's reflex; it was nursing leadership at its best and an embodiment of a commitment to health for all. Kirsty's values were the values that South Australian nurses and midwives provide in their service every day. I commend the motion to the council.

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

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILD-LIKE SEX DOLLS PROHIBITION) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

When I spoke on the Statutes Amendment (Child Exploitation and Encrypted Material) Bill some weeks ago, I foreshadowed that I would introduce this bill to deal with the shocking and unseemly issue of childlike sex dolls, a word I use loosely and which I, and I think other members would agree, find repulsive to use in this instance. At the time, I accepted the very sound advice of parliamentary counsel that moving amendments to the child exploitation and encrypted material bill to include these dolls and criminalise their behaviour fell outside the scope of that bill.

The child exploitation and encrypted material bill is still to be finalised in this chamber after it returned from the other place due to the absence of our colleague the Hon. Mark Parnell. On that point, I take this opportunity to wish him well in his continuing recovery and look forward to welcoming him back to the chamber soon. Depending how the child exploitation and encrypted material bill is ultimately resolved, it may mean that this bill will need to be further amended to ensure that childlike sex dolls are included in the definition of child exploitation offences within the framework of the proposed encryption powers.

Childlike sex dolls are an emerging and increasing form of child exploitation material that must clearly be criminalised to prevent children from being abused, as the dolls normalise abusive behaviour towards children, encourage the sexualisation of children and increase the likelihood that a paedophile will engage in sexual activity with or towards children. It is one of the main reasons the

federal government introduced the commonwealth Combatting Child Sexual Exploitation Legislation Amendment Bill 2019 on 14 February.

The commonwealth bill amended a number of acts and sought to prohibit the possession of child sex dolls, as well as criminalising the use of a carriage service to advertise or solicit childlike sex dolls and criminalising the use of a postal service to send such dolls. Unfortunately, as we know, the commonwealth bill lapsed on 11 April when the federal parliament was dissolved ahead of this weekend's election, and it is unknown when it will be dealt with, regardless of who forms government after this weekend. To that end, it is important that the South Australian parliament moves quickly to ban the use of these repulsive objects, which are three-dimensional, resemble children and have imitation orifices that are intended to be used for simulating sexual intercourse.

In March this year, the Australian Institute of Criminology prepared a report entitled 'Exploring the implications of child sex dolls', highlighting serious concerns with the issue of child sex dolls. We know that the so-called 'dolls' are currently manufactured in overseas markets, including China, Hong Kong and Japan, and are designed to be as lifelike as possible. Manufacturers go to significant lengths to offer an array of tailored options, from being able to choose skin, hair and eye colour, facial features and body shape.

Most disturbing of all is the trend towards robotic dolls. Robotic versions of adult sex dolls are already available, with child versions thought to be in production. The robotic versions of such dolls can have a heartbeat, use artificial intelligence and programming to give positive verbal cues, track eye movement and assume sexual positions.

The Australian Institute of Criminology report stated that in Australia in 2017 a significant increase was reported in the number of imported and seized childlike sex dolls classified as 'objectionable goods' under the commonwealth Customs Act. Figures provided by the Department of Home Affairs indicate that, between July 2013 and June 2018, 133 childlike sex dolls were detected at point of importation, although the largest portion of these detections occurred in the 2016-17 financial year.

In the US, in a bipartisan house bill, the Curbing Realistic Exploitative Electronic Pedophilic Robots Act, known as the CREEPER Act, passed unanimously six months after its introduction in 2017. The CREEPER Act prohibits the importation or transportation of any child sex doll. Persons guilty under the CREEPER Act are fined and/or imprisoned for up to five years for the first offence and imprisoned for up to 10 years for subsequent offences. The US act defines a child sex doll as an anatomically correct doll, manikin or robot with the features of, or with features that resemble those of, a minor, intended for use in sexual acts.

The motivation behind the US legislation includes the assertion of a correlation between possession of child abuse materials and participation in the abuse of children. In 2016, a New South Wales man was sentenced to two years and three months' imprisonment for possession of a child sex doll after a District Court judge ruled that a child sex doll could be classed as child abuse material under 91FB of the Crimes Act 1900 (New South Wales).

The Australian Institute of Criminology's review of the literature on the issue of childlike sex dolls identified a number of potential harms. For example, it is possible that the use of childlike sex dolls may lead to an escalation of child sex offences, from viewing online child exploitation material to actual physical contact and sexual offending against children because it is suggested that childlike sex dolls bridge the gap between fantasy and reality. In addition, the sale of childlike sex dolls could potentially result in the risk of children being objectified as sexual beings and of child sex becoming a commodity. Finally, the review of the literature also found that there is a risk that childlike sex dolls could be used to groom children for sex.

We already know that adult sex dolls have been used as tools in the grooming process. In the case of *R v Gommeson* [2014] a child was encouraged to have sex with a blow-up adult sex doll as part of the grooming process. The perpetrator in that case was former police officer Robert Gommeson, who brutalised nine children, the youngest of them just five years old, between 1967 and 1983 in Victoria. In one incident, this heinous excuse of a human held his police issue revolver to the head of one of his victims as he raped her, according to the victim's testimony to the Victorian County Court in 2016.

A parent reported him to the police in 1979 but, shockingly, he was not charged. Instead, Gommesson resigned from the police force and moved to New South Wales, where he offended against a further seven children between 2005 and 2011. Gommesson, who was sentenced to gaol for the New South Wales offences in 2014, pleaded guilty to the Victorian crimes and was sentenced to at least 15 years in prison in 2016.

There is absolutely no evidence—none—that childlike sex dolls have any therapeutic benefit in preventing child abuse. As legislators, we need to stay ahead of changes in technology and we cannot sit idly by when this disturbing, sickening phenomenon continues to grow. We must protect children from all forms of child exploitation.

I cannot overstate the importance of the Criminal Law Consolidation (Child-like Sex Dolls Prohibition) Amendment Bill 2019, which proposes amendments to section 62 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to include childlike sex dolls within the definition of 'child exploitation material'. While it could be argued that childlike sex dolls could already fall within the existing definition, this remains untested in South Australia. The more prudent course is to finetune the definition to make it abundantly clear that there is absolutely no doubt that, in the minds of those even contemplating buying such a crude and crass object, childlike sex dolls fall within the meaning of 'child exploitation material'.

In addition, the bill makes it an offence to produce or disseminate childlike sex dolls, with a penalty of 10 years' imprisonment applying to the offence. The bill also makes it an offence to possess a childlike sex doll. A person guilty of such an offence will face 10 years' imprisonment. I should point out that these penalties are in line with similar penalties contained in division 11A of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. They fall slightly less than what was proposed in the federal bill that was introduced into federal parliament earlier in the year, but I think it is important that we keep the balance with our legislation here. Ten years is certainly in line with the provisions that currently exist for similar offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

SA-Best stands resolute in its commitment to prevent the exploitation of children. This bill falls within that commitment. We are intent on seeing the bill progress quickly through the parliament. As such, I urge my honourable colleagues to support this critical piece of legislation. To that end, I am keen to work with the government, the opposition and the crossbencher in securing its passage in a timely manner. With those words, I commend the bill to the chamber.

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

Motions

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE SYSTEM

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:44): I move:

1. That in the opinion of this council, a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the effectiveness of the current system of parliamentary committees in supporting the role and functions of the South Australian parliament;
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; and
5. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting its concurrence thereto.

This motion creates a joint committee to examine and report on the effectiveness of the existing committee structures that operate within the South Australian parliament in supporting the work that we do. In doing so—should the motion, of course, be successful—it is hoped that recommendations will be made that improve the current processes and structures that surround and support the

committee structure. This in turn, it is also hoped, will lead to a more fluid framework and improved engagement by South Australians with the democratic process and the examination of legislation they are governed by and the issues affecting them.

The motion was born from the frustration of the ever-growing number of select committees currently impacting the resourcing of this chamber. I will note for the record that select committees are an extraordinarily important tool in the toolkits of the crossbench in particular, so I cannot emphasise enough the importance with which we rely on this select committee process, but, again, it is one that is becoming strained. We have seven select committees currently in play since the 54th parliament commenced a year ago, and we are likely to have an eighth by the end of today when we vote on the Hon. Clare Scriven's motion to establish a select committee into the timber industry.

As I said, we are only one year into the parliamentary session. By comparison, in its 57th parliamentary session the New South Wales parliament dealt with a total of eight select committees over four years. One of the limitations of our committee structure is the inability to accommodate participating members, with the Budget and Finance Committee an exception. By contrast, the federal Senate allows for participating members to its standing committees and has done so certainly since I can remember.

The result of this limitation in the South Australian parliament's current committee structure is that should a member want a particular issue examined and they are not represented on one of the existing standing committees, they are forced to move to establish a select committee to ensure that they will be included in the process. This limitation is acutely felt by the crossbench who are much fewer in number and consequently are spread thinly across the existing standing committees or, indeed, in some cases are not represented on them at all.

It is also felt acutely by our committee staff and their secretariats and we only have three assisting clerks in our chamber, so I do not underestimate the pressure they are under in terms of the growing number of select committees. I think we all appreciate that there are only so many committees they can serve on. We also have standing committees that are understaffed or under-resourced and it is of no help if they are left effectively competing for resources.

There is no doubt about the importance of committees in highlighting issues and making recommendations that will ultimately lead to legislative change to the benefit of South Australians. As I have already alluded to, it is absolutely critical to the work that we do. That said, there is no doubt that our committee structure is in need of improvement and could be doing so much more, particularly in the area of the scrutiny of legislation that comes before us.

Parliamentary committees are a common feature of the Westminster system, the basis of our system of government, and have dated as far back as the 16th century in Britain. Committees promote political accountability through supporting the concept of responsible government by providing an appropriate environment for parliaments to be held accountable to the very people who elect them. In that regard, it can be argued that committees are, for the main, concerned with safeguarding the public interest.

Committees also represent an opportunity for members to set aside their partisan views and work collectively as a nonpartisan group, listening to the public, community groups and peak bodies when reviewing and assessing government initiatives, programs and legislation. A couple of recent examples highlight this point and illustrate the need for better, more rigorous and more open scrutiny of government.

Yesterday, together with a number of other honourable members, I attended a roundtable discussion chaired by Ross Womersley of SACOSS concerning the Health Care (Governance) Amendment Bill 2019 and attended by key stakeholders in the health sector, including the AMA(SA), the Health Consumers Alliance of SA, the SA Network of Drug and Alcohol Services and the Mental Health Coalition, among others.

The meeting was—and I mean this in the most respectful manner—somewhat hastily organised due to the bill being listed as the first priority on the government's legislative agenda for the sitting week. During the round table it was revealed that there was a very small window of opportunity between the close of the consultation period and the date for closing of submissions.

When you take into account that consideration of the bill would have had to pass through the cabinet process some time earlier, it begs the question of whether the consultation period for the stakeholders was genuine and whether any of the concerns raised by stakeholders were not only listened to but indeed incorporated into the bill itself. In addition, the submissions provided by key stakeholders to the bill, including the AMA(SA) and others, were not provided to members until Monday and not until the urging of at least my office, despite many of those submissions being dated 30 April 2019.

This does not augur well for the accountability and transparency of government. Only this month, Dr Sarah Moulds, lecturer in law at the University of South Australia, and Dr Laura Grenfell, associate professor in law at the University of Adelaide, published an article in the Law Society flagship journal *The Bulletin* in relation to the issue of the South Australian parliament's ad hoc approach to the scrutiny of bills, with a focus on individual and human rights and with specific reference to the youth treatment orders bill. The article says, and I quote:

South Australia has no formalised parliamentary system of rights scrutiny for bills. Instead it relies on an ad hoc system of external rights scrutiny, often undertaken by bodies like the Law Society.

While these bodies can produce thoughtful, persuasive submissions, the impact of such extra-parliamentary scrutiny can be limited by political factors and particularly by timing.

This means that the community more broadly is often shut out of the law-making process or left wondering how to best draw parliament's attention to problematic law.

The lack of a scrutiny of bills committee, or indeed a human rights committee, to offer a technical analysis of a bill and their rights impact was starkly contrasted with the outcome at a federal level or in other states and territories with scrutiny of bills committees, namely, Victoria, NSW, Queensland and the ACT.

Bills in those jurisdictions would be assessed, for example, as to whether a bill unduly trespasses on personal rights and liberties; whether a bill makes rights, liberties or obligations unduly dependent on insufficiently defined administrative powers; whether any delegation of legislative powers is inappropriate; or whether the exercise of legislative power is subject to sufficient parliamentary scrutiny.

It is unacceptable that in the absence of an intraparlimentary focal point we are instead reliant on the extraparliamentary scrutiny of the bills scattered amongst various government ministers or communicated via media releases. The result is that any scrutiny information is not easily accessible either to us as lawmakers or indeed, and perhaps more importantly, to the broader community. In order to strengthen our lawmaking process, careful scrutiny of legislative provisions must take place.

A review of committees is not new. The New South Wales government examined its committee structure, focusing on the Legislative Council, with a process started in 2015 with a discussion paper which was followed by the establishment of a select committee into committees in 2016. A number of recommendations were made, including the successful trial of a Selection of Bills Committee.

It is time for the South Australian parliament collectively, I believe, to look at our system of committees with a view to making recommendations that will lead to substantive changes for the betterment of the parliamentary process and the democratic engagement of South Australians with us. This motion represents an opportunity to reflect on the current structures that underpin our committees, as well as to look to the future to provide recommendations for genuine and practical changes to the committee structure more reflective and responsive to a modern parliament.

At this point, I would like to take this opportunity to thank our Clerk for his advice and assistance with the preparation of this motion. With those words, I commend the motion to the chamber.

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

JUSTICENET

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the invaluable work of pro bono community legal centre JusticeNet in assisting many vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians dealing with civil matters like bankruptcy, eviction and financial abuse;
2. Notes the decision of the state government to decline providing recurrent funding to cover operational costs of the service has resulted in an uncertain future for JusticeNet; and
3. Urges the state government to reverse its decision as a matter of urgency.

(Continued from 25 July 2018.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:55): I rise today not just as Leader of the Opposition in this place but also as the Labor shadow attorney-general to indicate my support for this motion. It is timely that we are debating this motion now; it remains a very important one. The JusticeNet Walk for Justice fundraiser will be held shortly. I was at the fundraiser last year and I will be there this year, as will other members of the Labor caucus and, indeed, other members of this chamber, I suspect.

This year, the funds raised by JusticeNet through the walk take on even more significance than in the past. We are aware of a draft bill that, I am told, is likely to be introduced, or has just been introduced, in the other place that may have the effect of forcing even deeper cuts on JusticeNet. It is the Legal Practitioners (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2019. We have received advice that, if this bill is passed, clause 5 of the draft bill will change the formulation as set out in section 57A(2) of the act, which governs the allocation of interest accruing on solicited trust accounts.

The practical effect of the amendment will be to reduce the amount paid to the Law Foundation of South Australia from 10 per cent of the funds to only 5 per cent, with an option to reduce it to zero at the Attorney-General's discretion. I understand that 10 per cent of the funds paid under this act have been paid to the Law Foundation every year since its inception in 1983. We understand that this equates to approximately \$180,000 to the Law Foundation each year, which likely means funding for JusticeNet through the Law Foundation will not be forthcoming.

For many years now, JusticeNet has operated in South Australia, funding itself on donations and through the work of other generous organisations and individuals and, of course, through government funding. In opposition, the Liberal Party spoke out in support of JusticeNet. The current Attorney-General (Deputy Premier, Vickie Chapman) in the other place talked at length about the good work that JusticeNet SA does to support those most in need. However, once she found herself in government, strangely, those well-wishes mysteriously dried up.

Now the Liberal government have refused to offer funding to JusticeNet. They have not offered any reason, so they have probably forgotten the good work it does. There are people out there who should be protected, who have done everything right and have just been caught up in a bad situation or preyed upon by bad actors and find themselves at a loss. Maybe they do not understand their legal rights and protections under the law or they have been ripped off. Many cannot afford a lawyer or do not have the skill sets to defend themselves in court. Maybe they are recent immigrants and are not yet fully immersed in our language or laws.

These are the people most at risk in our society who have the most to lose and who are the most vulnerable. They should not also be the ones who are least able to access justice. It is that fault that JusticeNet strives to correct. Through JusticeNet, up-and-coming lawyers, as well as some of the best lawyers in the state, offer services to those in need.

Wherever justice would not be done, JusticeNet can step up to give someone the support they need in times of difficulty. In South Australia, this is done through a number of different means, through legal advice, representation, giving guidance to those representing themselves and a referral service for others. Reports have consistently found that JusticeNet provides a very distinct and real benefit to clients, lawyers, law students and courts alike.

When the self-representation service began in 2013, a report found that every group involved in the evaluation believed the trial had been a success, and there was strong evidence that it had not only helped clients but eased the courts' burden as well, diverting unmeritorious cases and helping applicants get their paperwork together clearly and efficiently.

According to JusticeNet SA's 2018 annual report, they generated over 7,000 hours of pro bono work valued at more than \$2 million. What JusticeNet does is to allow people access to the justice system who likely would not have that access, if not for JusticeNet. I think we can say with some surety that everyone who engages with JusticeNet is better off than they would have been without it and that those in the greatest need will likely get the most benefit. It enables the proper functioning of the justice system, something you would think would be of the highest order of priorities for the Attorney-General.

We would like to see JusticeNet continue for a long time. The problem is that it should not need to do that on its own. It is reasonable to expect that a state government would be willing to be able to front up a small sum of money to help some of its most vulnerable citizens access legal redress in the justice system. I strongly urge the Liberal government to keep in mind the many people who have been able to access life-changing help because of JusticeNet SA, to reconsider the funding of it, and perhaps reconsider the legislation that would deprive JusticeNet of funding. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:01): I rise to speak in wholehearted support of the motion moved by my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo concerning funding for JusticeNet SA and to echo some of the sentiments expressed by the member opposite. It is wonderful to see so many volunteers, staff and members of JusticeNet here today, led by the organisation's executive director, Tim Graham. It is also wonderful that there are so many volunteers, staff and members of the legal profession who support JusticeNet as a vital pro bono community legal service which provides free advice and representation to over 1,500 vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians each and every year.

On that note, I am very proud, for the second time to be an ambassador for the 11th annual Walk for Justice, a fixture in South Australia's legal calendar, which is on next Tuesday 21 May. I look forward to seeing many South Australians taking part in this year's Walk for Justice fundraising event, along with many of my colleagues and luminaries from the legal profession. I will be on hand to help serve the walkers a delicious gourmet breakfast prepared by award-winning chef Simon Bryant.

I think we need to remember why it is we need a walk like the one that is being put on next week, and that goes to the very heart and essence of this motion. Approximately 25 per cent of South Australians experience legal problems every year for which they require the assistance of a lawyer, yet so many of them just cannot afford a lawyer and do not get the help they need to resolve serious and often complex civil law issues.

Cruel cuts to the Legal Services Commission last year by the Marshall government have only exacerbated the problem. The dire lack of funding has meant that JusticeNet is forced to rely on mammoth fundraising efforts, like the one I just explained, culminating in the annual Walk for Justice. The Attorney-General, the Hon. Vickie Chapman, has been involved in JusticeNet's Walk for Justice for many years, helping to raise funds for low income and disadvantaged South Australians to receive legal representation that they would otherwise not receive. I reiterate the Attorney-General's words spoken at last year's event:

Free legal assistance provides vital access to services for our community, particularly people facing poverty or homelessness, refugees and people with a disability. I am grateful to all the agencies and individuals in South Australia that offer free legal services to disadvantaged and vulnerable South Australians.

Apparently that gratitude does not extend to providing JusticeNet with recurrent funding from government. That government, then opposition, committed only to review JusticeNet's funding arrangements or lack thereof.

As we now know, that review resulted in the government's decision not to fund JusticeNet at all, not to fund the low core operating costs of about \$120,000 per year—a small amount, a tiny amount, given the invaluable work provided by the service. I think we would all agree that the funding pales in comparison to the more than \$2 million of pro bono value donated to and by JusticeNet each year.

Indeed, the letter signed by the Hon. John Gardner MP, acting on behalf of the Attorney-General last year during a period of leave, provides absolutely no reason for the

government's position other than to say, 'The government is not in a position to grant your core operating costs funding request at this time.' To top it off, the possibility of one-off project funding proposals was also rejected by the Marshall Liberal government.

It is an absolute embarrassment that JusticeNet receives no recurrent funding from government to cover its core operating costs. It is an extremely modest sum of approximately \$125,000 per year they are seeking. I note that the previous Labor government provided two modest one-off grants in the lead-up to the last state election. JusticeNet has made these funds stretch as far as possible, but these are now exhausted.

I would like to point out that any suggestion by any member that JusticeNet receives any form of recurrent funding from the state government—and we have an amendment to that effect by the Hon. Dennis Hood in his amendment circulated in this chamber—is completely disingenuous. I would like the honourable member to advise who the government says provided the recurrent funding referred to in the amendment. JusticeNet receives a three-year grant from the commonwealth to run a project in the federal courts and that is it. JusticeNet receives zip, zero, zilch recurrent funding from the state government to help vulnerable South Australians—absolutely nothing.

Further, what revenue stream does the honourable member say is projected to sufficiently meet JusticeNet's operational needs? In the 2018-19 financial year JusticeNet had sufficient funds to meet its needs from two one-off grants from the previous government which met its operations for that year and that year only. Those funds have not been renewed. Again, perhaps the honourable member, on behalf of the government, would like to speak directly with Tim Graham of JusticeNet. He is best placed to know about JusticeNet's precarious financial position and what a great return on investment JusticeNet can provide to this government.

Perhaps the honourable member, or other members of the Marshall Liberal government, would like to tackle head on the task of trying to secure substantial donations to the service to ensure that JusticeNet continues its vital work in the community. I can tell members this: if JusticeNet does not provide those services they will fall in your laps. You will have to provide the funding to provide those services.

I do not think we can underestimate how grateful we should be for the fact that services like this exist and take pressure off government coffers in terms of providing services to the most vulnerable citizens in South Australia. I will let my colleague the Hon. Frank Pangallo—and it is his motion—further elaborate on the assertions made in this debate, particularly on the amendments to the motion proposed, in his summing-up of the debate.

With those words, I again commend JusticeNet for the extraordinary effort it makes on the part of the most vulnerable members of our community. I hope that somehow the government will see sense and reverse its decision in this instance in terms of funding.

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (17:09): I rise to address this very important matter. I will start by saying that the government, of course, is well aware of the substantial contribution made by JusticeNet in supporting those South Australians who are disadvantaged and either cannot afford private legal services or are unable to access legal aid funding for free legal assistance. Indeed, members of the current government, both in government and whilst in opposition, as members have already indicated during their contributions, have participated in the Walk for Justice to help raise funds for this organisation.

As you would be aware, sir, this government took a commitment to the last state election to review the funding formula for JusticeNet. While elements of JusticeNet's services are unique, they must be considered in the broader context of community legal services provided across South Australia. In this context, JusticeNet is one of many service providers, each of which has its own funding needs. In 2018, the government's review of JusticeNet's funding arrangements found that in 2017-18 JusticeNet's revenue totalled \$643,264, with \$474,158 from grants and \$122,916 from donations and fundraising. They ended the financial year with a surplus in that year.

As part of this discovery process it was also apparent that, going into the 2018-19 financial year, the organisation's estimated revenue stream was projected to sufficiently meet its operations for that period. It should be noted that another unique characteristic of JusticeNet is its ability to raise

funds beyond traditional means, unlike other community legal centres whose primary source of income is various grant programs administered by either the state or federal government.

In addition to government grants, JusticeNet raises funds through the Walk for Justice, which I just spoke about, private donations and individual and corporate membership fees. These are avenues that are not available to most traditional community legal centres, which also provide vital free legal services to disadvantaged members of the community who otherwise may not be able to afford those services. JusticeNet do a fantastic job coordinating and promoting these events, particularly the Walk for Justice, which is actually occurring next Tuesday for the interest of members.

This financial year, JusticeNet is expected to raise \$135,000 through fundraising, including \$75,000 from the Walk for Justice, at least \$30,000 from private donations, \$30,000 from individual and corporate membership fees, and there has been support from the state government. Over the past four years, the state government has provided over half a million dollars of funding and in kind support to JusticeNet, including one-off grants from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Attorney-General's Department and the Department of Human Services, as well as in kind support from lawyers working in the Crown Solicitor's Office who have donated their time to work pro bono.

In fact, it has been estimated that the value of pro bono work undertaken by staff in the Crown Solicitor's Office has exceeded \$300,000 over the past four years, and the Attorney-General will encourage staff to continue this practice moving forward.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What about the last 15 months of the Liberal government, Dennis?

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD: That would include the last 15 months, would it not? Also, as I have just said, that will be the case moving forward. Can I also add that earlier this month the Crown Solicitor's Office held its third office art prize, featuring artistic works from employees from the Crown Solicitor's Office and other parts of the Attorney-General's Department. A charity auction of the works was held as part of the event and around \$4,500 was raised for JusticeNet just a few months ago.

In addition, JusticeNet has received funding from the Courts Administration Authority and the Law Foundation of South Australia, which provided JusticeNet with some \$190,000 in 2016. I understand the organisation also has recurrent funding totalling \$180,000 from the Wyatt Benevolent Trust and the commonwealth Attorney-General's Department to continue providing its self-representation service in both state and federal courts.

After considering the sources of funding available to JusticeNet and its unique capacity to raise funds outside those avenues available to other similar services, it was decided that the government would not provide additional funds towards JusticeNet's core operational costs at this time. Based on the information provided to me by JusticeNet to date, I am confident that JusticeNet will be able to meet its operational costs this financial year, and the Attorney-General's Department will continue to support the service with our contribution to pro bono legal work and through the participation in the fundraising efforts for JusticeNet.

In responding on behalf of the government and specific to the Hon. Mr Pangallo's motion, I would like to amend the motion, as members would have seen. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Leave out paragraphs 2 and 3 and insert new paragraph 2 as follows:

2. Notes that the operational costs were covered by recurrent funding in 2017-18 and it is apparent that, going into the 2018-19 financial year, the organisation's estimated revenue stream is projected to sufficiently meet its operations.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:14): I rise briefly to indicate the Greens' support for this motion and to acknowledge the very fine work that JusticeNet does. I do so not as the portfolio holder because, as many members of this council are aware, the portfolio holder, the Hon. Mark Parnell, is currently not in the council, but a place that he has been at for many, many years is of course at the annual walk for JusticeNet. He will, sadly, be missing next Tuesday but our support stands strong, and we will be supporting the crossbench team led by SA-Best and funding that team as they walk next Tuesday.

In this place we see people at their best, we see people at their finest and we often see people at their worst in our community. When they are at their worst we refer them to organisations

like JusticeNet because the need for justice, the need for representation and the need for legal support and advice is not going anywhere. It is all very well for the government to say that benevolent societies, fundraising, art exhibitions, community walks and charities should pick up the pieces, but what sort of society are we where people seeking justice have to rely on the kindness of strangers? With those few words, we support the motion and commend the Hon. Frank Pangallo for bringing it before this place.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:16): I thank all honourable members for their contributions. I would first like to address the amendment moved by the Hon. Dennis Hood, which, as my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros has pointed out, is a misstatement of facts. JusticeNet does not get recurrent funding from any source except a three-year grant from the commonwealth to run a specific project in the federal courts, which is the federal courts self-representation service. There is no revenue stream for JusticeNet. What is the revenue stream to which the honourable member refers?

The facts are that, for the 2018 calendar year, JusticeNet had enough funds from one-off grants from the previous Labor government. There were grants made in late 2017 and early 2018, which were to fund the 2018 calendar year only. Those funds have not been renewed. JusticeNet has managed to make those two grants last until February 2019. JusticeNet has had no government funding for 2019 and beyond, and there are no funds scheduled to be paid to JusticeNet; it is unfunded.

They do not have an estimated revenue stream, and certainly do not have one that is projected to sufficiently meet its operations. The only funds JusticeNet has—and one would not call this a revenue stream—are from fundraising events and membership fees, which are minor. JusticeNet has made an application to the Law Foundation, but JusticeNet would not know the outcome of this application until the end of June 2019. This would commence in July 2019, but there is no confirmation that the application has been supported. Perhaps the Hon. Dennis Hood knows more than JusticeNet re this application. Operating expenses immediately needed to keep JusticeNet operating until the end of 2019 amount to approximately \$125,000.

As the Hon. Kyam Maher pointed out, this is a timely motion, as next week the annual JusticeNet fundraising walk is happening again. We will see members from the government and the opposition, and no doubt the Attorney-General will again front up like the thick-face, black-heart practitioner she is, to take part along with the legal profession, in recognition of the wonderful work this small organisation does for battlers who cannot afford legal representation.

Last year, the newly installed Attorney-General took part and herself acknowledged the incredible work they do in providing much-needed free legal assistance for low income and disadvantaged South Australians, yet her government and the Treasurer could not find the meagre \$120,000 to maintain this invaluable service. We have asked several times for them to reconsider, but the answer is always the same: no. Perhaps they figure there are no votes in it and there is more to be gained by giving the big end of town huge concession carrots and free kicks with relaxed shopping hours than worrying about the state's battlers, the jobless, the homeless, refugees and the disabled, who are confronted with the challenges of poverty each day.

JusticeNet SA was established as a pro bono safety net 10 years ago to help people who fall through the gaps in the civil justice system, and provides legal services based in three locations across the Adelaide CBD. The South Australian Legal Services Commission only provides legal aid in serious criminal law and family law parenting matters and not civil matters like bankruptcy, eviction and financial abuse that affect many poorer Australians, but accessing that is becoming more difficult, too.

Legal representation should not be out of reach for the most vulnerable in our community. However, as we are seeing, our courts and tribunals are becoming out of financial reach for many, placing additional strain on the court system. More often, we are seeing people going to court representing themselves, much to the annoyance, perhaps, of prosecutors, magistrates and judges because of the time soaked up dealing with 'bush' or amateur lawyers ignorant of the justice system and our laws. But it is not their fault.

It is disconcerting to hear that the government now has legislation to further carve up funding to legal services like the Law Foundation. The government's mean-spirited attitude threatens the

future of JusticeNet and the service it provides to over 1,500 vulnerable and disadvantaged South Australians each year. It is worth about \$2 million a year, so where will this come from? Can the government provide an answer?

I do hope the Treasurer and the Attorney-General can find a solution to find funds from other sources within the Attorney-General's Department to keep JusticeNet going. As respected moderate American lawyer and jurist Lewis Powell once said:

Equal justice under law is not merely a caption on the facade of the Supreme Court building, it is perhaps the most inspiring ideal of our society. It is one of the ends for which our entire legal system exists...it is fundamental that justice should be the same, in substance and availability, without regard to economic status.

Governments do also have a responsibility to invest in civil justice so that it is available to those in need. I commend this motion to the Legislative Council.

Amendment negated; motion carried.

LIMESTONE COAST TIMBER INDUSTRY

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

1. That a select committee of the Legislative Council be established to inquire into and report on the exporting of wood fibre and other matters regarding the timber industry in the Limestone Coast of South Australia, with particular reference to:
 - (a) whether the exporting of wood fibre is in compliance with the conditions of sale of the radiata pine forests in the Limestone Coast sold by the previous state Labor government;
 - (b) the volume of radiata pine log being exported from the Limestone Coast area by all growers;
 - (c) the economic benefit and employment opportunities that could be gained through additional wood fibre based industries should the current exported logs be made available for processing in South Australia;
 - (d) options for increasing the availability of logs to South Australian processors;
 - (e) the supply agreements between forest growers and processors; and
 - (f) 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 1 May 2019.)

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:24): I move to amend the motion as follows:

In paragraph 1, delete subparagraph (e) and insert new subparagraphs as follows:

- (e) a review of water licensing laws applying to forest estates;
- (ea) opportunities to strengthen the forest and timber products industries in the Limestone Coast of South Australia, and in particular:
 - (i) barriers to investment in timber resource and processing capacity;
 - (ii) opportunities to expand the plantation estate, including greater utilisation of farm forestry;
 - (iii) strategies available to timber processing businesses to secure long term timber supply;
 - (iv) strategies to grow domestic manufacturing;
 - (v) opportunities to maximise returns for timber processors from forest and timber residues;
- (eb) policies in other states to constrain resource for specified markets;

- (ec) the promotion of the economic contribution of the forest and timber products industry to the South Australian community; and

I rise to speak in support of the motion of the Hon. Clare Scriven to establish a select committee into the timber industry on the state's Limestone Coast, which includes the Green Triangle. This motion had its genesis in the House of Assembly with one of the region's local members, Troy Bell, who has expressed alarm about the one-way traffic of logs leaving the state and the country because of the high prices this timber is attracting overseas, seemingly at the expense of local processors.

Mr Bell has also reported that several companies are being frustrated from investing hundreds of millions of dollars into the industry because of uncertainty in sourcing additional wood fibre. Paradoxically, the Liberal member for MacKillop, Nick McBride, made a glowing speech supporting Mr Bell's original motion, then in a backflip that would have had P.T. Barnum in raptures, he voted with his own party to defeat it. This is the one and the same member who wants to deregulate shopping hours in his heartland town of Millicent and refused to cross the floor to represent the wishes of his electorate, the very people who put him in office.

The motion now finds its way to this chamber, but there is some further irony here, because it was Labor that sold off the significant ForestrySA assets in the South-East against strong advice to the contrary. Now they are putting on an air of concern about a situation they helped create in selling off forward rotations of timber plantings to plantation owner, OneFortyOne. As we know, timber has been a significant contributor to jobs and the economy of communities in that part of the state for more than a century. The sector's value has been put at a total of \$1.9 billion, with \$1.27 billion of that on the South Australian side and the remainder on the Victorian side. The sector includes growers, forest managers, harvest and haulage processors, and biomass users, equating to about 2,000 jobs within the industry.

It has had its fair share of ups and downs. We have seen a few associated businesses close for various economic reasons, creating concern amongst plantation growers who then needed to urgently find markets for their surplus product. Now, I am informed, it is boom time for growers as demand for Australian timber hits new highs in overseas markets. But there are fears there is not enough stock to satisfy the local domestic demand, said to be the strongest in 15 years, as smaller processing mills are finding themselves having to now negotiate large volumes of logs they say they cannot handle and pay the going rate, which is threatening their viability as well as jobs.

Primary producers are having to import timber products. Does this sound familiar? The country is doing the same thing with its gas. We are now the world's largest exporter of gas, yet we cannot meet local demand. Australia now imports its own gas, at astronomical prices I might add, and it has the flow-on effect on soaring electricity generation costs and higher energy bills. I spoke about this issue last year and suggested we need to look at a gas reservation policy, much like has been in place in Western Australia since the 1970s.

Should there be a similar policy applied to our timber industry, where a percentage is reserved or guaranteed for local processors? Perhaps that is an area that can be explored with the establishment of this committee. The inquiry hopes to ascertain whether growers are complying with the conditions of Labor's fire sale of radiata pine forests, any benefits from expanding wood fibre industries and what can be done to ensure supply to local processors. It will also look at the contentious issue of water licensing.

There is some disquiet among the forestry sector that the committee would seek access to agreements between growers and processors. I can fully understand that disclosure of commercially sensitive in-confidence agreements has the potential to cause a disadvantage and undermine market position and competitive edge. I cannot see any logic in pursuing that kind of delicate and sacrosanct information, as we would not ask or expect the same from other industrial corporations. After all, this is not a royal commission.

However, I can see that for some, including the government, this has the odour of a fishing expedition. I have moved additional amendments to broaden the scope of the committee so that it also looks at how to boost investment in the timber and processing industries, expanding plantation estates, strategies to secure long-term supply and to grow local manufacturing.

SA-Best went to the last election supporting commitments from the Liberals, Greens, Dignity Party, Australian Conservatives, Mr Bell and fellow Independent Richard Sage to establish the Forest Industry Advisory Council. The council has been formed and is due to provide a report on the state of the sector by the end of 2019. An audit has also been announced by minister Whetstone into growers OneFortyOne Plantations to investigate compliance concerns raised by small processors. However, this audit was a pre-election commitment by the minister and only applies to the past 12 months since the Liberals have been in government, not previously. So will it find anything that has not already been fixed?

Meanwhile, nine companies known as the GT9, which represent over 80 per cent of the sector in the Green Triangle, have formed into the forest industry hub, with \$1 million from the federal government to advise relevant stakeholders on how best to grow and manage the sector. It might sound like we cannot see the wood for the trees and that we are doubling up with yet another inquiry, but I believe a select committee of inquiry serves to add weight and sunlight to these other inquiries.

The South Australian Timber Processors Association supports this inquiry. Its CEO, David Quill, wrote to me last week expressing his members' fears for the future because of the large volumes of export timber and the lack of continuity of supply of raw materials for the locals. These are also the views of a cohort of mayors from the district councils of Mount Gambier, Grant, Kingston, Naracoorte-Lucindale, Robe and Wattle Range who want a national inquiry that would lead to policies that stimulate investment and create a sustainable domestic supply chain. They have launched a media campaign #AussieTimberJobsFirst to highlight the domestic supply issue and the impact it is having on rural jobs.

Interestingly, the local chapter of the CFMEU has not backed its Labor friends on this. Brad Coates, the Green Triangle's secretary, calls it a political exercise that highlights the obvious, and that is, fibre exports equals job exports. However, what he does want is an inquiry into the restrictive water licensing laws for plantations because that could result in a 25 per cent reduction in plantation estate over the next 15 years. Is there enough scientific evidence that the forests are affecting the region's water table?

Shrinking our forests is at odds with current federal policy to increase the country's forestry estate by 400,000 hectares, or a billion trees, to fight climate change, which means the South-East of our state could miss out on a golden opportunity to secure a long-term viable future for the forestry industry. This is an area the committee must also explore. I commend the motion to the chamber.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:35): It gives me great pleasure to rise today in support of the proposal by Labor's shadow forestry minister to establish a select committee into examining the economic benefits of greater domestic processing and options to improve timber supply to the industry of the Limestone Coast.

I have always believed that good industry policy is consistent industry policy. I have always believed that good industry policy recognises that more than just economic value, primary industry builds community value, and it does it in a key way that we do not always see in our more buzzword, innovative sectors. Primary industry builds regional towns, and it builds them in a way that few other sectors can or historically have, often with the targeted support of government as well as the prudent work of private interests. Labor's proud history of support for many primary industry sectors, such as steel, smelting, mining and grain, shows that they understand the importance of industry generally to our state, as do I, and again Labor and I support it here, this time with respect to the forestry industry.

As I have said can often happen with primary industry, we see the economic and community values of industry coming together in the forestry industry here, this time specifically on our Limestone Coast. There we see how vital the industry is to the South Australian economy, being a major employer on the Limestone Coast, with 22,000 South Australians employed directly and indirectly. What a great industry! It is a thriving community of people and families who bond together and in doing so contribute over \$2 billion per year to the South Australian economy—\$2 billion.

It is worth noting that the issues surrounding the industry that led to the call for the establishment of this committee are not only being led by the shadow forestry minister and her excellent understanding of her community but also by the industry itself. In particular, I note that the

South Australian Timber Processors Association have been leading the charge for a parliamentary inquiry to be set up to address these concerns, along with a number of South-East local government councils who share similar concerns.

I am aware that the South Australian Timber Processors Association are concerned about things like the volume of logs being exported and the lack of continuity of supply of raw materials to the region's timber processors. This lack of supply to their processors is restricting potential growth at their processing facilities as well as restricting investments in their region which could bolster their economy and create further job opportunities.

May I add that these concerns are not just recent ones. The volume and value of logs harvested in Australia were the lowest in a decade only half a decade ago, but this is not a reason not to act. The fact is that volatility in many primary industries can affect those sectors just as violently—and the communities that rely upon them—with fluctuations in the value of logs or timber of over 5 per cent year on year.

The fact is that the issues of the value of timber, the supply of timber and the domestic processing of timber are all something that require monitoring and planning by both the private and sector and government. I know that industry supports this motion. I know that local government representatives in the community support this motion. I know the community supports this motion, and I know Labor supports this motion.

So who else does? I understand this motion has the backing of one of the state's South-East members, the member for Mount Gambier. The member for Mount Gambier also tried to introduce a similar proposal in the other place, but it was defeated by the Marshall Liberal government. I pause to note here that refusing to support primary industry is not entirely out of step for the Marshall Liberal government, unfortunately.

By this I mean that this government, in having voted down this motion in the other place, is maintaining a hands-off-the wheel approach to industry policy and public investment in our regions that started with Arrium and appears to be continuing with its negative attitude and comments to Nyrstar, which have been made in this place, and its refusal to support regional farmers suffering from significant drought conditions.

So we saw the continuation of this cavalier attitude to primary industry, which ignores not only the legitimate concerns of industry but also the concerns of the community and the opportunity for good government policy that can often develop out of the intersection of the two. But here, I have to note, the member for Mount Gambier was not alone in standing up for his community.

What is interesting about the Liberal Party voting down a very similar motion in the other place is that another MP representing a large part of the forestry industry in the South-East, the member for MacKillop, when debating this issue in the other place said:

I believe that a select committee would provide a transparent and bipartisan approach to support a regional industry...

Sounds like me. The member for MacKillop went on and stated:

...I believe, as do my constituents, that we need to take one further step and support the motion to establish a select committee for the purposes described by the member for Mount Gambier.

Outstanding.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: So how did he vote?

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: What followed, though, as the Hon. Clare Scriven has inquired, is a good indication of the hunger games that is so common in the Liberal Party these days. Unbelievably, after speaking in favour of it, the member for MacKillop actually voted against the proposal to establish a select committee, no doubt much to the disappointment and anger of his constituents.

For a party that likes to talk a lot on social media about how regions matter, they sure are doing a lot to let down the regions and ignore what they are saying—drought conditions, Nyrstar, Arrium and now, of course, the forestry industry. And don't they love to talk about it when they are

wrong. For a party that likes to talk a lot on social media, they sure do get it wrong a lot outside of this place.

Such is their contempt for motions, such as establishing this committee, that, after voting down the motion in the other place, the Marshall government's minister for agriculture actually wrote to the South-East paper *The Border Watch*, where he attacked the shadow minister for forestry for introducing this motion to establish a select committee. The minister actually said, on the establishment of this committee, that it would 'make a mockery out of the proud forest industry in South Australia'. Then, bizarrely, recently, we learnt that the Marshall Liberal government would be proposing to support the establishment of the select committee in an amended form.

The fact is that what we see here is a flip-flop, and we see it from this Marshall government in a way that does not support good industry policy. They have flip-flopped on this issue more times than the poor member for MacKillop has. It really is a worry. At least the Liberal Party should be worried but not necessarily about what I am saying. It should be worried about its regional voting base; those who often work in primary industries like forestry live in the regions.

The cavalier attitude that they display again here today, and interrupting me during my speech, has seen them lose four of their supposed regional seat strongholds to Labor or Independents—four of them—Independents like the member for Mount Gambier, who took no backward steps in backing his community and his local industry, unlike those opposite.

This motion is fundamentally about the importance of the forestry industry to the Limestone Coast region and the huge contribution the industry makes to the state's economy—\$2 billion. Any measure taken to support the industry, such as the establishment of this committee, which has the support of the forestry industry, should also be supported. Forestry is one of the most significant industries in our regional economy and the communities that surround it, and it is important that we do everything we can to support that industry and those who work and live around it.

As I foreshadowed earlier, concerns have been raised about the ability of processors to access timber supply, particularly small processors but also new businesses wanting to establish facilities in the region and create jobs. This select committee will look at the extent of the problem and explore possible solutions, the Hon. Mr Stephens—it will do that. It is about looking at the best future for the industry and supporting local jobs. This select committee is supported by many within the industry and across the local community.

This is an opportunity to produce greater understanding across all of the region's forestry industry members and look at how timber availability can be better managed for the better management of the area. We need to have the right balance between local jobs, business needs and shareholder needs. I support this motion.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:44): I rise to speak about this motion to establish a select committee to examine the economic benefits of greater domestic processing and options to improve timber supply to the industry on the Limestone Coast. I also note that this committee has very strong support from the very popular member for Mount Gambier, who is very keen to get the select committee on its way.

My Labor colleagues and I understand the importance of the forestry industry to our state and the Limestone Coast. We especially understand how vital the industry is to the economy, being a major employer on the Limestone Coast, with 22,000 South Australians employed both directly and indirectly.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Mr President, I cannot even hear myself talk, let alone—

The PRESIDENT: Order on the government benches!

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I don't need advice from you seated, the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: The industry contributes around \$2 billion per year to the South Australian economy. The Hon. Ms Scriven has in recent weeks met with the relevant stakeholders

around the purpose and terms of reference of this committee. I, myself, have received correspondence from the councils around the South-East and the Limestone Coast, as well as the South Australian Timber Processors Association in which they expressed their concern for the future of the forestry industry.

The South Australian Timber Processors Association in their letter have voiced their concerns about the current state of the industry and the lack of supply of raw materials to the region's timber processors. The association is concerned that the lack of supply is restricting their potential growth which would be of benefit to the local communities and in turn would also benefit the state's economy and create further jobs on the Limestone Coast.

Labor wants to ensure that we have a healthy and strong forestry industry so that it will continue to grow and create jobs in the region. We believe that any action that can be taken to support the industry is a worthwhile action and should be supported. It is a shame that the state government has refused to do so. I know that the member for Mount Gambier, who is in the chamber today, moved a similar motion in the other place which unfortunately did not receive support from state government.

The Hon. Mr Pangallo has moved an amendment that expands the areas for consideration, and we are happy to support that. In failing to support the proposed terms of this motion, the state government is letting down the people of the South-East. I remind those opposite that all members here represent the South-East and call upon them to represent their constituents by supporting this motion. Unlike those opposite, Labor is listening. We have heard the concerns of the industry and residents of the South-East. We are standing up for them in moving this motion. I commend the motion to the council.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:47): I rise very briefly to put the Greens' support for the establishment of the select committee on record. I commend the Hon. Clare Scriven for bringing this matter before this place. It has certainly been something that is of grave community concern on the Limestone Coast. We have had many representations both for and against, but overwhelmingly for such a select committee. I note that we will be supporting the amendments placed before this council of the Hon. Frank Pangallo.

Before I sit down, I ask that the government provide advice on who wrote their amendments because they are very much the same, almost word for word, as those on a track changes document provided to the Greens in the name of Laurie Hein, with the only difference being that the phrase 'any other related matters' that he had sought to delete is still on this government amendment.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (17:48): I am very happy to rise to speak and I indicate that we will not be moving our amendment which the Hon. Tammy Franks referred to. I might leave some remarks around who actually sold the forests and who really cared for the industry until the end because I am sure that will distract members. Unlike the Labor Party, the Marshall Liberal government has a plan for the forestry sector. It is a good plan because it has been informed directly from industry.

Before the state election, the industry asked for the Forest Industry Advisory Council. We have delivered on this, and they have started their work. The forestry sector directly employs some 5,500 people and indirectly supports the employment of another 12,500 people, totalling some 18,000 people. The Marshall Liberal government is 100 per cent focused on providing a stable investment environment for the forestry sector and is focused on growing the entire sector, including domestic manufacturing.

We are focused on delivering outcomes on the ground to the sector in the Green Triangle. The Marshall government has delivered on its key election commitment to the forestry industry by establishing the Forest Industry Advisory Council.

The council membership was announced on 13 December last year and includes: Wendy Fennell, managing director of Fennell Forestry; Mark Rogers, managing director of New Forests; Laurie Hein, managing director of Green Triangle Forest Products; Jill Stone, farm forester and owner of Three Streams Farm; Ian McDonnell, managing director of NF McDonnell and Sons; Linda Sewell, chief executive officer of OneFortyOne Plantations; Ian Tyson, chief executive officer of Timberlink Australia; Tammy Auld, chair of the National Institute of Forest Products Innovation; Martin Crevatin,

national operations manager at PF Olsen Australia; Peter Badenoch, Plantation Treated Timber; and Emma Daly, executive manager for people and culture and director of Bio Gro.

This group met in April. It is scheduled to meet again in June, and is working at providing specific recommendations back to the government on how to grow the sector by the end of this year. It was clear from the first meeting that measures to grow the plantation estate and domestic manufacturing will be a key theme of that advice.

The federal Forestry Industry Advisory Council provided its advice to the federal Coalition government, which resulted in the National Forest Industries Plan, a \$20 million plan to grow the sector and plant a billion new plantation trees. A key ask from the industry was that the federal government acknowledge 'forestry hubs' in regions where plantations and manufacturing are located within economic distance. In the National Forestry Industries Plan the federal government said it would recognise a pilot hub.

Last year, a group of nine forest industry companies in the Green Triangle organised in anticipation of the federal government's forestry hub announcement. The members are AKD Softwoods, NF McDonnell and Sons, New Forests, Green Triangle Forest Products, Australian Bluegum Plantations, Timberlink, Borg Manufacturing, Hancock Victorian Plantations and OneFortyOne. Off its own back this industry group has self-funded several research projects, including the economic contribution of the forest industry to the region.

With the assistance of Ernst and Young they are currently developing a 35-year Green Triangle forestry industry strategic plan. The plan focuses on growing the sector, and may work to fast track advice to government on this issue. Just last month strong forestry advocate and Liberal member for Barker, Tony Pasin, announced that another million dollars of funding will be provided to the Green Triangle Forestry Industry Hub. This funding will be used to complete the strategic plan.

Last year, minister Whetstone met with the South Australian Timber Processors Association, which represents three small processors from the Green Triangle. At this meeting the association raised concerns with the minister that OneFortyOne was not complying with their agreement with the state government. Minister Whetstone committed to the association, during that meeting, to undertake an audit of OneFortyOne's compliance for the 2018 year, focused on the concerns of these processors.

Once the annual compliance report was lodged with PIRSA, as set out in the lease agreement, independent auditors BDO Advisory were appointed to undertake the independent audit of the plantation lease agreement with OneFortyOne. BDO has partnered with specialist forestry sector advisory firm Indufor to undertake the independent audit. Both BDO Advisory and Indufor have extensive experience and capabilities to undertake an audit of this nature.

The Indufor team working on the audit has 71 collective years' experience in the forestry industry. The South Australian Timber Processors Association wanted the auditor to be experienced in forestry, and we have delivered on this. The audit is a comprehensive process that will focus on their compliance with conditions attached to the plantation lease agreement it has with the state, particularly those relating to domestic sawlog supply.

The areas to be covered in the audit will include whether OneFortyOne has met the following requirements during 2018:

- the area weighted average clear fall age;
- the tender process for uncontracted sawlog in excess of planned viable domestic supply;
- the sale contract lengths for sawlog exports; and
- the amount of sawlog and pulp log exported and if those logs were appropriately classified.

In addition, a review of the ancillary confidential documents between the state and OneFortyOne, including agreements, deeds, contracts or similar, will be undertaken to determine whether those documents contain any undertakings relating to the supply of product to domestic manufacturers not

covered by the lease, and whether those undertakings, if they exist, have been adhered to for the calendar year 2018.

We actually welcome the Labor Party's new interest in the forestry sector. When asked by the sector during the last election, the Labor Party had no plan at all for the forestry sector. During the last Labor government we could not even find a member on the Labor side who would co-chair a parliamentary friends of the forest group.

How things have changed. Now we have a shadow minister keen to meddle and play political games at the expense of the industry. If asked now, the industry probably preferred it when the Labor Party did not—

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Point of order: the speaker just reflected improperly on the motives of the mover of this motion.

The PRESIDENT: Restrain your enthusiasm for reflection.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It is a substantive motion. I think I am allowed to—

The PRESIDENT: I ask you to restrain yourself.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: If asked now, it probably would have preferred if the Labor Party did not know that forestry existed. On 21 March this year, the member for McKillop and the shadow forestry minister launched the Parliamentary Friends of Forestry. At the launch there was talk about the need to avoid partisan politics with the sector, which has suffered much from that approach. I know that the member for MacKillop meant those words, and he takes seriously his role to advocate for the forestry industry in his electorate.

On 4 April this year, exactly two weeks before talking about the need for a bipartisan approach, the shadow forestry minister was in the house laying on the table the motion for this select committee, and we all know the political reasons. The South-East knows it, the whole forestry industry knows it, and it is disappointing that the sector has been betrayed by somebody who worked in the forestry sector.

It is interesting to note: I was recently made aware of some comments made by the shadow minister and the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Peter Malinauskas, in Mount Gambier, where they said that this sale was regrettable. They said that it was not a good outcome. I just want to recap. It was the member for Mount Gambier, many years ago, a minister in a Labor government, who opened the door for the then treasurer, Kevin Foley, I think as the minister at the time said, 'to have a creative look' at the revenue from—not the forward rotations, but a 'creative look at how they could use the forward revenue'. And we have had a number of committees.

It is interesting that the then premier, the Hon. Jay Weatherill, said at one stage that he would love to have a 'future fund' for South Australia, something we could invest in for our children's future and our community's future. But then they went ahead and sold the forests. One of the investing partners is the Australian Future Fund; so it was good enough for the nation to invest in our forests, and this mob had to sell it.

I was really interested to see the comments made by the Hon. Clare Scriven and Mr Peter Malinauskas, the Leader of the Opposition, that, 'Oh, but this decision was made before we were in parliament.' Well, I remind members that Mr Peter Malinauskas was the head of the SDA, the most powerful union in the state. He had the power to walk into Mike Rann's office and sack him as Premier. He could have stood up at any one of at least five, if not 10, state conferences and moved a resolution not to sell the state's forests. Any one of these members opposite could have done that.

The Hon. Clare Scriven, who worked in the industry, could have done that. I am sure the Hon. Russell Wortley, I am sure the Hon. Ian Hunter, the Hon. Justin Hanson—

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: On a point of order, Mr President: I draw your attention to standing order 186:

The President may call attention to the conduct of a Member who persists in continued irrelevance, prolixity or tedious repetition, and may direct such Member to discontinue speaking and to be seated.

The PRESIDENT: With respect, the Hon. Ms Franks, I do not think the Hon. Mr Ridgway quite got to that point, but—

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I am talking about—

The PRESIDENT: I have ruled in your favour, the Hon. Mr Ridgway; it is not a debate, but you are aggravating me with your constant references to the Hon. Mr Malinauskas. Please refer to him either as the Leader of the Opposition in the other place or by his correct title with the seat in which he was elected.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I do not need anyone else putting in their two cents' worth.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: In relation to Mr Peter Malinauskas as the member for Croydon and Leader of the Opposition, I do not believe he is entitled to the title 'honourable'.

The PRESIDENT: No, I was not asking for him to be called 'honourable'. I am asking you to call him by his seat.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: What I am trying to point out, Mr President, is that these people opposite, all lovely energetic stalwarts of the Labor Party, sat silently at every state conference while Kevin Foley and the team sold the forests. They sat silently. We were ones that kept—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: There were log trucks out the front of this place and you sat there and did nothing. You were probably even in cabinet. You were just happy to sit there and let it go.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, they hate it when you bring back the truth. They were the ones who sold the forests. You were the ones to blame for this. We warned you against it. You sold it for a fraction of its value to build Adelaide Oval and now you are trying to reinvent history. They go down to Mount Gambier and say, 'Oh, it was a bad idea.' Give me a break! We had warned them, they did not listen—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: The South-East people are not stupid.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: That's right, the South-East people are not stupid. They know who sold the forests. We warned them against it. When this mob opposite were in government they did not want to listen and so here we are today with an industry that is very concerned—a \$2 billion industry—and they laugh, they think it is a joke. You sold it, your lot sold it. You were members of the Labor Party, in those state conferences, and you could have done something against it. You did nothing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: You have no credibility in the South-East, none of you.

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

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: None of them, Mr President. So we will support the Hon. Frank Pangallo's amendment to this select committee and we are happy to see it progress, but I would point out to members opposite that they have no credibility in the South-East. They were the ones who sold it. They turned their back on the South-East. Most of them do not even know where it is. More people on this side of the chamber live in the South-East than on that side of the chamber. With those few words, we will support the amendment and support the establishment of the select committee.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (17:59): I find it quite remarkable that the Labor side is being accused of political games and partisanship after the diatribe that we have just heard.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Can the government benchers restrain themselves? The Hon. Ms Scriven is summing up the debate. It is not a repechage. Please sum up the debate.

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, you are a minister, act like a minister.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: He does not know how.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven, it is a summing-up of the debate; it is not a further engagement in the debate.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Indeed. Thank you for your direction, Mr President. I would like to thank for their contributions the Hon. Frank Pangallo, the Hon. Justin Hanson, the Hon. Russell Wortley, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Mr Ridgway. I would also like to thank the member for Mount Gambier for bringing an almost identical motion to the other place. I will just sum up to point out the incredible flip-flops that we have seen from the government on this. We had the member for MacKillop in the other place talking about how keen and important it was that this committee should progress. He then voted against it.

We brought it here to this chamber and we have seen the government attempt to move an amendment that would actually change all of the terms of reference and be replaced with their own. They then advise us today that they are not progressing with that. The terms of reference are obviously included in the Hon. Mr Pangallo's amendments and the Labor opposition is happy to support them. The toing and froing from the government benchers on this in both this chamber and in the other place has been absolutely remarkable, and it is incredible that they then say—and what I would point out too is that—

The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Ridgway, please cloak yourself with restraint and be demure.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I would point out that the motion that I have brought to this chamber does not seek to take out those parts for which the Labor Party will be criticised, so to suggest that we are trying to be partisan and that we are trying to play political games is incredibly ironic. The part that was originally proposed to be removed by the Liberal government in their amendment, which they are now not proceeding with, was the very part that we may have reason to have a lot of criticism about.

I think it is a shame that in fact the Liberal government is making this a political football. There was no need for it to be. They could have supported the motion of the member for Mount Gambier. If they so desired, they could have referred it to a standing committee in the other place. I note that the Hon. Mr Stephens said that apparently it must be political because we were attacking the member for MacKillop. When someone says that they fully support something that their constituents want and then vote against it, I do not think that person needs any help from us in order to make the front page of the local media.

I will now return to the substance of the motion, including the amendments—

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Stephens, please!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —by the Hon. Mr Pangallo, which we will be supporting. It is to support the industry, it is to look at solutions going forward, it is to look at where we are now as well as where we have been, and to look for ways to support local processes and to support the development of the industry. I therefore commend the motion to the chamber.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Scriven, your work is not yet done. You need to move who will be on that committee.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I assume that honourable members know that there are television cameras in here.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I move:

That the select committee consist of the Hon. Russell Wortley, the Hon. Terry Stephens, the Hon. Dennis Hood, the Hon. Frank Pangallo and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I move:

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

Motion carried.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Mr President, I crave your indulgence. On behalf of members, the Hon. Mr Darley has a very important engagement to get to tonight, an 82nd birthday. We wish him a happy birthday for this evening.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 18:08 the council adjourned until Thursday 16 May 2019 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***TOURISM BUDGET**

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (2 May 2019).

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment): I have been advised:

This year the South Australian Tourism Commission (SATC) has taken the opportunity to promote winter in South Australia with a standalone campaign.

The focus is on winter, with a dedicated campaign that showcases a wide range of tourism offerings that haven't been produced by the SATC for several years.

While the SATC has traditionally promoted tourism year round, this campaign is different in that it has specifically asked tourists to 'embrace winter' and enjoy the red wine, amazing food, live music, unique events, cosy accommodation and fireplaces of destinations such as the Adelaide Hills, Clare, Limestone Coast, Barossa and the Flinders Ranges.

Since 2 May 2019, Tasmania has launched its winter campaign and while other states also promote winter, the SATC's current holistic approach to promoting winter in South Australia is unique.