

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 3 July 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 Procedure*

### ANSWERS TABLED

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

### PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Rules of Court—

Magistrates Court Act 1991—

Civil—Amendment No. 24

*Question Time*

### REGIONAL TOURISM

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment regarding regional tourism.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Yesterday, the minister was asked a question about regional tourism organisation funding and the regional consumer collaborative marketing fund program. In his initial response to this chamber to which he is responsible, the minister let the cat out of the bag by giving an unusually honest answer, and I quote, that 'those two matters are not being continued with.' That is what the minister told the chamber: 'those two matters are not being continued with.' The minister then tried to weasel out of it by making an embarrassing personal explanation late in the day when he said, and I quote:

...both the regional tourism organisation funding and the regional collaborative marketing fund programs will remain unchanged for the current financial year.

It seems a pretty inescapable conclusion that either the minister is totally out of his depth, as most suspect, or he is deliberately fudging what he says to this chamber at different times of the day. The minister did not clarify what will happen to this funding after the 2019-20 financial year. My question to the minister is a simple one: what will happen to the regional tourism organisation funding and the regional consumer collaborative marketing fund program after the 2019-20 financial year?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:19):** I thank the honourable member for his question. I am not particularly excited at the innuendo and the intimidation claimed in it.

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

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, please. Allow the minister to answer your question.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I am advised that the fund will be continuing beyond the 2019-20 budget.

#### REGIONAL TOURISM

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Supplementary arising from the answer: has funding been allocated to the regional tourism organisation funding program in the 2019-20 financial year?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:19):** Yes, it has.

#### REGIONAL TOURISM

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** Supplementary arising from the answer: has funding been allocated to the regional tourism organisation funding program in the 2020-21 financial year, that is, the next financial year after the one we have just started?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:20):** I am advised that there are no plans to cut that particular fund beyond the 20. But we release a budget for a financial year and then we have the forward estimates, so in this current budget the programs are funded. It is my understanding and my advice is that we will be funding those programs across the forward estimates, but we are dealing with this year's budget. My advice from the South Australian Tourism Commission is that they will be funding it across the forward estimates.

#### REGIONAL TOURISM

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20):** Just to be clear, because I had asked specifically about the regional tourism organisation funding program, can the minister confirm that both the regional tourism organisation funding program and the regional consumer collaborative marketing fund program will be funded across the forward estimates; that is, this year and the next three out years in the budget?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:21):** I said, we are dealing with this year's budget at present, and I am advised that it is the intention to continue that funding across the forward estimates.

#### REGIONAL TOURISM

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21):** Final supplementary: why did the minister answer the question that those two matters were not being continued with yesterday? What led him to believe that when he answered the question?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:21):** Mr President—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I clarified it. I have made concerns from the honourable members opposite at times with all the yelling and screaming that goes on. It is sometimes somewhat difficult to hear. As soon as I had realised that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** See, again, Mr President, they can't help themselves.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister. Leader of the Opposition, before I go on to give the Hon. Ms Scriven the call, in your brief explanation you were getting very close if not making improper imputations against the minister. I ask you to restrain yourself going forward. Otherwise, I will ask you to withdraw and apologise.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND VISITOR CENTRE

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:22):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment about regional tourism.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** Yesterday, the minister tabled a response to a question on notice regarding the Kangaroo Island Visitor Centre, which has been closed since 19 May 2019. In that answer the minister said that a consultant had prepared a report about the future options for the visitor centre. My question to the minister is: will the minister make that report public?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:23):** I will take some advice from the South Australian Tourism Commission in relation to that report. There are ongoing negotiations with Tourism Kangaroo Island (TKI). There are ongoing negotiations with the local council, with the very hardworking mayor and former member for Finniss, Michael Pengilly. So we are trying to gather all of the information to look at the best model going forward to service the Kangaroo Island visitor economy with a visitor information centre.

#### KANGAROO ISLAND VISITOR CENTRE

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:23):** Supplementary: why won't the minister commit to making the report public now?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:23):** As I said, I will take some advice from the South Australian Tourism Commission as to whether we are able to release that report. If it has been prepared in confidence, I am not going to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Through me, minister.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:24):** My questions are to the Treasurer.

1 Is there any money in the budget to fund the privatisation of the public transport rail network?

2. What assistance will the Department of Treasury and Finance provide in the process of the privatisation of the public rail and transport network?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:24):** The very capable Minister for Transport, the Hon. Stephan Knoll, has a very adequate budget to meet all the requirements, not only for this financial year but for the forward estimate years. He, unlike perhaps ministers in the former government, is quite happy to accept his responsibility to manage his budget processes, and so whatever funding is required for the outsourcing of trams and trains, as outlined by the minister, he will have funding for.

The process of managing the outsourcing will be a responsibility for the minister and his department. If required, Treasury, as always, is a willing adviser, assister or participant as required, but the management of the process will be one for the minister and his department and his officers.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:25):** Supplementary: will the commercial and economics branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance provide support and advice in the process for the privatisation of the public rail and transport network?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:25):** All sections of Treasury, from the Treasurer down, are willing and ready, if required and if asked, to assist, but the process will be managed by the minister and his department.

#### TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:25):** Supplementary: can the Treasurer confirm why the commercial and economics branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance received an additional \$13.5 million and 15 FTEs in the budget?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:26):** The only party that secretly commissioned a scoping study in relation to SA Water was the former Labor government of which the Leader of the Opposition was a member. Not only did they do it secretly, they hid the cost of the actual consultancy so the media and the community would not be able to see the actual fact that the former Labor government was secretly commissioning a scoping study into the sale of SA Water.

The Liberal government hasn't done that. No, it was the Labor government, of which the Hon. Mr Hunter, the Hon. Mr Maher, led by the Hon. Mr Hunter—the Hon. Mr Hunter knew all about it and he kept it secret. He knew all about it but he wouldn't tell them what he was up to. He wanted to keep it secret. He hid it. He was the minister in charge of water. He knew all about it but he slunk away into his dark corner. He slunk away into the slippery dark corner as a minister.

He secretly, together with his colleagues, sought to find the information in relation to how much SA Water would be able to be sold for. He was a part of the government. He was the minister with responsibility in relation to water.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** I can yell just as loud as you lot. I can yell just as loud as you lot, if you are going to be out of order. He was the minister. The Hon. Mr Hunter and the Hon. Mr Maher were members of the government that looked at the privatisation of SA Water.

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The Hon. Mr Hunter—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The Hon. Mr Hunter is squealing like a stuck pig because he has been caught out. We know what he was up to, Mr President. We knew what the Hon. Mr Hunter was up to. He was trying to look at what it was going to be worth. He was part of the government and he was caught out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** The Hon. Mr Hunter can protest as much as he likes because the evidence is there on the public record. He was a part of the government, he was the minister with responsibility, and he was caught out in relation to the privatisation of SA Water. The Hon. Mr Hunter has been caught out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** They are rank hypocrites when it comes to the issue of privatisation and outsourcing, because if there was anything that moved, if there was anything that wasn't locked down, they were wanting to sell it off, outsource it, contract it out. Unless it was nailed down they would sell it, they would actually outsource it, they would contract it out, they would privatise it. Unless it was nailed down they would sell the whole lot off. The rank hypocrisy of the Labor Party on privatisation or outsourcing is evident for everyone to see. It is evident for everyone to see.

In relation to the commercial and economics branch, there has been no increase in funding; it's a continuation of former funding that was provided to that particular section of the department which existed under the former government.

**The PRESIDENT:** Supplementary, Leader of the Opposition.

#### **PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:31):** Does the Hon. Rob Lucas think that it's rank hypocrisy to promise not to sell ETSA, and then to sell it?

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, that was—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** No, there's no need to answer that, Treasurer. Leader of the Opposition, that was just in poor taste and embarrassing. The Hon. Ms Bourke, we are moving on. You can blame the Leader of the Opposition for you not getting a supplementary; we are moving on. If he hadn't acted like a fool I might have been more minded. The Hon. Ms Lee.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** You were pointing back; the whole time you were pointing back.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** No, it's not a right, but if you want to play the fool. The Hon. Ms Lee.

### COMMUNITY VOICES PROGRAM

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:32):** My question is to the Minister for Human Services about an important program for volunteers. Can the minister please provide the council with an update about the Community Voices program, which is in collaboration with Flinders University Screen Production?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:32):** Thank you, Mr President. I thought you were going to ask me about Labor's secret SA Water privatisation plans, but that would have been in order to provide a prop.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I printed that one off myself, thank you very much.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Minister, go on. Do you want to answer this question, minister?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I think it's a very worthy question, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** Then please get on with it.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I would like to be able to answer it.

**The PRESIDENT:** Please get on with it.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I'm actually becoming quite deaf in this ear, so that's probably—

**The PRESIDENT:** Your own benches were just as bad then.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I thank the honourable member for her important question. It was my great privilege recently to attend Flinders University, the alma mater, I think, of the—

**The Hon. I.K. Hunter:** The greatest university in the world.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** —Opposition Whip, to attend the launch of this year's Community Voices program, which is a partnership between the South Australian government's Department of Human Services and Flinders University about shining a light on volunteering in South Australia. Since the program started 13 years ago, about 200 filmmaking students have worked in partnership with volunteer community organisations to produce almost 120 video advertisements and short documentaries.

These videos promote the valuable work undertaken by volunteers and their organisations in contributing to the wellbeing of our community. We know that the generous support given by people through volunteering and philanthropy is fundamental to a sustainable South Australia.

The students put in an enormous amount of effort, which takes up to 250 hours of their time, using a range of skills, including research, writing, producing, directing, editing and cinematography. The program assists the students to become industry ready, to get jobs or even start their own business.

At the same time, the program provides invaluable benefits for community organisations, giving them access to skills and resources that may be beyond their reach and helping them to promote their programs and services, recruit and celebrate volunteers, and raise awareness about the valuable work they do in the wider community.

Community Voices is a win-win for both the students and the organisations they work with. An estimated 900,000 South Australians donate their time and energy to contribute to volunteering in this state, and together they give approximately 1.7 million hours, equivalent to over 100,000 full-time jobs, worth about \$5 billion to our state every year. We know that the reasons why people volunteer are many. Some of these are intangible. They learn new skills, increase confidence, increase their connectedness and wellbeing, and a range of other areas.

The organisations that were showcased through videos this year include Puddle Jumpers, Baptist Care SA, Headspace Port Adelaide, Lutheran Community Care and the Australian Marine Wildlife Research and Rescue Organisation. I would like to commend the lecturer in screen production, Dr Tom Young, and thank the university for their partnership with this very important program and wish them and all their students well into the future.

### SHACK LEASES

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:36):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Human Services, representing the Minister for Environment and Water, a question about the government's retaining shacks commitment.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY:** It has been nearly 18 months since the government committed to delivering their retaining shacks policy. This policy seeks to extend arrangements for shack owners whose shacks are situated on Crown land or national parks. Prior to the government's election in 2018, the policy was that leases for these Crown land sites would expire at the death of the last listed lessee. The government made an election commitment to move away from this and allow for mechanisms where the leases could be transferred, extended or freeholded.

In the past 10 months, I have been in contact with the minister and the department about the progress of this new policy. In particular, I have asked about a time frame in which it would be expected that this would be finalised. I understand that a few weeks ago the department released a preliminary discussion paper for public consultation. However, the information required to move forward with this project seems to be severely lacking. My questions to the minister are:

1. When does the minister expect this project will be finalised?
2. Does the government have a time line of implementation that outlines which individual issues need to be addressed for each shack area and when they will be addressed? If such information exists, will the minister provide a copy?
3. If the detailed time line for implementation of the policy does not exist, why not?
4. How does the government plan to track progress and ensure that implementation is carried out well before the next election in 2022?

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:38):** I thank the honourable member for his question. I thank him for his ongoing commitment to shacks in South Australia. He has been a champion in this space in the fight against the dastardly intentions of the former Labor government, who variously took opinions about shacks as being squatters and a range of very derogatory opinions that they held about people who held shacks, including a number of working people who have found them a quite cost-effective way of enjoying their summer holidays and school holidays in fairly cheap manners, and a number of farming communities, in particular, that have been associated with various locations, which I was able to outline in a speech that I gave in support of the Crown lease bill that I moved in this parliament, with the support of the honourable member, several years ago. I am aware that there is a discussion paper that the Minister for the Environment has released. The detailed questions that he has put to this place I will take on notice and bring back a response for him.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:39):** My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer advise the chamber whether he has received any representations from the member for King against the privatisation of the public transport rail network?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:40):** No, I have certainly not had any conversation with the member for King. I am not sure whether or not she may have written a letter to my office—I am happy to check—but I have certainly not had a conversation or telephone call with the member for King on the issue.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:40):** Supplementary: along the same lines, will the Treasurer advise the chamber whether he has received any representations from any of his parliamentary colleagues against the privatisation of the public transport rail network?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:40):** I don't go into the nature of discussions I have had with colleagues, but the answer in relation to this particular issue is that, no, I haven't. As I said in response to an earlier question, the minister responsible for this particular bold reform and policy initiative is minister Stephan Knoll, and it is more likely that, if members have views to put on the particular issue, they are more likely to go to the minister who has carriage for the policy response.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

**The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:41):** Supplementary: will the Treasurer undertake to provide on notice, when he goes back and checks his emails and all the rest of the correspondence, whether he has received any of that correspondence and provide an answer, please?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:41):** No. In relation to the member for King, I am happy to check, as I said at the outset, but I am not going to trawl through all of my correspondence, text messages, and whatever else it is, in relation to other members. I have indicated that I have not had any contact from members in relation to it, and that is unsurprising, because I do not have carriage for this particular bold policy reform—it is minister Knoll.

### TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:42):** My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister update the council about the recent appointment of a new chief executive of the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment, and the wealth of international experience they bring to the role?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:42):** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in trade, tourism and investment. I am delighted to inform the council today of the appointment of Ms Leonie Muldoon as the new chief executive of the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment. This is a fantastic appointment, and I am very excited to talk about it today. Ms Muldoon brings with her a wealth of experience in the trade and investment sectors internationally.

She was formerly the senior trade and investment commissioner for Austrade in Singapore, and before that the senior trade commissioner for South Asia. Ms Muldoon has spent almost five years in senior Austrade roles in Japan, another key market of ours and the location of our second office, and she has experienced working across India, Sri Lanka, Pakistan and Bangladesh.

Ms Muldoon has experience across both the public and private industries, having been a lawyer and former partner with Mallesons Stephen Jacques in their Sydney banking and finance practice. She is also fluent in Japanese. Ms Muldoon's in-depth knowledge of export markets in Asia, which are a crucial pillar in our state's economic growth, will be invaluable as we strive to further strengthen our export and investment opportunities into the future.

There is no doubt that Ms Muldoon has the expertise to drive the South Australian growth agenda and implement the endorsed recommendations outlined in the Joyce review to grow our economy, grow our exports and create local jobs. We have an ambitious agenda to grow local jobs and strengthen our economy, so much of which is done through our thriving trade and tourism

sectors. Getting the 3 per cent annual growth will not be an easy task, and Ms Muldoon's experience and expertise across the globe will help us deliver the growth, creating jobs and driving our economy as a whole.

I would like to thank Mr Michael Hnyda for his dedicated service as chief executive of DTTI, who retired in March, and acknowledge the work of Mr Jim McDowell, who has acted as the department chief executive since that time. I look forward to welcoming Ms Muldoon into the role of chief executive of the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment when she officially begins next month, and working with her to grow the state's economy and to continue building South Australia.

It is interesting to note that, on a LinkedIn post, in less than 24 hours well over 5,000 people from across the globe have endorsed the Marshall government's decision to appoint Ms Muldoon. In fact, in the first 15 minutes of being in the chamber another 25 people joined that chorus of people endorsing the Marshall Liberal government's appointment of Ms Muldoon.

### TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:44):** A supplementary arising from the answer: can the minister confirm that because of the way the dismissals from that department have been handled, senior executives were offered psychological counselling before they left? Can the minister inform the chamber how many senior executives took up the psychological counselling they were offered because of the way this was handled?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:45):** I think the honourable member is referring to an article that was published in InDaily today. It is a shame that members opposite always want to continue to talk down the hardworking public servants who are trying to grow our state's economy. Any of the terminations and activities that happen in the department are an operational matter for the chief executive and his team.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** They just keep talking over the top of me, Mr President.

### VACCINE RESEARCH

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:45):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding vaccine trials at the Flinders Medical Centre.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** Yesterday, I raised serious concerns about the conduct of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network in blocking and sabotaging life-saving vaccine trials by the internationally acclaimed research company Vaxine, headed by Professor Nikolai Petrovsky, who, as it turns out, has been extremely busy in the past 24 hours meeting numerous international media requests on their breakthrough technology announced yesterday. Vaxine has been operating successfully from labs it leases from the government, so its work does not cost taxpayers one cent. It gets its funding from the US government.

I would like to clarify a point I made yesterday when I said that SALHN ordered Vaxine to cease one vaccine trial while it was in progress. I have since discovered that I greatly underestimated this unethical intrusion: in fact, SALHN stopped not one but three vaccine trials covering influenza, hepatitis and cancer research, and it has cost the company millions of dollars. My question to the minister is:

1. Has the minister sought an explanation from SALHN about why these trials were stopped midstream?
2. Does he accept that the actions of SALHN have now exposed the government to the risk of legal action to recover any losses incurred by Vaxine?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:47):** I thank the honourable member for his question. As I indicated to the honourable member yesterday, I am following up issues in relation to SALHN and governance of medical research. The issues the honourable member raises will certainly be part of that conversation.



### PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:47):** My question is to the Treasurer. Has the government met all its obligations under the enterprise agreements with operation staff regarding privatising the operation of the public transport rail network? Also, what consultations, if any, have occurred with rail operations staff about privatising the operation of the public transport rail network?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:48):** In relation to the outsourcing of the rail and tram network, as I indicated earlier our very capable minister, Stephan Knoll, is in charge of that particular project. In relation to enterprise arrangements, I will consult with him. Certainly, the industrial relations section of Treasury provides advice to ministers and to government in relation to EBs, and I am happy to seek further advice from minister Knoll and/or my department in relation to the member's questions.

### COMMUNITY HEALTH SERVICES

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:49):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding community health services.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS:** In my work as the Premier's Advocate for Suicide Prevention, as well as my many years of involvement in community networks before holding that position, I have seen the difference that support in the community can make to patients and their families. Will the minister update the council on the reform of health services to deliver more care in the community?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49):** I thank the honourable member for his question. Public health systems around Australia have seen steadily rising demand over the past decade, bringing additional challenges to services that are already responding to the increasing proportion of the population aged over 65. In South Australia, these increasing demands are exacerbated by the former Labor government's mismanagement of the health system, particularly their disastrous Transforming Health experiment.

The Marshall Liberal government is determined to improve the delivery of services. This is a large and complex task. We are responding with a range of measures. In strategic terms, we are reforming health governance to drive accountability, engage clinicians and consumers, and return decision-making to a local level. But as the honourable member highlights, community initiatives will be fundamental to rebalancing the health system. Yesterday, I was delighted to announce one such initiative: the rollout of a new mobile radiology service in Adelaide's southern suburbs.

This trial program will mean that residents of nursing homes will be able to receive X-rays in their nursing home rather than needing to be transported to their nearest hospital. This is clearly beneficial to elderly patients who will not need to be transported to hospital and who will receive this service with no out-of-pocket charges. It will also help ease the pressure on the hospitals themselves. Although the initiative is a trial, it is estimated that, if fully rolled out, it could potentially reduce the number of ED presentations from nursing homes by more than 1,700 per year.

To put this in raw dollar terms, although the patient won't have any out-of-pocket costs, the costs of delivering the mobile X-ray service will be approximately \$100 per image. On the other hand, if a resident of a nursing home is directed to the hospital for the X-ray, then the cost, including ambulance transfers, would be around \$1,800. Mobile imaging avoids this cost but also eases pressure on the broader system. Ambulances are freed up from these transfers and become available for other work.

During the trial period, the mobile X-ray service will be based at the Repat site and provide around seven appointments daily from Monday through to Friday. The service will focus on residents who are clinically stable and, although they require an X-ray, do not require an urgent ambulance transfer to an emergency department. The types of general X-rays that can be performed by the mobile service include chest and thoracic, abdominal, spine, hips and pelvis, upper and lower limbs, and facial bones.

The images and reports produced through this service will be available to clinicians through the same process as if they were done at a hospital site, ensuring appropriate care is maintained.

The service will be staffed by a South Australian Medical Imaging (SAMI) radiographer and a SAMI nurse, ensuring quality clinical services on the ground. I look forward to seeing the outcomes of this trial. Our commitment is to develop quality of care to residents in the southern suburbs, including those who are residing in nursing homes.

### SCISSOR LIFTS

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:53):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the minister for industrial relations on the topic of elevated work platforms, otherwise known as scissor lifts.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Scissor lifts have been involved in the death of Mr Castillo-Riffo in South Australia and Mr Steve Wyatt. Mr Castillo-Riffo's death led to a Coroner's finding of a range of recommendations for change in South Australia. They have also been responsible for deaths of Australians and South Australians on 5 December 2017, 8 February 2017, 26 October 2016, 30 August 2016, 9 August 2016, 22 February 2016, 15 May 2015, 21 May 2014, 11 September 2013, 15 May 2013, 12 March 2013, 24 May 2010, and that is simply my time in parliament that this machinery has been associated with deaths in the workplace.

My question to the minister is: of the Coroner's quite simple recommendations, which range from including a spotter immediately on all sites where this machinery is used to placing a simple document on a website and placing this agenda before COAG for urgent clarification to investigate standardisation of this machinery, other than placing a document on the website how many of the Coroner's recommendations have now been implemented from that finding in November 2018?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:55):** To get a definitive response to all the recommendations of the Coroner, I am happy to take the honourable member's question on notice and bring back a reply. My recollection of the last advice I had from SafeWork SA was, with the exception I think of the two recommendations about which there have been questions asked from an honourable member earlier in this particular session, that they were either implementing or had implemented the other recommendations. But I will take the question on notice and bring back a definitive reply, having received some advice from SafeWork SA.

### SCISSOR LIFTS

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:55):** Supplementary: do I expect to receive the same reply that you took on notice in November 2018 to pretty much the same question?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:56):** If it was a comprehensive answer, I am sure she will get a comprehensive answer to this question as well.

### HOSPITAL SECURITY

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:56):** My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the government implement in full the 10-point plan for improving hospital security put forward by the nurses' association following the brutal stabbing of a nurse at the Lyell McEwin Hospital last week?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:56):** I thank the honourable member for his question. I would reiterate that both the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation and the Marshall Liberal government share a strong commitment to ensure that the workplace for South Australian health workers is safe.

The assault outside the Lyell McEwin Hospital on 24 June was very disappointing. Following that assault, I have spoken to management at the Lyell McEwin site. Additional security guards were put in place to patrol the hospital grounds overnight on 24 June. There were information sessions on staff safety and wellbeing scheduled, I think, for this week. There's an internal review of current risk controls. It is pleasing that the alleged attacker has been arrested and charged in relation to the incident.

To clarify, the honourable member's question implied that the 10-point plan was issued in response to the assault; that is not my understanding. The 10-point plan is—in fact, to be frank, it is more than 10 points—a very comprehensive overview of suggested initiatives by the Australian

Nursing and Midwifery Federation. Certainly, SA Health has engaged the ANMF and the ANMF have been vigorous advocates for SA Health changes in the way that SA Health equips staff to maintain a safe workplace and also in the way that complaints are managed.

A number of aspects of the material provided by the ANMF have been incorporated into SA Health material, but I think it is clear that the ANMF believes that more should be done. I will continue to engage both the ANMF and the department to make sure that we are taking opportunities, as I said, to equip staff and to maintain a safe workplace but also to support staff when they are the victims of assaults.

I think it is also worth highlighting that the 10-point plan is particularly focused on safety within the hospital environment. This assault occurred on or near a public road. Of course, the safety of a hospital does not stop at the hospital door, and it is important that we keep the hospital precincts safe. I will just clarify that most of the focus in terms of hospital safety is inside the hospitals.

In relation to the Lyell McEwin precinct, it is a particularly challenging one because the precinct is bounded on four sides by public roads. One of the issues that this particular assault highlighted was the need to look again at lighting. The assault occurred near what I understand was the old Lyell McEwin Hospital entrance on Haydown Road, and my understanding is that one of the issues raised by this assault is whether we need to enhance lighting right around the precinct.

#### HOSPITAL SECURITY

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:00):** Supplementary question: can the minister confirm that any additional security measures will be rolled out across all hospitals and not just at the Lyell McEwin?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:00):** The Department for Health and Wellbeing and the local health networks and their recently appointed boards are constantly looking at security issues. As an indication of that, Country Health has had a review going, I suspect perhaps for the last 12 months. My understanding is that a report will be finalised in the middle of this year. Two of the country sites that have experienced security issues in recent months include Meningie and Whyalla, so certainly that is an example of the government taking a broader view of hospital security. Considering that not only from a point of view of our duty of care to our workers but also as an employer with our occupational health and safety duties, of course worker safety is part of the core responsibilities of the department and the LHNs as employers.

#### HOSPITAL SECURITY

**The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:01):** Further supplementary question: will the minister reconsider reversing the 129 per cent increase in cost for nurses' car parking fees, given the increased risk this could create if staff are forced to park on side streets?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02):** The government, the department and the LHNs have a responsibility to manage the hospital precincts and maximise the safety for everyone who comes to the precinct: staff, visitors, relatives of patients, and so forth. Whether they come by public transport, bring their own car or the like, the government has, if you like, related the cost of hospital car parking with the cost of public transport metro tickets, and we will not only continue to maintain security in the hospital car parks as part of the precinct but also in relation to the public transport sites. I acknowledge the conversation that I had with the Mayor of Playford even before this assault.

I visited Lyell McEwin, I think it was last month, and spent a couple of days there. On those days I met with the Mayor of Playford and he specifically highlighted that he thought there was an opportunity to improve the public transport bus stops, for want of a better word, in the Lyell McEwin precinct. I know that, following the assault, he made that comment publicly. I am sure that NAHLN management will include that in their consideration. Considering that we have a redevelopment on the Lyell McEwin site, and the need for car parking going forward, there will be a need to refresh the car park at the Lyell McEwin site, and security can be considered in that context.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION BOARD

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:04):** My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Will the minister please update the council on the new experience and skills that are

being brought to the table with the recent appointments to the South Australian Tourism Commission board?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:04):** I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in the tourism sector. I was pleased to officially welcome the new SATC board members recently and believe they will bring a great deal to the table as we work towards our 2020 target and then look beyond to 2030.

As we know, the new chair, Mr Andrew Bullock, is a respected national hotel and tourism industry leader. He is the chief executive of the 1834 Hotels group and has more than 17 years of business experience in this particular sector. Mr Bullock has significant on-ground experience of the challenges and opportunities that face our tourism industry. Tourism is an increasingly competitive space, but it is also one of our major economic opportunities. The SATC is having to constantly review and adapt to the changing marketplace such that we can keep the South Australian industry strong and indeed grow it.

With the 2030 tourism sector plan to be released soon, along with the government's growth agenda, it could not be a better time to bring some new perspectives to the SATC board. Of course, Mr Bullock will be joined by incoming director Mr Grant Wilckens, who is the CEO and co-founder of Discovery Parks. He obviously has very strong business acumen, he has a commerce and financial background and he knows how to build a very successful business. Mr Wilckens will be a great asset to the team.

Donna Gauci has also been appointed; she is the Chief Operating Officer of SeaLink Travel Group, and I am pleased that she has a place on the South Australian Tourism Industry Council board, so she will be well informed as not only an operator but someone with broad industry knowledge. Interestingly, the Tourism Industry Council were very keen to have representation on the board, and it was an opportune time to appoint Ms Gauci but also make sure that the SATIC board had a voice on the South Australian Tourism Commission board.

Mr Ian Horne is continuing on, as it is certainly important for the hotel industry to have a strong voice as we strive to grow tourism. I again want to extend my very sincere thanks to the previous chair, Mr Sean Keenihan. During his time as chair an additional 5,000 jobs were created, many of them in the regions, and record growth was achieved. I look forward to continuing to work with Mr Keenihan in his role with the Study Adelaide Board. I would also like to thank Julie Smith from Rawnsley Park, who has been a strong voice for our regional operators and who will undoubtedly continue to be a respected industry advocate.

We know that there is a huge amount of potential in tourism, as one of our government's key growth sectors. We constantly need to review how we are selling ourselves and competing with other states and other countries, and to that end I believe the new board will offer some very valuable perspectives. I look forward to working with the board and the commission as we get back to work on our 2030 targets.

#### **MOBILE PHONE BLACKSPOT FUNDING**

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:07):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, representing the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development in another place, a question about mobile blackspot funding?

Leave granted.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** At the 2018 state election the Liberal Party promised \$10 million to fix mobile phone blackspots with a South Australian mobile phone blackspot fund. In early April this year, the federal government announced the allocation of \$80 million for round 5 of its Mobile Black Spot Program, with applications closing on 26 July 2019. In late May, the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development announced the state government would allocate \$3 million from the South Australian mobile phone blackspot fund towards applications for round 5.

The minister also announced a new expression of interest process, something that requires 'a minimum community contribution of \$50,000', oddly one that only had a two-week deadline for submissions, which closed on Friday 7 June 2019. Our hardworking federal Centre Alliance colleague, the member for Mayo, Rebekha Sharkie, wrote to the Premier to share her concerns about

the short time frame and barriers this co-contribution presented the less affluent communities. Those concerns fell on deaf ears, the Premier writing back saying that the concept of the co-contribution came about after round 4 of the Mobile Black Spot Program was announced, and communities and businesses approached the minister asking how they could effectively jump to the head of the queue.

He went on further to say that communities only had to register an expression of interest by 7 June and only had to come up with the money ahead of the 26 July deadline. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why did the government wait until 24 May to publicly announce an expression of interest process that only gave a two-week window to submit applications?
2. Why demand regional communities come up with \$50,000 within two weeks and enter into a memorandum of understanding outlining how their financial contributors will provide \$50,000 within that time frame?
3. Does the government believe the expression of interest process will lead to equitable outcomes for regional communities?
4. Were those communities and businesses that asked to elevate their blackspot sites given advanced warning of the new expression of interest process?
5. Aside from the expression of interest process, does the state government have its own shortlist of mobile blackspot sites for prioritising the \$3 million it set aside for the co-contribution in round 5 of the commonwealth Mobile Black Spot Program, and, if so, what sites are on that list, how were they prioritised, and how will the government's new expression of interest procedure for regional communities affect the priority order of the short list? Got that?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:10):** I will run out of time writing it down; I might have to ask him to repeat the question. The Marshall Liberal government is absolutely focused on providing extra mobile phone coverage in regional South Australia, unlike the members opposite when they were in government. They spent the least amount of any state government to support our regions when it came to mobile phone blackspots. Of course, as a result, we got the smallest number of towers. Other states, like Tasmania, and smaller states, smaller economies, got a larger share of the pie.

It is in stark contrast to the members opposite, who turned their back on regional South Australia during their term in government. Mobile phone coverage in the regions is about productivity, it is about tourism, it is about public safety. When the members opposite were in government, they turned their back on regional South Australia. For the member who has asked a very extensive question with, I don't know, 10 or 12—a large number of questions, it will be a pleasure to take them on notice and refer them to my very good friend, the Hon. Tim Whetstone, Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, and bring back a reply.

#### **MCLAREN VALE AND DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:11):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding the McLaren Vale hospital.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** The McLaren Vale hospital is a private hospital with a contract with the government for services, as well as a \$500,000 grant recently provided by the government. My question to the minister is: will the minister update the council on the McLaren Vale hospital, including whether any concerns have been raised with him regarding the ongoing viability of the hospital?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:12):** Yes, they have. That's why this government engages constructively with the hospital about its future service offering. That's why the Marshall Liberal team, in opposition, committed to investing \$500,000 to help the hospital ensure that its facility was well-placed to provide services going forward. That's why the Deputy Premier, the second most senior member of the Marshall Liberal team, joined me—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.G. WADE:** I thought we were feigning interest in the welfare of the McLaren Vale hospital but apparently the Leader of the Opposition is determined to turn this into a circus again, another circus like we did earlier in question time. If I could at least give the honourable member the benefit of the doubt and continue to answer her question: that is why the Deputy Premier and I actually met with representatives of the board at the McLaren Vale hospital to talk about the changes in health services that are being delivered by the Marshall Liberal government and how the McLaren Vale community hospital may well be able to partner with us.

We have shown, right across the networks, that the Marshall Liberal government is willing to work with non-government partners, private partners, community hospitals, whoever they might be, if they offer a benefit to the public health services of South Australians.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Scriven, a supplementary.

#### **MCLAREN VALE AND DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:14):** Has the McLaren Vale hospital either temporarily or permanently closed any of its operating theatres or wards in the last several months?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14):** I will take that on notice.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Scriven, a further supplementary.

#### **MCLAREN VALE AND DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:14):** Is the minister saying that he provided a \$500,000 grant without knowing the details of closures, either temporary or permanent?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:14):** I will just remind the honourable member, if she missed it, that there was an election in March last year. It was leading into that election that the commitment of \$500,000 was given. If there were any developments, as I said, I will take that on notice but it certainly is around a year—at least a year—after that commitment was made. I wouldn't actually be surprised if the commitment to invest in McLaren Vale hospital was in 2017. If so, if the honourable member is asking me when we made that commitment—whenever it was; 2017 or 2018—did I know what changes the McLaren Vale hospital was going to make in 2019, the answer is no.

#### **MCLAREN VALE AND DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:15):** Further supplementary: have any senior clinicians resigned from the McLaren Vale hospital in the past several months?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:15):** Again, I will take that on notice.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition and minister, private conversations are for outside the chamber. Shouting at each other disrespects the Hon. Ms Scriven. The Hon. Ms Scriven, your supplementary, please.

#### **MCLAREN VALE AND DISTRICTS WAR MEMORIAL HOSPITAL**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:15):** Supplementary, thank you, Mr President. Have any major assets recently been sold or otherwise transferred away from the McLaren Vale hospital?

**The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:16):** I hope the next question is not going to be about the Hoyts complex in Norwood because I don't run that either.

#### **STATE BUDGET**

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:16):** Mr President, that was gold. You have to say that was 10 points. My question is to the Treasurer: can he please advise the council as to how much the government has allocated to explain the budget to the great people of this great state of South Australia?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:16):** I am pleased to respond to the honourable member's question because this particular issue has attracted some parliamentary interest. I'm not sure there has been much community interest in relation to the very frugal amount of money this government is spending compared to the multimillions that the former government used to spend on itself in terms of the budget.

The very frugal, meagre, minuscule amount—whichever other adjective you would like to use in relation to the budget—is approximately \$200,000. The Marshall Liberal government will not be, as the former government did—involving the then premier of the state, the Hon. Jay Weatherill, bold and proud on paid television advertising the party political nature—advertising himself in a party political fashion at the expense of the taxpayers of South Australia.

The former government spent, on various budget campaigns, \$1.3 million up to \$2 million on various budget advertising campaigns and involved—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Order! I cannot hear. Leader of the Opposition, you are talking over me and I cannot hear the Treasurer.

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** As I said, the Marshall Liberal government gave an undertaking and there will be no involvement of either the Premier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition!

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Leader of the Opposition, having a conversation with another member, which is your habit these days, does not allow me to listen to the Treasurer, and if other members of the Labor front bench wished to object to something that the Treasurer is saying, they would not be able to hear him. You are not doing your own side a service and you are not assisting me, and the Hon. Mr John Dawkins can have a conversation with you a bit later. Treasurer, do you have anything further to add?

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS:** Just to conclude the answer, Mr President. I'm happy to get further information for the honourable member in relation to the many millions that were spent by the former government on budget-related advertising—it was in the millions. The meagre allocation in this particular budget is about \$200,000.

*Matters of Interest*

### **GOOD SHEPHERD MICROFINANCE**

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:19):** I rise to speak about Good Shepherd Microfinance, an organisation that is regarded as a leader in financial inclusion product services and advisory services. It works in collaboration with the corporate, government and community sectors to create programs that enable low-income clients to improve their financial situations and realise their own economic mobility.

I have personally met with representatives from Good Shepherd on numerous occasions and I am impressed by the impact it is having in many local communities, with a focus on assisting the most vulnerable members of our community. Good Shepherd certainly has a long history. In fact, it dates back to 1835, when Saint Mary Euphrasia Pelletier founded the Sisters of the Good Shepherd in France to assist women and children in need.

To provide alternative options for vulnerable Australians, the Sisters of the Good Shepherd established the no-interest loans scheme (NILS) in Australia in 1981, which offered no-interest loans to men and women for the purchase of essential items. Their operations expanded rapidly in the following decades and now Good Shepherd offers safe, fair and affordable financial products to people on low incomes, and advisory services in 600 locations across the nation.

In our state alone, 15,000 South Australians are currently receiving benefits either through the NILS or the Good Shepherd's program StepUP, which provides larger low-income loans on a

not-for-profit basis, delivered in partnership with the National Australia Bank. Unlike payday loans, no exorbitant fees are incurred, along with excessive and unaffordable interest rates.

Another one of Good Shepherd's initiatives that is unique to South Australia is the LaunchME microenterprise pilot program that was developed in 2017 to assist people in acquiring skills to commence their own business or join the workforce. It supports clients' small business aspirations through a range of services, including coaching and mentoring, support for documented business planning, guidance in the attainment of new enterprise, access to networking opportunities, referral to specialist advisors and, of course, access to no-interest finance when business plans are sufficiently mature.

Over the life of this program to date, 75 per cent of participants have generated income from their entrepreneurial ventures, with 19 per cent obtaining employment. The success of LaunchME in our state is unsurprisingly attracting investment and interest from the Victorian and commonwealth governments, who have an interest in establishing a scheme similar to that in their own jurisdictions.

The collaboration between Good Shepherd Microfinance and the South Australian, Victorian and Queensland governments, as well as the National Australia Bank, has also enabled seven Good Money stores to be established. The stores are strategically located near high-cost lenders to provide people in the community with a visible choice and to prevent predatory lending.

They give clients the opportunity to take the important initial steps in making responsible and sustainable financial decisions through discussing in person how Good Shepherd's financial products can lead to long-term financial self-management. This particular operation expanded into South Australia in 2015, with the opening of a Good Money store in Salisbury, and I am informed that in the last year it has been able to issue some 350 loans.

Many of the three million people experiencing financial exclusion in Australia have been turned away from mainstream financial institutions. Unfortunately, many of them, in their desperation, end up using high-cost credit options, such as payday loans or rent to buy services, and can become susceptible to having to take repeat loans that lead to spiralling debt.

I take this opportunity to commend Good Shepherd Microfinance on making a significant contribution to the South Australian community through offering their much-needed services. The Marshall Liberal government is certainly pleased to continue its partnership with this organisation, to build confidence in those experiencing financial hardship to help them take control of their future and their finances.

### FEDERAL POLICE RAIDS

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:23):** I rise today to speak about police raids on journalists. Whilst we do not always agree with the work of journalists, particularly when they get it spectacularly wrong, as they sometimes do, that is not the important matter. A free and well-resourced media holds public officials and, indeed, the business community to account. It exposes corruption and tells truth to power, if it is doing its job, which is why it has been deeply troubling to see several raids on journalists by the Australian Federal Police in recent times.

The first was a raid by the AFP on NewsCorp journalist Annika Smethurst in relation to a story she published years earlier. The story was about a proposal to increase the powers of the Australian Signals Directorate, with a suggestion that those new powers could include the ability to monitor Australian citizens. In a statement, the committee of the federal parliament's press gallery said that the raid was:

...alarming for all Australians. It is in the public interest for us to know of any plan for greater powers to monitor our messages.

This was a raid on a journalist's home, years—years—after she published a story in her professional capacity. It is concerning to see such action by police agencies, particularly the Australian Federal Police, investigating genuine public interest news reporting.

Home affairs minister, Peter Dutton, I understand, described Annika Smethurst's report as nonsense, as is his right, and the secretary of his department described it as the worst example of ill-informed reporting regarding home affairs. I am not sure that that is quite in his remit. Yet, the



article was referred to the AFP for investigation anyway, ultimately leading to the raid on Annika Smethurst's home. This issue alone was enough to cause concern amongst the media, politicians, public commentators and, indeed, the public.

But the events of the next day raised even graver fears. The AFP launched a raid on the ABC's headquarters in Sydney, with officers spending more than eight hours, I am advised, delving through emails, notes and other electronic files. This raid focused on a set of stories published by the ABC in 2017, known as the Afghan files, which published allegations of, to quote the ABC on Wednesday 5 June:

...unlawful killings and misconduct by the Australian Special Forces in Afghanistan, and were based off hundreds of pages of secret defence documents leaked to the ABC.

The warrant used by the AFP was extensive. ABC executive editor, John Lyons, who live-tweeted the raids, has said that he had never seen a warrant that was so all encompassing. It gave the AFP the authority to 'add, copy, delete or alter' a wide range of materials on ABC computers, including draft versions of some files and handwritten notes.

I must say that I was alarmed to see a warrant comprising the words 'add, copy, delete or alter' as permission for the officers. Let's be clear: the Australian Federal Police raided this country's publicly funded national broadcaster with a warrant to 'add, copy, delete or alter' materials. This is a significant intrusion into the ABC just a day after a journalist's home was raided for a completely separate article.

Journalists and, indeed, all Australians are rightly worried about the implications of this, of freedom of the press in our country, and our own general freedoms. It is absolutely essential that political leaders, in my view, reaffirm their commitment to a free press and ensure that it is protected in practice. Shamefully, the federal Liberal government has not done this to date, and it shows no signs of enhancing press freedoms or expressing concern at the implications of what has occurred on its watch.

I was pleased to see NewsCorp's Michael Miller, Nine Entertainment's Hugh Marks, and the ABC's David Anderson come together to call for an overhaul of laws to protect press freedom. I hope our federal parliamentary colleagues take up this challenge and address this series of issues that have been uncovered. I hope these concerning events highlight to all Australians that we cannot take our freedoms for granted, and we must all do more to protect the free press in this country, and I for one will be watching these developments with great interest and some alarm.

## CLIMATE CHANGE

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:27):** I rise today to admit that I was wrong. I believe it is important that individuals recognise their failings as well as their achievements, and on the subject of climate change I have been very wrong. The issue of climate change has emerged over the past few decades to the point where it has become a particular focus for the community in the last few years. There have been worldwide protests, which have been backed globally by scientists, all urging our leaders to do something about climate change before it is too late.

The matter has been widely debated, with evidence plainly demonstrating that the human impact on the earth is unsustainable. However, notwithstanding all of this, I remained a sceptic. In my 82 years on the planet I have experienced extreme weather conditions and natural disasters, including droughts, floods, bushfires and earthquakes. I experienced the 1948 hurricane that destroyed the Glenelg jetty and washed away the frigate *HMAS Barcoo* in 1954. I experienced South Australia's worst earthquake in 1954; I experienced Black Sunday in 1955; and I experienced both Ash Wednesday bushfires in 1980 and 1983 respectively.

These types of events had been occurring since I was a boy, and I did not see the difference in these and the more recent extreme weather conditions that were being experienced globally. In recent years the issue of climate change has been widely debated and, based on my own experiences, I believed the sceptics. I had experienced the changes in the climate and I did not believe that anything abnormal was occurring.

However, on 17 June this year the ABC's Q&A program aired a science special. The show featured five scientists from a wide range of disciplines; from astrophysicists, marine ecologists and

particle physicists to geologists and climate scientists. Without a doubt, each member of the panel came to the same undeniable conclusion: that climate change is a real threat and that serious action must be taken immediately.

One might ask why the information provided in this program was so different to all the other information I had been exposed to on the subject before. Previously, I had paid too much attention to climate sceptics who presented their opinions as fact; however, the information given by the ABC on this program was based on scientific research presented by experts in a manner that was easy to consume. They did not shy away from the criticisms but instead addressed them, using arguments based on actual facts, not opinion.

I now understand that, whilst it is true that our earth's climate has always been changing, it is the rate of change that is particularly concerning. The changes are so rapid that it is untenable for our planet. It threatens our very existence, and we face extinction as a result of political inaction on climate change.

In 2016, Australia signed the Paris Agreement. Signatories pledged to strengthen the global response to climate change by maintaining this century's global temperature rise to 2°, with a stretch target of 1.5°. Australia's target was to reduce 2005 emissions by 26 per cent to 28 per cent by 2030. Unfortunately, we are not only failing to be on track with this target but our emissions have been increasing since 2015. If global emissions continue to rise at their current rate our global temperature will rise by 1.5° in just 15 years. This will have a devastating and irreversible consequence for our planet.

Naysayers often state that Australia is only responsible for contributing 1.3 per cent of global emissions; however, considering that we only make up 0.3 per cent of the global population, our emissions are alarmingly high. Australia needs to take urgent action and commit to a target of 0 per cent emissions by 2050, as the UK has done.

I am not afraid to admit that I was a climate change sceptic. However, I was wrong. I hope my admission will inspire other political leaders to challenge their views by turning to science instead of opinion.

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

**The ACTING PRESIDENT (Hon. D.G.E. Hood):** Order!

#### **ROTARY CLUB OF GAWLER**

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:32):** It was my great privilege to attend the 3,000<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Rotary Club of Gawler at the Nixon's Function Centre in Gawler on Monday 1 July. This dinner meeting also saw the induction of President Steve Barilla as the 66<sup>th</sup> president of the club by outgoing president Jacqui Atyeo.

A particular feature of the night was the toast to Rotary International and to Australia by the Hon. Bruce Eastick, who is now well into his 90s. He stood up and delivered that toast without a note. Dr Eastick, of course, was a charter member of that Rotary Club, so he has been a member of that Rotary Club longer than I have been alive.

Also present was the former Governor of South Australia, Sir Eric Neal, and Lady Joan Neal. Sir Eric Neal and Dr Bruce Eastick were both present at the first meeting of the Rotary Club of Gawler on 8 March 1954, and it was terrific to see all three of them there to enjoy the celebration of the 3,000<sup>th</sup> meeting.

The guest speaker of the night was the Hon. Neil Andrew, former member for Wakefield for more than two decades and former speaker of the House of Representatives. Neil, who was an honorary member of the Gawler Rotary Club, gave a terrific snapshot of the club's service right across the local community, national issues and the many aspects of international service, including Rotary's very strong commitment to end polio. Another particular program that I think is worthy of mention here—and I will quote extracts from the club's annual report—is the Indigenous Health Scholarship student:

...we have been privileged to sponsor Jasmin Taylor for the 2018 university year. Jasmin undertook an Intensive Care post graduate diploma, and achieved a High Distinction in her end of year exams in 2018. She now works in the Intensive Care unit of the Royal Adelaide Hospital and is loving it.

Past president Patsy Johnson was invited to the 20-year anniversary of the scholarship project and the graduation ceremony for last year's scholars at Government House and saw Jasmine and the other students receive their graduation certificate from His Excellency the Governor Hieu Van Le. Continuing to quote from the report:

This year we briefly sponsored Arleye Jongbloed, who was then awarded a higher scholarship, and moved on to that. We wish her well. We now have Montana Doudle, another great student, who is in her 3rd year of a 4 year Physiotherapy Degree.

I end the quote there but I think that is a wonderful example of the work the club has done over its many years of existence. At the dinner the Mayor of Gawler, Karen Redman, was awarded a Paul Harris Fellowship for her community work. Indeed, Paul Harris Fellow awards were also presented to the editor of *The Bunyip*, Grady Hudd, and long-serving Rotarians, Brian Burt and Barry Stewart. I also acknowledge the presence that evening of the member for Light, the Hon. Tony Piccolo.

I have been a member of the Rotary Club of Gawler since October 1990. I was a full active member for two decades. Unfortunately, I felt the need to resign at one stage because I could not get to enough meetings but the club offered me honorary membership which I have been delighted to hold for much of the last decade.

### SUSTAINABILITY

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (15:37):** Today I want to talk about sustainability and South Australia's role in the increasingly urgent debate about the world that we will leave to future generations. My inspiration for this topic was a lecture delivered last night at the Bob Hawke Prime Ministerial Centre at the University of South Australia by Professor Ian Lowe.

Ian Lowe is Emeritus Professor of Science, Technology and Society at Griffith University and an adjunct professor at Flinders University. He has held a wide range of advisory positions to all levels of government in the broad areas of energy and environment. Among the many awards for his work, he was made an Order of Australia way back in 2001 for his services to science and technology. Ian Lowe was president of the Australian Conservation Foundation from 2004 to 2014 and he chairs the Wakefield Futures Group.

The Wakefield Futures Group is a fairly new organisation based in Adelaide. It consists of 10 prominent Australians, mostly scientists, who share a deep concern that Australia as a society and an economy has failed to set goals and implement policies that will lead to a future that is environmentally sustainable and desirable as well as socially just.

Many of their members are nationally and internationally famous for their work in a wide variety of disciplines and include prominent South Australians such as Professor Fran Baum from the Southgate Institute for Health, Society and Equity at Flinders University and Professor Rob Fowler from the University of South Australia Law School. Other members are from prominent universities interstate, and I note it includes Professor Carmen Lawrence from the School of Psychological Science at the University of Western Australia, who of course is a former premier of that state.

Why is it called the Wakefield Futures Group? The name Wakefield reflects the group's base in South Australia where the ideas of social pioneer Edward Gibbon Wakefield underpinned a radically new approach to funding the establishment of a free and tolerant society. The group believes that this began a tradition of social innovation that has repeatedly resurfaced in South Australia over the last 180 years: from giving women the vote in the 1890s to the social reforms of the Dunstan government in the 1960s and 1970s. I think we could add to that list initiatives such as container deposit legislation or banning single-use supermarket shopping bags. These are initiatives that were largely welcomed here but have struggled to gain traction interstate.

Coming back to Ian Lowe's address last night, the first thing I would say is that they had to find a bigger venue. Over 350 people registered to come out on a cold winter's night at dinnertime to hear a professor talk about sustainability, so this is absolutely an issue that is resonating with South

Australians. I have spoken before in this place about groups who are taking personal responsibility and direct action on a range of issues, from the extinction crisis to the climate crisis. They include Extinction Rebellion, the Australian Youth Climate Coalition, the School Strike 4 Climate, as well as the more established environment groups, such as ACF or the Wilderness Society, who continue to hold a candle to the way our governments treat our environment.

At the heart of Ian Lowe's presentation was the starting principle that the future is not somewhere we are going, it is something that we are creating. There are many possible futures to choose from, but we should be trying to create a sustainable future. He then points out that, if you look at what we are actually doing, you would be forgiven for thinking the objective was to make our world as unsustainable as possible. At the state, national and global level, we have rapid population growth; growing consumption per person; we are depleting non-renewable resources; we are overusing renewable resources, such as water, forests and fisheries; we are disrupting the climate; we are losing biodiversity; we have an economy that depends on increased use of resources to fuel growth; we are becoming less equal; we embrace materialism; and we foster fundamentalism.

One of Professor Lowe's great skills is to explain complex issues clearly and to un muddy the waters that those who benefit from business as usual seek to keep dirty and opaque. He also has the great advantage of having been around the block a few times, so he is able to point out that the reports, the warnings and the recommendations for transitioning our society and economy to a more sustainable basis are decades old. Whether it is the Club of Rome back in the seventies or more recent national and international forums, the advice has always been the same: things are going very badly wrong and time is running out to fix them.

I am delighted that there is now a new voice for reason in South Australia. The Wakefield Futures Group is one that all members of parliament should pay attention to. They are planning a number of future events featuring their esteemed academic members and I would urge all honourable members to attend where they can.

### PARLIAMENT HOUSE SCHOOL TOURS

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:42):** History can tell us many things about our future. History can inspire us in one direction and warn us from taking others. One of the greatest satisfactions this job brings is sharing the history of this parliament with schoolchildren. Many, if not most, students who enter this place are probably not overly excited about the prospect of heading to parliament for the day. For many, parliament is a big grey building on North Terrace that many would not think to enter as they do the Art Gallery or the SA Museum.

But it is this place—it is the walls that we have the privilege to work in every day—that hold the stories of why South Australia is the bold state that it is today. Exploring the history and stories behind the walls with schoolchildren from across the state is nothing but a joy. Hearing the reaction of every student who enters the other place never gets old. The gasps of excitement that such a place exists—a place that belongs to them, their families and their neighbours—a place that belongs to all South Australians has been here hidden all along.

School tours enable students to leave with hope and an understanding that, yes, there is a bloodline in the other place, there are lots of buttons to play with and, yes, these microphones bend in all different directions, much to the delight of our parliament. But parliament is much more than a big, scary grey building; it is a place where you can make a difference, a place where you can change the rules, and hopefully for the better.

Recently, I had the pleasure of helping the member for Light in the other place with a school tour. Trinity College North joined me in exploring the corridors of parliament. It was a busy morning with two school tours, but there was nothing but engagement and excitement from the students, especially when we visited Dr John Weste, who is always a highlight of the tour, especially when he shares his horror stories about mock turtle soup. They left this place buzzing with excitement and days later I received a very special parcel from the Trinity College North students. Inside, were over 50 letters detailing their newfound excitement about parliament.

I know this is pretty standard and students often write letters thanking members for school tours but, as I mentioned earlier, many of the students who came through the doors of parliament that day entered unaware of the tales of this place, unaware that in these chambers we create laws,

debate and change how South Australia operates. But they left with something much bigger: they left with hope and they left with new dreams. Of the 50 letters I received recently, over 15 students, including Sofia, Lily, Harry, Kaylee and Abby, said they now wanted to be a member of parliament—nine and 10 year olds wanting to be members of parliament with the hope that they too can change the rules.

We all enter this place with the hope that we as individuals or our political parties can leave the state better than we found it. For the sake of students like Sofia, Lily and Harry, who came to this place with no dreams of becoming a member of parliament but left with high hopes—the hope of becoming a member of parliament and changing the rules—I hope that they will have the tools they need to stay in South Australia.

Unlike my school tours, I will not leave politics out of this conversation. I am giving this speech today because this government went to the last election and provided a false hope—a hope that they would deliver better services and a lower cost of living. The member for Dunstan, the Premier of this state, has let South Australia down and, more importantly, he has let South Australians down. The Premier championed before the election, and I quote, 'We [the Liberal Party] do not have a privatisation agenda.'

These were the very words of the member for Dunstan, Steven Marshall, only a month before the state election. I would say the Premier has a very different understanding of the words 'don't', 'privatisation' and 'agenda' to that of the South Australian community. The government has let South Australians down. There is no vision, there is no direction, but there are cuts. There is a penny-pinching privatisation agenda, an agenda to put profits before people, from trams, trains and our front-line health service of SA Pathology. There are increased fees and charges.

Time expired.

#### **DEBOO, MR V.F.**

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:47):** As some of you may remember, I moved a motion last year regarding the importance of National Child Protection Week. On that occasion, I took the opportunity to highlight some of the absolutely harrowing figures relating to Australian children who have suffered abuse, neglect, child maltreatment or some other harm at the hands of those who should have protected them. I rise today to speak to the judgement handed down by the Court of Criminal Appeal on Monday in relation to the sentencing of convicted paedophile, Vivian Frederick Deboo.

For those who may not remember, Mr Deboo last year pleaded guilty to six counts of offence of a sexual nature committed against two boys aged 13 and 11. This followed an earlier conviction in 1996, where Mr Deboo was found guilty of nine counts of indecent assault and one count of unlawful sexual intercourse against three other young men. The despicable and unforgivable crimes committed by this man have imposed on his victims a life sentence in which they will carry with them the weight of these horrific actions for the rest of their lives.

On 4 December last year, Deboo was sentenced to a total of six years, seven months and six days imprisonment for offences against the two brothers, now known as A and B. Compared to the lifetime of grief and suffering the brothers are faced with, Deboo considered his sentence 'manifestly excessive'. In addition to this, he filed an appeal to serve out his sentence on home detention, claiming that due to his 'advanced age' and 'self reports of diminished libido and sexual interest' he no longer posed an appreciable risk to the safety of the community. Fortunately, the Court of Appeal did not agree and his appeal was dismissed on Monday, earlier this week.

I commend the Court of Appeal's decision to dismiss Mr Deboo's appeal and his outrageous attempts to evade the punishment imposed upon him. Child abuse and crimes committed by paedophiles such as Deboo have a lifelong traumatic impact on victims, affecting their ongoing mental wellbeing. In some tragic cases, child abuse leads to victims taking their own lives.

If there is a silver lining or one positive outcome to result from the years of offending by this man, it is the gracious and courageous response of both brother A and B following Deboo's sentencing. The two men are now using this terrible experience to raise awareness about child sexual abuse on a national level.

There are approximately 1.4 million Australians suffering from the abuse of paedophiles—that is 1.4 million, out of a population of only 25 million. Those numbers alone are staggering. In recognition of these alarming statistics and in the lead-up to the appeal decision, the brothers set up a 'field of innocence' on Montefiore Hill. Along with their family, the brothers created 1,400 paper cut-outs of boys and girls to represent the 1.4 million Australian survivors. As stated in *The Advertiser* on Monday 1 July, brother B said the aim of their efforts is that they hope all members of the community 'don't walk past child abuse'.

With 1.4 million Australians suffering from abuse, the brothers believe the issue should be a top public health priority, and I agree. All victims are left forever changed by their abusers, many suffering extensive mental health issues. The damage this can have on not just the abused individual but those around them is immense. As such, mental health issues which can arise from abuse are not bound to the victims alone. The toll of these crimes can wreak havoc on entire families and communities.

Both of these men are valued members of our community and of course are now parents themselves. Their goal now is to raise awareness in an effort to prevent any child from being exposed to such abuse within Australia into the future. I fully support brothers A and B, commend them for their efforts and applaud their courageous behaviours and their efforts to make sure that our community understands that this disgraceful behaviour that has happened in the past, and still, sadly, happens today, should never be tolerated and should be punished to the fullest extent of the law.

#### *Motions*

### **NATIONAL DIABETES WEEK**

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:52):** I seek to move the motion in an amended form.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS:** I move:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that 14 to 20 July is National Diabetes Week;
2. Recognises the thousands of South Australian families impacted by this issue;
3. Continues to promote diabetes awareness to make South Australians aware of the illness; and
4. Ensures that continued education takes place to promote better day-to-day activities to maximise opportunities to reduce contracting the illness.

I strongly believe in focusing on the importance of one's own health and wellbeing and the positive impact it can have. I believe setting individual goals and having clear and concise conversations to embrace an individual's own health beliefs and values can help achieve optimal self-management in respect to diabetes, one of the more complex conditions an individual can live with, a condition which, if left unchecked, over time can cause damage to the body's organs, blood vessels and nerves.

In South Australia 6.1 per cent of the population are diagnosed with diabetes. Self-management is the key to reducing the risk of diabetes-related ailments, albeit that the process can be complex. It is why we need to empower people to be confident in their choices. This National Diabetes Week, Diabetes SA is focusing on the importance of self-management, its campaign entitled 'A prescription for your health and wellbeing'.

The campaign focuses on self-management and improving communication between health professionals and people living with diabetes to create a more engaging and supportive environment. Treatment for this condition is more than a prescription for medication. It includes eating healthy, physical activity, maintaining a healthy weight, managing your medications, reducing stress and having regular check-ups with your doctor.

Unfortunately, a recent report, entitled *Burden of Diabetes in Australia: It's time for more action*, dated July 2018, noted that only 40 per cent of people with diabetes complete their annual cycle of care. For those who are unaware, a diabetes annual cycle of care is a list of the health checks created for people with diabetes to review their health. It is the minimum level of care for a person with diabetes.

International research indicates that type 2 diabetes can be prevented in up to 50 per cent of cases. Some studies have even found that the progression of diabetes can be delayed by up to 60 per cent. Knowledge is key. Early diagnosis and person-centred care remain critical for optimal diabetes management. We must do what we can to ensure people with diabetes feel empowered to make choices that lead to optimal health outcomes. NGOs in this area are carrying an enormous load in education, research and campaign work on this subject.

I thank Diabetes SA for the work they have undertaken in creating a new resource, Goals of Diabetes Management, to help people with diabetes navigate through the checks that are required to achieve better health and wellbeing outcomes. I encourage all in this chamber to familiarise themselves with this resource because we as a government have a responsibility to assist in developing a more coordinated and systemic approach to encourage optimal self-management for those who live with diabetes.

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

*Parliamentary Committees*

**ABORIGINAL LANDS PARLIAMENTARY STANDING COMMITTEE: APY LANDS VISIT**

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (15:57):** I move:

That the report of the committee on the key issues raised during its visit to the Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara lands, be noted.

The report covers the trip that five members of the committee made to the APY lands between 7 and 9 May this year. I think it was the fourth time that I have had the privilege to visit the APY lands, and in fact the first time I went there was with the honourable Minister for Human Services and the now Deputy Premier, which was a while ago.

Over the three days the committee was there, it visited four communities: Pukatja, Pipalyatjara, Amata and Mimili, as well as the administrative centre of Umuwa. During this time, the committee met with community members and service providers to hear about the successes and obstacles that the communities face. These issues included housing concerns, feral animal control, child and adolescent problems, sexual behaviour, potential mining and exploration activities in the area, disability services, education and health services. The report outlines the key issues raised in each of the meetings the committee undertook.

There are many people to thank for the organisation of the trip, and I will come to that shortly. As most members of parliament recognise, when a parliamentary committee visits communities, whether they be in the broader spectrum of South Australia as a whole or particularly the communities that are so isolated, they are very grateful for the presence of members of parliament. This trip was no exception. We were shown a great deal of the aspects of life in the APY lands and we saw a great demonstration of the great passion for those communities, both by the Anangu themselves but also by the many non-Indigenous people who have worked in those areas, for so many of them for a very long period of time. I think the committee would agree with me in indicating that that added great value to our visit.

On 7 May, after a longer than expected flight due to very strong headwinds, we met with the APY Executive Board in Umuwa. We had quite an extensive visit, hosted by representatives of the South Australian Housing Authority in Pukatja. That visit included something of great interest to me and that was the installation by the housing authority of poly septic tanks to replace the previous concrete ones which have a very low life span in the APY lands.

I am someone who, unfortunately, spent too much of my life cleaning out septic tanks but it was a bit of an education for the rest of the committee who had little or no knowledge of septic tanks, and are probably quite pleased that they do not have any. However, that was a great demonstration of the way in which the Housing Authority is extending the life of the facilities that are very much needed in these communities where the sewerage facilities that we all enjoy and take for granted every day are not available.

We then returned to Umuwa and had a terrific two-hour session with officers of the Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service, along with a number of other community members, and we

covered a great many issues while we were there. On Wednesday 8 May, we flew to Pipalyatjara and we then spent some time with APY Executive officers and the mining company, Metals X, looking at the mineral deposits that potentially will be mined—mostly across the border in the Wingellina region of Western Australia, but quite largely dependent on some of the minerals in South Australia—and, more importantly, water, and some other minerals including limestone, but also the potential for transport through South Australia to the Stuart Highway.

We then flew to Amata and spent time in the disability independent living centre. It was a place that impressed us very much with the services provided to those members of the community who do not have the physically active life that many of us enjoy. On the Wednesday evening we also had an excellent meal catch-up with many of the people that we had met during the two days and we also had the opportunity for each individual member of the committee to discuss with all those people the manner of the work that they do on the APY lands. On Thursday 9 May, we visited the Mimili Anangu School and then we went to the Nganampa Health Council clinic in that same community.

A trip like that does not happen without the help of many people in organising it. Our executive officer, Dr Ashley Greenwood, who only came on to our committee's services in a full-time capacity a number of weeks before this trip was due to occur, did a great job in organising that with many people, including the APY Trade Training Centre, particularly Mark Connelly, who I know a number of members in this place know. We thank him for the food, hospitality and accommodation, and for the friendly smiling face that he has provided in the APY lands for many years. Certainly, in relation to the accommodation at the Trade Training Centre, the honourable Minister for Human Services would have been aware of the vast difference between that centre and the place that she and I and the now Deputy Premier stayed in, probably a decade and half ago. It is a terrific facility there.

We are also very grateful to the Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation (RASAC), particularly Mark Jackman and Arshaan Khan, for their assistance in facilitating our movement around the communities; to the APY executive, Tania King, who was a great help to Ashley Greenwood in organising the logistics; and to Chris Doon, who was the APY mining tenement officer who accompanied us on the visit to the Pipalyatjara and Wingellina areas and also right up to the top north-west corner of South Australia, the Claude Hills, where we saw some of the area that could potentially be mined in the future.

We are also very grateful to Jacob McKenzie, the traditional owner who came out with us on his country to discuss the mining possibilities, and to Max Maczurad from Metals X, who I think has spent 14 years living at Wingellina, alternating between Perth and Wingellina. His great knowledge about the potential for that mining project was very valuable.

We are very grateful to the people from Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS)—Bobbi Sawyer, the social worker and manager, and Andrew Groome, the clinical lead and also, I must say, a very valuable impromptu interpreter—but also to the many Malpas and elders who shared their stories with us. Yllana Kerrin and her colleagues at the APY housing authority were very helpful in showing us the work that they are doing.

We are also grateful to Meredith Clarke from the Department of Human Services disability independent living program; to Nadia Mills, the principal of Mimili Anangu School; to Thomas Hampton, the Anangu education leader who has returned to his community and is showing great leadership to the young people there; to Kim Gates from Nganampa Health, who organised the visit to the clinic in Mimili; and to Viv Hammond, who gave us a great demonstration of her experience working in the lands.

We also thank the various artists we were able to meet at Ernabella Arts, Mimili Maku Arts and Tjala Arts, which is, in other terms, the Amata Arts Centre. I commend the report to the council. It does cover a great deal of the issues, many of which relate to the isolated nature of the APY lands. It is a very long way from Adelaide, but it is an important part of South Australia. As I said, I commend the report to members and thank the council for the facility to bring in this report for people's information.

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



*Bills***WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (SCISSOR LIFT CONTROL) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:11):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:12):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I introduce this bill to make some simple but urgent reforms to the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. I have introduced this bill as early as possible, endeavouring to give immediate effect to the Coroner's recommendations of 1 November 2018 regarding the safe operation of scissor lifts. I intend to consult widely with all stakeholder groups, including building and trade employer groups and unions. I acknowledge the presence of Pam Gurner-Hall, the widow of Jorge Castillo-Riffo, and members of the CFMEU in the gallery today, and appreciate their support for this bill.

In brief, the bill seeks to give urgent priority to preventing any further deaths or injuries from scissor lifts in South Australia by way of inserting new section 273A, aimed at ensuring a scissor lift is only operated when a safety observer or a spotter is present to enable that person to respond in an emergency, and that each scissor lift in use at a workplace is of the same make and model and has the same operating controls. This is a practical interim solution to the problems created by non-standard controls on scissor lifts that were identified by the Coroner. A maximum penalty of \$6,000 for an individual and \$30,000 for a body corporate will apply to offences against section 273A.

It also inserts new section 273B, which requires the department or the government, within a month of commencement of this section, to instigate a review of best practice engineering solutions adopted throughout the world to protect workers against scissor lift accidents involving overhead services. The review must consider the availability and design of secondary protective systems—including operator protective alarms and structures—and must provide options for law reform that would ensure scissor lifts are not able to be used in South Australia without a secondary protection system. That review would need to be provided to the minister within six months of the bill commencing, and the minister must provide a copy of that report to be laid before each house of parliament.

The Coroner provides his inquest findings with a clear focus on preventing further deaths in similar circumstances. Tragically, the significant and potentially fatal safety risks of scissor lifts have been well-known since at least 2014, yet here we are with another death in 2016 on the same machine on the same site having occurred, and still no action has been taken by governments at either a federal or state level. As my colleague the Hon. Tammy Franks noted earlier today, these machines have been responsible for a large number of deaths and injuries not just in South Australia but nationally, even going back to 2010.

The Coroner's thorough inquiry and report on the death of Mr Jorge Castillo-Riffo on the new RAH site made seven important recommendations. This bill seeks to urgently address two of those recommendations, while giving impetus to further reforms based on a review to be undertaken by the department, so that there are no more entirely preventable deaths like those of Mr Castillo-Riffo and Mr Steve Wyatt in South Australia, and no more needless serious injuries like those suffered by dozens more workers. I seek leave to conclude my remarks at a later date.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Parliamentary Committees***NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: MANAGEMENT OF OVERABUNDANT AND PEST SPECIES**

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:17):** I move:

That the report of the committee, on an inquiry into management of overabundant and pest species, be noted.

In 2018, the Natural Resources Committee commenced an inquiry to understand and review the current framework for the management of overabundant and pest species in South Australia. South Australia is home to numerous unique natural assets, many of which are adversely impacted by the occupancy of overabundant and pest species.

This is not the first parliamentary inquiry on this topic in South Australia, with a number of recent inquiries highlighting the ongoing interest in managing and preserving natural assets in the short and long term. This specific inquiry commenced in 2018. It seeks to review the efficacy of the current legislative policy and partnering programs currently in place and their strength in protecting our state's natural assets. The aim of the inquiry was to understand whether any other approaches may provide more effective alternatives.

The committee began by inviting submissions in relation to the cost of managing overabundant pest species in South Australia. Costs include impact on agriculture, animal welfare, communities, ecosystems and biodiversity. Supplementary to the submissions, the committee also visited Meningie in the Coorong region. In this regional meeting the committee heard evidence from 12 witnesses and received 44 submissions.

Through the regional visit and the number of submissions received, the committee was able to begin to understand the complexity of the problem in managing overabundant and pest species. There is no consensus on how to manage a wide range of different species that negatively affect our natural assets; however, the inquiry has helped outline the challenges that exist in formulating a successful management approach. These challenges include:

- divergent opinions among stakeholders about how overabundant and pest species should be best managed;
- varying levels of understanding about the roles and responsibilities of parties involved in managing overabundant and pest species;
- limitations in resourcing to manage overabundant and pest species; and
- a need for more research into best practice management approaches.

Stakeholder responses to the inquiry have highlighted that there is varying interest in the management of any species. The balancing of these interests is difficult. Communication and education about managing overabundant and pest species will prove to be an important element in balancing these varying opinions in the community. What also became apparent in the inquiry was the variance in understanding about parties' responsibilities in the current management system.

Stakeholders expect and assume that the government will manage overabundant and pest species and then enforce compliance. This is not currently the case. The committee heard that our state's biodiversity requires us to act on overabundant species. The clearing of native vegetation has in part created an environment which fosters some species to breed to the point of overabundance. Some species, such as little corellas and kangaroos, pose significant challenges for the environment in South Australia. The population of these two species have inflated to the point where they are affecting South Australia's environment and are costing the state in other ways, such as agriculture outputs.

Specifically, kangaroo populations may require substantial reductions. How to ethically achieve these reductions in kangaroo populations is a point of contention. However, the committee realised that urgent attention is required to strengthen the markets for kangaroo products to allow for better utilisation of non-commercial harvested carcasses. Further inquiry should be undertaken by the South Australian government to examine the validity and challenges of developing a more robust industry for kangaroo products. The South Australian government could also investigate industries arising from the use of overabundant carp from the River Murray.

The South Australian government should have the power to respond to a circumstance where a population of a species inflates to the point of overabundance and impacts the environment. This power does not currently exist. The committee agrees that the power should be in the form of a declaration from the Minister for Environment and Water. This ministerial declaration would trigger

urgent management. The committee heard that species that could be considered for a ministerial declaration include western grey kangaroos, little corellas, long-nosed fur seals and koalas.

The South Australian government must engage with stakeholders to build a mutual understanding on how to tackle this problem. Clarity is important to achieve outcomes, because although action should be government led, it is most likely to be local stakeholders such as the national parks service and Aboriginal communities fulfilling this action. Overabundant species are a problem for South Australia and it requires a sustained effort from all stakeholders and the state government. Long-term funding is needed to control overabundant species, research their populations and prevent their environmental impacts.

The committee would like to thank all the stakeholders who contributed to this inquiry. I also recognise my colleagues for their contribution to the committee and this report: the Presiding Member, Mr Josh Teague MP; and members of the committee, Mr David Basham MP, Mr Nick McBride MP, Dr Susan Close MP, the Hon. John Darley MLC and the Hon. Russell Wortley MLC. Finally, thank you to Mr Philip Frensham, our committee secretary, and the extremely capable Dr Monika Stasiak for their assistance to the committee. I commend the report to the chamber.

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

#### *Motions*

#### **BARTY, MS A.**

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:23):** I move:

That this council—

1. Congratulates Ash Barty on her recent wins at the 2019 French Open and the 2019 Birmingham Classic;
2. Recognises that Ash Barty is the first Australian woman since Evonne Goolagong Cawley to become the number one ranked female tennis player in the world;
3. Recognises that Ash Barty is the National Indigenous Tennis Ambassador for Tennis Australia; and
4. Acknowledges the excellent role model Ash Barty provides to young Australians as a strong Aboriginal woman.

It is with great pride that I rise today to pay tribute to Ashleigh Barty from Queensland. Ashleigh is now the number one tennis player in the world, and it is not only a source of great pride to all fellow Aboriginal people in this country but to our nation as a whole.

Barty, the 23 year old from Queensland, is extraordinarily special but the humble 23 year old would not say that. She is now the number one women's tennis player in the world after a rapid rise from a ranking of 623<sup>rd</sup> in the world after returning to the sport in 2016. She started playing at the age of five and won the girls' singles at Wimbledon in 2011 at the age of 15. In high school, she played volleyball, soccer and basketball, and she played them all well.

After winning the French Open at Roland-Garros last month, Barty said, 'it has just been really nice to have the support from everyone. I am a very lucky girl.' But luck had nothing to do with it. Hard work, dedication and a love for what she does had everything to do with it. Barty was the first Australian in 46 years to win the French Open. Before finding her sweet spot with tennis, she enjoyed a brief career as a cricket player for Queensland Heat.

Now, Barty is in the United Kingdom playing at Wimbledon. She had a strong first round win and I am sure she is going to play her very best. If she continues like she did in the first round, winning in straight sets, I am sure there are great things to come. Despite the expectations that many have, whatever she does will be a massive achievement. I am disappointed, though, that the broadcaster chose to play a men's game over the new number one seed, world number one and new Australian hero.

Barty is a proud Aboriginal woman, with ties to the Ngaragu mob and the land that stretches from the Victorian border up through the Snowy Mountains of New South Wales. Barty and her sisters learnt of their great-grandmother's heritage when she was around 12 years old and the girls became

involved with their Aboriginal family. In a recent article she said, 'My heritage is really important to me.' Barty became a Tennis Australia Indigenous ambassador in 2018.

I am not saying this is the main reason it is good to support this motion, but I also note that Barty is reported to be a supporter of the 2017 premiership winners, the mighty Richmond Tigers, which is another very strong reason to support a remarkable young woman. I note that many in the chamber, particularly those who wear the blue, yellow and red colours, do not necessarily seem to agree with this, but they are wrong. Her new ranking is the highest for an Australian woman since Evonne Goolagong Cawley was in the top position way back in 1976. She follows in her footsteps by becoming the second Indigenous Australian to lift the French Open cup, named after French tennis player Suzanne Lenglen, who won 31 championship titles.

It has been reported that Goolagong Cawley is Barty's idol. I think many Australians may have a new idol in Ash Barty as well. I would like to pass on to Ashleigh that I support her in what she does, the pride she takes in her Indigenous heritage and watching Richmond win the 2019 and 2020 AFL grand finals.

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

*Parliamentary Committees*

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON HEALTH SERVICES IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:27):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Wednesday 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON SA PATHOLOGY AND SA MEDICAL IMAGING**

**The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:28):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Wednesday 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON POVERTY IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:28):** On behalf of the Hon. Tammy Franks, I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Wednesday 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON MORATORIUM ON THE CULTIVATION OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:29):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Wednesday 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON WAGE THEFT IN SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (16:29):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Wednesday 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON REDEVELOPMENT OF ADELAIDE OVAL**

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (16:29):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Wednesday 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON FINDINGS OF THE MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION AND PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION AS THEY RELATE TO THE DECISIONS OF THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN GOVERNMENT**

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

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Wednesday 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

**SELECT COMMITTEE ON MATTERS RELATING TO THE TIMBER INDUSTRY IN THE LIMESTONE COAST**

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:30):** I move:

That the time for bringing up the report of the committee be extended to Wednesday 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

*Bills*

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CODE AMENDMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 February 2019.)

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:31):** I rise to support the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Code Amendments) Amendment Bill 2019, as introduced by the Hon. Mark Parnell, and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. The intent of the bill is simple: it will remove subsections 67(4) and 67(5) from the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. These subsections deal with the establishment of heritage character or preservation zones or subzones under the new planning system's Planning and Design Code.

Labor supports this bill because these subsections establish problematic precedents under the new planning system. Under the new planning system, the Planning and Design Code will replace all of the state's 72 development plans, establishing a single set of statewide planning rules. The system is currently under development. It was introduced in outback South Australia on 1 July 2019, so just this week. In regional councils, the consultation process will commence soon and it is expected that the code will be operational from November of this year.

In metropolitan councils, consultation will commence later this year for implementation of the code in July 2020, according to our advice. While the Planning and Design Code will establish one statewide consistent set of planning rules, it will of course feature many overlays to regulate planning and development in zones and subzones, much like our existing development plans do now.

In determining how a heritage character or preservation zone or subzone can be established under the Planning and Design Code, as I mentioned, subsections 67(4) and 67(5) establish a problematic precedent. This is because they stipulate that the Planning and Design Code cannot be amended for this purpose without the agreement of at least 51 per cent of owners of allotments within the relevant area. Nowhere else in our planning system do property owners have such a privilege to veto the establishment of planning rules.

Property owners cannot veto planning rules regarding building heights or land use and they should not be able to veto the establishment of heritage character or preservation zones or subzones either. Planning rules should be established according to best practice principles, not the will of property owners in certain localities. Indeed, that is the very point that was made by Labor in this place when the legislation was moved on 11 February 2016. On that day, in response to the proposed amendment to add these subsections 67(4) and 67(5), the Hon. Kyam Maher MLC stated:

...in the view of the government, zoning decisions should not only be determined by those who enjoy the local property franchise and who are accorded voting rights in the system. It should also be based on sound and logical policy objectives.

Heritage matters in particular should not be reduced to a question of percentages, but should include and take into account heritage expertise and applying the right criteria.

So Labor has been consistent on this issue. However, despite the objections of the then Labor government, the amendment that included these subsections was passed. It is in this light that Labor supports this bill. We objected to the subsections when they were originally moved as an amendment to the act and we object to them now. We do not want to create a precedent whereby property owners are given veto rights over planning rules and development decisions. Planning rules and development assessments should be made according to sound principles. I therefore commend the bill to the council.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:34):** I rise on behalf of SA-Best to say a few words in support of the Hon. Mark Parnell's Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Code Amendments) Amendment Bill 2019. The bill, of course, repeals parts of section 67 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act to remove the right of veto of property owners to strip heritage status from the areas where they live or where they own property. The history of the bill dates back to 2016 when the parliament voted in favour of an amendment to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Bill which meant that, when it comes to zoning areas such as historic conservation zones to protect heritage value, zoning could not take place unless 51 per cent or more of the affected property owners agreed.

I share the Hon. Mark Parnell's concerns that the effect of this arcane law is that governments cannot create any historic conservation zones unless more than half the affected property owners agree. The relevant sections of the act have yet to be made operational. It is imperative that we move now to protect South Australia's building heritage before it is too late. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the Hon. Mark Parnell that giving property owners a right of veto over planning policy has no place in a modern planning system. With those few words, I commend the bill to the chamber.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (16:36):** I rise to speak to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Code Amendments) Amendment Bill 2019. I am sure the honourable member will not be surprised with the response. The government understands the importance South Australians place on heritage and has introduced regulations to ensure that all state and local heritage places transition into the new planning system and are recognised by the Planning and Design Code.

The government understands that this provision of the act requiring 51 per cent of owners of properties in existing heritage conservation areas to approve these zones for the code has created some uncertainty in the process of transitioning heritage and character preservation areas from local development plans. As such, the government does not intend to proclaim these sections of the act at this time to enable the smooth transition of the code and will reconsider this provision at a later date following the full implementation of the code on 30 June 2020.

The government intends to further engage on heritage and character issues with the South Australian community prior to considering an amendment of this nature to the act. So the government will not be supporting the honourable member's bill.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:37):** To sum up the debate, I would like to thank the Hon. Clare Scriven and the Hon. Frank Pangallo for their support, and I also to thank the Hon. David Ridgway for his contribution. I have to say that I am somewhat gobsmacked in relation to the government's response to this for a number of reasons. The first one is that, in all of my discussions with people in government, whether it is in the Public Service, the state Planning Commission or the minister himself, I have not heard anyone defend these provisions. Not one person in government has said, 'These are good provisions; we like them, and we are going to keep them in the bill.' The best they can do is to say, 'We won't proclaim them to be operational'—in other words, leave them on the statute book but not commence them.

What an outrageous proposition, when everyone agrees that these clauses are hopeless, they need to go, they create the wrong message, they create dangerous precedent, that the best the government can do is to say, 'Can we just leave them on the statute book and we'll just not commence them, we'll just not proclaim them?' What a pathetic response! I am not going to speak at great length.

Clearly, I have the numbers here, and the lower house will have the opportunity to reconsider their position, and I am hoping they do.

I want to put on the record two very quick things that have occurred subsequent to me moving this bill. The first one is that all members would have received communication from the Local Government Association expressing their full support for this bill. The Local Government Association, on behalf of all of the local councils, agree with what I have said, what the Hon. Clare Scriven has said and what the Hon. Frank Pangallo has said, that a popularity contest for whether an area should be declared to have heritage status is absolutely the wrong way to go. The LGA have weighed in, saying, 'Get rid of these provisions from the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act.'

The second thing that has happened is that the Environment, Resources and Development Committee of this parliament has recently conducted an inquiry into heritage. It has reported on that inquiry. One of its recommendations, as reported, was: get rid of these offensive provisions in the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. It should be no surprise that that particular committee of parliament is a government-dominated committee.

When I put it forward as a potential recommendation, I said to the Liberal Party members of the committee, 'Go and talk to the minister. Go and talk to the department. I think you will find nobody agrees that this is good law and should stay on our statute books.' Clearly, they have done that. They have come back into the committee and we have unanimously agreed that these provisions should be expunged from the act. That is exactly what this bill does: it expunges these offensive provisions from the act.

Whilst I am disappointed that my fifth private members' bill in 13 years will not be passing in both houses today, I do hope that common sense will prevail and that in the lower house the Minister for Planning will eventually agree that a provision that nobody supports ought to be struck from the statute book rather than simply using the power to not declare it operational. With those brief words, I look forward to what I expect will be a very short committee stage and the final vote on this bill.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

Bill taken through committee without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:43):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Motions*

**SENIORS, FREE PUBLIC TRANSPORT**

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

That this council calls on the state government to extend free public transport to seniors to include all weekday services as well as weekends and public holidays.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (16:44):** It is a pleasure to speak on this particular motion. The Marshall Liberal government is developing and implementing a number of key public transport reforms to provide a better service to customers and drive patronage growth.

Some of the key public transport projects outlined in the 2019-20 state budget, as well as projects currently underway, include: the Gawler line electrification project, some \$615 million; the extension of the Tonsley rail line to the Finders Medical Centre, \$125 million; building new park-and-rides, \$33.5 million; a new station on the Tonsley line, \$8 million; the extension of 11 country bus contracts; the establishment of the South Australian Public Transport Authority

(SAPTA); the tendering of both the new bus supply and bus services contracts; and the north-east transport study, exploring sending the O-Bahn to Golden Grove.

SAPTA was established on Monday, 1 July—so not that long ago actually—and it will be reviewing the fare structure. The current initiative that provides for free travel for seniors on the Adelaide Metro network is designed to provide cost-of-living relief for seniors whilst also balancing the capacity of the network. Currently, free travel for seniors applies during interpeak periods, that is between 9am and 3pm and after 7pm on weekdays and all day on weekends. During these times, patronage demands across the network is lower and therefore sufficient capacity is available to encourage seniors to travel during these times. During the am and pm peaks the network is operating at capacity with predominately commuters and schoolchildren who do not have the flexibility to travel at other times.

Expanding the free seniors travel initiative, particularly during peak periods, is likely to result in additional demand for services which may not be able to be accommodated. This would result in services either operating over capacity or passengers being left behind, including those seniors, to wait for the next scheduled service. For some routes this may require additional wait times of up to 30 minutes, depending on the route.

The current free seniors travel initiative does not apply to regional public transport services which has resulted in ongoing complaints from these passengers. Further extending this initiative and excluding regional areas will exacerbate this inequality between regional and metropolitan communities. With those few words, I indicate that the government will not be supporting the honourable member's motion.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (16:46):** I thank the honourable member for moving this motion but the opposition will not be supporting the motion at this time. A fortunate situation for the opposition is that, unlike the Greens, the Labor Party is a party of government and is a party that South Australians have elected to government on numerous occasions.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** Point of order, Mr President.

**The PRESIDENT:** The Hon. Ms Franks.

**The Hon. T.A. FRANKS:** The Greens have held government in Tasmania and currently hold government in the ACT.

**The PRESIDENT:** Thank you, the Hon. Ms Franks. The Hon. Ms Scriven.

**The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN:** In South Australia, as I said. With this responsibility in South Australia it means that all commitments need to be both costed and taken into consideration in the larger context of a state budget. It would be irresponsible of the opposition to proceed with such a proposal without fully costing such a policy.

Of course, it was a Labor government that introduced free public transport for seniors in non-peak times, so the existing free public transport was a Labor government initiative. The opposition is listening to the community in order to develop strong public policy in preparation for the next state election in 2022. This, of course, includes public policy in relation to public transport. The opposition will release policies relating to this matter in due course.

Labor has recently finished its Labor listening tour with the Leader of the Opposition, along with caucus and shadow cabinet members of the parliamentary Labor Party, and has engaged with the broader community over the last 12 months. We have engaged with South Australians in all 47 state electorates, along with key stakeholders in industries, and will continue to do so in the lead-up to the next state election and beyond.

Of course, as we on this side know, the former Labor government has a strong record when it comes to public transport, including the following: the O-Bahn tunnel which has made the commute for north-east users in and out of the city even quicker; the expansion of trams throughout the city; the electrified Seaford train line—all of these are examples—and the list goes on. This is in contrast, of course, to the current state government, which has an abysmal record when it comes to public transport. Its first 12 months in office has seen \$47 million in cuts to public transport; the right-hand lane turn debacle that the member for Schubert has overseen; increases in fees and charges for



public transport users; the cancelled Modbury park-and-ride expansion; bus routes being axed; and, of course, this week the revelation that the government intends to privatise our trains and trams. It is really no surprise that public transport users think the Marshall Liberal government hates public transport.

As I said earlier, the opposition will generate strong policies in the lead-up to the next election and these will be announced in due course. I thank the honourable member for moving this motion but, again, point out that the opposition will not be supporting it at this time.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:49):** I rise on behalf of SA-Best to speak in support of the Hon. Mark Parnell's motion calling on the government to extend free public transport to all weekday services, not just during non-peak times, as well as weekends and public holidays. South Australia's senior citizens are feeling the pinch, with the highest electricity prices in the nation and cost-of-living pressures ever-increasing. The decision this week to privatise our trains and trams leaves me with no doubt that fares will increase for commuters and further disadvantage our senior citizens.

Last year, before the election, Premier Steven Marshall said the Liberal Party 'doesn't have a privatisation agenda'. Privatising trains and trams is a blatant broken promise by the Marshall Liberal government. It is the privatisation of trains and trams today and the privatisation of SA Pathology is on the horizon as well. One must ask, 'What's next?' Here are just a couple of comments by readers of InDaily on the privatisation announcement:

Here we go again.

Liberal government privatised Electricity Trust with the same lies er, promises.

Telling us the same storyline with the recent prison hive off. And now comes public transport.

Let us do away with politicians and privatise Parliament.

If they don't perform then seek new operators by the proven method, as all voters know from the electricity con.

That was written by Anthony Leahy. From another reader:

The lowest satisfaction rate for our transport systems is 80% for the privately-run buses.

At 87% (trains) and 91% (trams), these services are deemed so poor by the neo-cons that run the State Government that we must hand them over to the usual suspects.

By this calculation, surely the government must resign and call an election.

Unless of course they can demonstrate a satisfaction rating considerably better than our A-rated public transport system.

That was written by Ross Heitmann. Currently, you just cannot trust this government to do the right thing for South Australians, including providing incentives to the elderly members of our society to keep active and get out of their homes. The privatisation of our trams and trains should have been put to voters at the election. This is a government that prides itself on accountability and transparency. Spare me!

The Hon. Mark Parnell had the initiative contained in his motion costed by the Parliamentary Budget Advisory Service at the last election. The advice received from the PBAS is that the cost of seniors travelling for free at a time when they would currently have to pay a concession fare is about \$1.5 million a year. In my view, \$1.5 million is a miserly amount for the government to wear to provide free public transport at all times to all Seniors Card holders.

A cost-benefit analysis would no doubt demonstrate the many benefits of providing such an investment, including enabling more seniors to use public transport for travelling, engaging with the community, spending money, meeting friends and continuing to experience an enriched quality of life, which could only be further enhanced as a result of such a great initiative. Research conducted by Dr Helen Feist and her team at the Australian Population and Migration Research Centre at the University of Adelaide back in 2016 proved the innumerable benefits of providing free transport to seniors. Dr Feist acknowledged that:

On average, we found that Seniors Card holders are making more than 150,000 rides on public transport in the Adelaide metropolitan area every week.

She also acknowledged that:

Most activities of daily living—such as shopping and paying the bills—are conducted in the local neighbourhood and involve other forms of transport. However, public transport is often used for other life-enriching activities, such as volunteering or civic and social engagements, going to the movies, visiting friends, or travelling to the city for a day out.

We should be doing everything in our power, using every opportunity available, to encourage the independence and mobility of our senior citizens so that they stay engaged with the community and the world around them, and not limit them to the four walls in their homes. The initiative by the Hon. Mark Parnell is one way to achieve that noble goal. I commend the Hon. Mark Parnell for his motion, and with those few words I commend the motion to the council.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:55):** Just briefly, by way of summary, I thank the Hon. Clare Scriven, the Hon. David Ridgway and the Hon. Frank Pangallo for their contributions, and particularly thank SA-Best for supporting the motion; it is clear that it does not have the support of the old parties.

I want to put a couple of things on the record: first, to make it abundantly clear that we did get this policy costed—the parliamentary budget office costed it prior to the last state election. I can provide the detailed charts to members if they want, but, as I have said, it is about \$1.5 million a year. Given that the amount we are spending on roads and freeways is in the billions of dollars, we are talking about less than a thousandth of that.

As the Hon. Frank Pangallo said, there is a range of reasons why seniors are travelling during peak period, but there is one that had not actually struck me until quite recently. I have become friends with a family from Pakistan. They have recently arrived in Australia and they are undertaking their English language courses at TAFE, which is great. They have the initiative to try to learn (they already speak some English) or to better learn the language of their new country.

The TAFE classes start at 9.30, but the family need to be on the train before 9 o'clock in order to get to class on time, so they are paying a fare, including their elderly mother who does have a Seniors Card and can travel free on the interpeak. Given that we are talking about a family that has arrived in South Australia with very little, it seems mean that an older person travelling to English classes at TAFE has to pay on their trip into town.

I am disappointed that neither of the old parties see fit to support this motion. I remind members that all of the seniors groups and social welfare groups have called for an initiative such as this, and I expect that, when the 2022 election rolls around, we will certainly be putting it back on our policy manifesto.

It has occurred to me in the meantime that I might join my Labor colleagues standing at the top of the ramp of Adelaide Railway Station, and they can hand out their flyers condemning the Liberal government for privatising the trains and I can hand out some flyers condemning both Liberal and Labor for not supporting free travel for seniors. I am disappointed that this will not pass today, but it will be back and I will make sure that all the seniors groups in South Australia are made aware of the result of today's motion.

Motion negated.

### **GREAT AUSTRALIAN BIGHT**

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges that the Norwegian government owns 67 per cent of the oil and gas exploration company Equinor;
2. Further acknowledges that Equinor plans to drill in the pristine and environmentally sensitive waters of the Great Australian Bight despite overwhelming public opposition to the proposed drilling;
3. Supports the Norwegian government's decision in 2018 that its own sensitive Lofoten Islands be protected against oil and gas drilling;
4. Recognises that our own Great Australian Bight should also be similarly protected;

5. Further recognises that it is within the Norwegian government's power, as majority shareholder, to stop Equinor's plan to drill for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight; and
6. Requests the Norwegian parliament to take note of the wishes of the majority of South Australians and broader Australians by imploring the Norwegian government to have Equinor abandon its exploration plans to drill for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight.

(Continued from 16 May 2019.)

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:58):** On behalf of the Greens, I am delighted to be supporting this motion. It is pleasing to see that, in the state parliament and in the federal parliament, we have an alliance of sensible minor parties who are listening to the wishes of the people of South Australia. They are paying attention to the environment and they are campaigning strongly against this ill-conceived project to drill for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight.

This is an issue I have spoken about at some length previously, so I am not going to revisit all of that. In the past I have moved motions calling for South Australia to support World Heritage listing for the Great Australian Bight, and I have asked numerous questions during question time. In fact, at the federal level the Greens have been even more active: former senator Wright was active on this campaign, former senator Simms was active on this campaign, and now Senator Sarah Hanson-Young is continuing with that work.

This is an issue that the Greens are not going to let go lightly. We know that the implications of drilling for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight are both local and global. When it comes to local impacts, you need look no further than the modelling commissioned some years ago now by The Wilderness Society that showed what would happen to an oil spill of modest magnitude in the Great Australian Bight.

In other words, we are familiar with the BP spill in the Gulf of Mexico, a very large spill, but an even smaller spill than that in the Great Australian Bight would, depending on the season, flow either east or west but, regardless, would contaminate thousands of kilometres of coastline. It would contaminate the water to an extent that commercial fishing would not be possible, and the impact would be measurable not just on the South Australian coast but right through to Victoria, through Bass Strait to Tasmania and to southern New South Wales. It would impact on the tourism industry, the commercial fishing industry and the recreational fishing industry. The impact would be immense.

At the global level, as I have said in this place countless times before, if we are serious about reducing our impact on the world's climate, if we are serious about keeping global warming to below 1.5°, some people might say 2° but, regardless, if we are serious about acting on climate change, we need to leave the remaining reserves of fossil fuels in the ground. In fact, scientists say that we need to leave 80 per cent of known reserves in the ground, let alone going out looking for new reserves.

This is a disaster in waiting at the local level and at the climate level. It is absolutely nonsensical that in a climate emergency, with renewable energy now punching well above its weight and getting better and stronger every year, we would risk our marine environment searching for oil and gas in a risky, deep water environment. It makes no sense at all.

The motion before us is in a number of parts, and I appreciate that a number of amendments have been filed. I guess we will get to those—I was going to say 'in a committee-type stage'. Do we do that, a committee stage? No? We are going to do it all in one go.

**The PRESIDENT:** We are going to do it live, the Hon. Mr Parnell.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** We are doing it live. So we have amendments from the Labor Party filed and from the Liberal Party, and this is my chance now to move my amendment, a very simple amendment that has been filed. It simply provides for a transmission mechanism; in other words, in my view—and I did this in consultation with the Hon. Frank Pangallo—the motion as drafted required a mechanism so that what we decide today will actually be delivered to our colleagues, the parliamentary decision-makers in Norway. My amendment adds an additional paragraph 7. I move to amend the motion as follows:

After paragraph 6, insert new paragraph as follows:

7. Requests the President of the Legislative Council to write to the President of the Norwegian Storting, Tone Wilhelmsen Troen, conveying this resolution and requesting her to inform other members of the Storting of its contents.

It was unclear that the motion as drafted would have necessarily resulted in such a letter being written and, out of an abundance of caution, I wanted to make sure that it was written.

I also understand that the Hon. Frank Pangallo intends, at some point, to visit Norway. I think that is a great initiative, and if he were able to personally talk with members of the Norwegian parliament that would be even better. If part of his presentation was that the people of South Australia, via their elected parliament, are saying that the risks of drilling for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight are unacceptable that would be an excellent message and I would be more than happy for him to deliver that on my behalf and on behalf of other members of parliament, if that is how it turns out. That is not what my amendment says. My amendment invites the President to write, and that at least would make sure that our colleagues in Norway, our parliamentary colleagues there, know how strongly South Australians feel about this issue.

So we will vote on the clauses as they come up. What I will say, though, is that I am happiest with the motion as originally drafted. That is what I am happiest with. It makes it very clear, in particular in paragraph 6—that is really the guts of this motion—because it requests the Norwegian parliament to take note of the wishes of the majority of South Australians and, more broadly, in Australia by imploring the Norwegian government to have Equinor abandon its exploration plans to drill for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight.

Other amendments that have been put forward are not as strong as that; they are weaker. I will listen to what arguments are put forward by the movers of those amendments but I wanted to put on the record now that the Greens' position is consistent and unshakable. This is a bad project. It is bad for South Australia. It is bad for the planet.

We want Equinor to follow the lead of Chevron and BP and abandon the field. We want them to leave. We want them to say, 'Well, it seemed like a good idea at the time, but it is too risky and the people of South Australia do not want it. So we are out of here.' Once that has happened, we can then close the door so that we do not get company after company coming forward with this harebrained idea that it is somehow good for us or good for the planet that we risk the resources and the natural environment of the Great Australian Bight.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (17:06):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Paragraph 2

Leave out 'Further'

After 'Equinor' insert 'currently'

Leave out 'despite overwhelming public opposition to the proposed drilling'

Paragraph 3

Leave out paragraph 3 and insert new paragraph as follows:

- '3. Conveys to the Norwegian government, Norwegian parliament and Equinor the substantial public opposition in SA to the proposed drilling, including from multiple local councils, and tourism and fishing businesses concerned with threats to jobs.'

Paragraph 4

Leave out paragraph 4.

Paragraph 5

Leave out 'Further'

Leave out ', as a majority shareholder,'

Leave out 'for oil and gas'

Paragraph 6

Leave out paragraph 6.

I rise to speak very briefly on this motion. I thank the Hon. Frank Pangallo for bringing the motion to this chamber. I note that there are a number of amendments and I think it will take some time to carefully work through those as we go through the process. I think that the government and the opposition, and also the amendment from the Hon. Mark Parnell, seek to give expression to the intent of what the Hon. Frank Pangallo is putting forward.

I am sure that whatever we decide on in this chamber will be something that the Hon. Frank Pangallo can take with him. I think, importantly—and this is what much of this motion goes to—it is expressing the wishes of many people in Australia. So I think once we finish the process of going through amendments, I am sure there will be something that suitably expresses the views of many people in South Australia, and indeed Australia, that the Hon. Frank Pangallo can take with him when he makes representations. I thank him for bringing this motion to the chamber. We will be as constructive as we can be in going through the various amendments that the government, the opposition and the Greens have on this.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (17:08):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Paragraph 2

Leave out 'despite overwhelming public opposition to the proposed drilling' and insert 'and that public concerns have been expressed'

Paragraph 3

Leave out 'Supports' and insert 'Notes'

Paragraph 4

Leave out 'should also be similarly protected' and insert 'is already afforded significant protections'

Paragraph 6

Leave out 'the majority of'

Leave out 'by imploring the Norwegian government to have Equinor abandon its exploration plans to drill for oil and gas in the Great Australian Bight' and insert 'when proposing plans to undertake exploration in the Great Australian Bight.'

The South Australian coastline and waters of the Great Australian Bight are of great ecological significance, providing habitat for many protected species, most notably the nationally endangered southern right whale, which congregates in large numbers at the Head of the Bight every year to give birth and rear their calves. The government supports, through evidence bases, assessments for development in sensitive areas that ensure environmental protection but also allow ecologically sensitive development that creates economic benefit and employment.

Oil and gas exploration permits in the Great Australian Bight are currently held by Equinor, Bight Petroleum, Chevron, Karoon Energy, Murphy, Santos and JX Nippon Oil and Gas. The tenements are between 200 and 400 kilometres off the South Australian coast. All petroleum exploration permits in the Great Australian Bight are in commonwealth waters. The National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority (NOPSEMA) is Australia's independent expert regulator for health and safety, environmental management, and structural and well integrity for offshore petroleum facilities and activities in commonwealth waters, as well as designated coastal waters where functions have been conferred.

South Australia has no statutory role in the assessment process; however, a number of South Australian departments are considered relevant organisations and proponents must undertake meaningful consultation and address all concerns. In February 2009, Equinor published a draft environmental plan (EP) for its proposed exploration drilling program in the Great Australian Bight. Following a public comment process, a revised EP was submitted to the independent regulator NOPSEMA in April. On 27 June, NOPSEMA requested additional information on the EP and I understand Equinor is preparing a response to this request.

As I stated, all mining exploration in the Great Australian Bight is regulated by NOPSEMA, in line with strict processes for approval. Ultimately, NOPSEMA decides whether the impacts of a proponent are as low as reasonably practical and acceptable. There are already numerous protected

areas within the Great Australian Bight region: immediately adjacent on the land, such as the Nullarbor Wilderness Protection Area; and, in state and commonwealth waters, South Australia's Great Australian Bight Marine National Park extends eastward from the Western Australian border, and the Far West Coast Marine Park complements and overlays much of this national park. The Great Australian Bight Commonwealth Marine Reserve covers a vast area of ocean under commonwealth control, and that offers a level of protection already in place.

It is noted that there is a degree of opposition from the South Australian community to Equinor's drilling proposal. This is largely motivated by the threat of oil spill, particularly based on worst-case modelling that shows the extent reaching as far as the coast of New South Wales. While it has no direct role in the approval process, the South Australian government is supportive of the proposed development only if it can satisfy the rigorous independent assessment process. The government will need to be assured that risks to South Australia's sensitive marine environments and the economies that depend on these are managed appropriately. With those words, I commend the amendments to the council and I commend the honourable member for bringing this matter to the Legislative Council's attention.

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO (17:13):** Thank you to all members who have contributed to this motion, although I will express an element of disappointment that both the government and Labor have attempted to water—or should I say oil—it down and temper the public feeling that exists in our community and beyond. It is interesting to see that Labor still do not believe in opinion polls when an Australia Institute poll back in April showed that almost 60 per cent of Australians were opposed to drilling in the Great Australian Bight and 68 per cent of South Australians were opposed to it. So an overwhelming majority of Australians are opposed to it.

Both parties have already nailed their colours to the mast when it comes to mining. They are obviously staunchly supportive of it regardless of who gets hurt. We are seeing that today as the Marshall government pushes ahead with the contentious mining bill, despite a pyrrhic stance by a handful of their own MPs in opposing it. I will view that stance with a bit of cynicism. They happen to be in vulnerable regional seats and perhaps self-preservation would be at the forefront of their thinking. They know full well that the Labor Party was the architect of that bill and is not going to oppose it in both chambers. The farming sector will be the ultimate loser as the government and Labor pander to the big end of town, the greedy mining companies and their shareholders, but I will have more to say about that when the bill comes before the Legislative Council.

As for drilling in the Bight, both federal Labor and the Coalition made some half-hearted noises during the recent federal campaign to try to appease and win the votes of the many Australians who have expressed their opposition. Bill Shorten promised an independent inquiry, while the Liberals followed suit, committing themselves to an independent audit of the National Offshore Petroleum Safety and Environmental Management Authority's current consideration of exploration in the Bight, and asking the Chief Scientist to work with the regulator, which I have to point out is supposed to be independent anyway.

What does that all mean? Nothing really. They seem to be paying lip service because they can turn around and say, 'NOPSEMA is an independent body. They have done all the due diligence, so who are we to interfere with their decision?' Only last week, NOPSEMA delayed the inevitable. They have asked for more information from Equinor about its plans and have given the Norwegian company 60 days to respond. I would have thought there was already plenty of information available in the massive EIS it put out for public consultation, which received tens of thousands of responses. Again, this appears to me to be somewhat of a gentle consolation to the opponents.

We have seen large numbers of people turn out on our beaches to protest drilling for oil and gas in our Bight. An impressive group of the world's leading professional surfers is also backing the protests. We have even had Richard Branson, the boss of Virgin, come out against the drilling. They know the enormous damage an oil spill can do to our 'girt by sea'. In May, the Great Australian Bight Alliance travelled to Norway to meet various interested environmental groups, political parties and, of course, Equinor. The delegation attended the company's AGM, which was dominated by the issue of drilling in the Great Australian Bight.

Just consider that: Equinor is a large multinational company that makes billions of dollars each year. They have interests all around the world, but the issue that dominated their AGM was

drilling in the Great Australian Bight. That was the important issue addressed by The Wilderness Society to shareholders, and they tell me that they got a very good hearing. They also met with local Indigenous groups and there was a colourful paddle out event at the Oslo Opera House.

Significantly, Norwegian MPs have backed a decision to divest the country's \$1 trillion sovereign wealth fund from oil and gas exploration firms and invest more in renewable energy companies that are not listed on stock markets, not that it will affect the fund's stake in the state oil and gas firm, Equinor, or the country's ongoing plans to explore and pump more oil and gas in waters increasingly north of Norway. Tore Storehaug, of the Christian Democrats, part of the country's ruling coalition, called it a major step in Norway's efforts to limit the nation's climate risk 'and contribute to the urgent global shift from fossil fuels to renewables', so they are taking an enlightened approach.

As mentioned, I will be travelling to Norway next month and I have scheduled meetings with Equinor, MPs and members of the Norwegian government where I will remind them of the rising tide of sentiment against the drilling plans, along with a motion that hopefully will be passed today by the Legislative Council.

**The PRESIDENT:** Honourable members, we are going to do this very slowly, since there are multiple amendments, and during the course of me putting the questions to the council I will be seeking indications from members, which is not additional debate, of where they will be voting. That will assist me in making the call on the voices. As I see it there are no amendments for paragraph 1, so I am intending to put the question that paragraph 1 stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** I now come to paragraph 2, and we have amendments that have been moved to the motion by the Minister for Human Services and the Hon. Mr Maher. The first question I am going to put is that the word 'Further' in paragraph 2 be left out.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Mr President, by way of trying to be helpful to the chamber, I wonder if there is a procedural way to move the suite of Labor amendments and have that voted on or the suite of opposition amendments and have that voted on.

**The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins:** Labor and opposition are the same.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Sorry, Labor or the government. Old habits die hard, the Hon. Mr Dawkins. I gather from discussions that have been held—my guess is, and other members will speak for themselves—that the Minister for Human Services' amended version will be preferred by the majority of the chamber rather than the Labor opposition's version. Maybe if people want to speak to that; I do not know if we can procedurally do that.

**The PRESIDENT:** I will simply put a lot of questions, but that will assist me greatly. As I understand it from the advice from the Leader of the Opposition, at the end of the questions I put, the amendments put forward by the minister will prove successful. Does someone need to disabuse me of that notion, or is that likely to occur?

**The Hon. F. PANGALLO:** If it is likely that I will not have the numbers for paragraph 2, and that it stand as printed, my preference would be for the government amendment.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** For the sake of helping to clarify as well, I do appreciate that, for all of these, the Hon. Frank Pangallo's preference is, and I assume from the very strong words that the Hon. Mark Parnell put that preference is for the mover and for the Greens, that they stand as printed. I was not trying to say that that was not the preference but that the least worst option for a majority of those in the chamber is the government's version rather than the opposition's version. That is the feeling I get from having discussions.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** And if it may also be equally helpful, the government is not supporting the Labor amendment to paragraph 2, but we are supporting the new paragraph 3.

**The PRESIDENT:** Let's worry about 3 in a minute. I just want to get through 2.

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY:** For the record, Mr President, I will be supporting the government's amendment.

**The PRESIDENT:** I am going to put the questions. We put amendments in the positive, which is not necessarily how they are expressed in the written motion that you file—for the benefit of honourable members. The first question I am going to put is that the word 'further' in paragraph 2 stand as part of the motion. That comes from the opposition and, as I understand it, that will fail.

Question resolved in the negative.

**The PRESIDENT:** I am now going to put this question: that the word 'currently', as proposed to be inserted into paragraph 2 by the Hon. K.J. Maher, be so inserted. As I understand it, that will not find favour with the council.

Question resolved in the negative.

**The PRESIDENT:** We now come to the question that the words 'despite overwhelming public opposition to the proposed drilling', as proposed to be struck out by the Hon. K.J. Maher and the Minister for Human Services, stand as part of the motion. Because the Labor Party and the Liberal Party are in agreement, it is likely that will prove successful. This is being put in the positive, so Liberal and Labor will be voting against this because I am saying those words are standing in and you both do not want them standing in.

Question resolved in the negative.

**The PRESIDENT:** Now we come to the question that the words proposed to be inserted by the Minister for Human Services be so inserted. As I understand it, that will find favour with the council.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** Just to be clear, we struck out the word 'further' and we are now being invited to put the word 'further' back in?

**The PRESIDENT:** No, 'further' was not struck out because the question was put that it stood. It was not successful; it did not stand.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** But the new words to be now inserted include the word 'further', so it does no harm.

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes. You are just trying to complicate things, the Hon. Mr Parnell. The minister is only inserting a paragraph at the end. 'Further' remains.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Now I am putting that question: that the words proposed to be inserted by the Minister for Human Services be so inserted. As I understand it, that is going to find favour with the Legislative Council.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** With paragraph 3, the minister is seeking to leave out the word 'Supports' and insert 'Notes', and the Hon. Mr Maher is seeking to remove the whole paragraph and insert a new paragraph.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** If I may speak to what we are doing?

**The PRESIDENT:** Yes, you can.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Again, I recognise that the mover's preference is that his original motion stand as printed, and that is what the mover has been voting for, has indicated he will continue to vote for and vigorously support in these deliberations. The Labor amendment leaves out the entire paragraph and puts in a new paragraph 3. The government amendment amends paragraph 3. From discussions, my guess is that Labor leaving out the whole paragraph will not find favour with the chamber and, although it is the preference of the mover that the paragraph remain unamended, that the government amendment to this will be successful.

Jumping ahead, it may also be helpful to indicate that when we come to paragraph 4, having had discussions, I suspect it will find favour that the entire paragraph 4 is left out, in which case I intend to move from the floor that what would have been the replacement paragraph 3 then replace paragraph 4, just for the sake of completeness about what I intend to do.



**The PRESIDENT:** The Clerk has advised me that you will not be able to do that.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** That I cannot move an amendment from the floor?

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** That makes it simpler.

**The PRESIDENT:** I am not sure that it entirely does. Let's just deal with paragraph 3 and then perhaps we will revisit paragraph 4 in a minute. My understanding—and I thank the Hon. Mr Maher for his guidance—is that the amendment moved by the minister, which leaves out the word 'supports' and inserts 'notes', will find favour; therefore, the question I intend to put is that the amendment moved by the Minister for Human Services to paragraph 3 be agreed to, and I would expect the chamber to find favour with that question. Does anyone wish to disabuse me of that notion? I put the question that the amendment moved by the Minister for Human Services to paragraph 3 be agreed to.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** The next question I have to put is that paragraph 3 as amended by the Minister for Human Services stand as part of the motion. If the council agrees with that, and in the ordinary course we do, then the Hon. Mr Maher cannot move his paragraph replacement.

**The Hon. K.J. Maher:** Is there a reason I cannot amend paragraph 4 for whatever I please, when it comes to it—leave out a word or insert other words?

**The PRESIDENT:** There are no amendments after debate has been closed. The exchange at the moment is not about further movements; we are talking about giving the President and the council guidance. I am now putting the question, which the council will find favour with, that paragraph 3 as amended by the Minister for Human services stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** We now come to paragraph 4. The Hon. Mr Maher has filed amendments to leave out paragraph 4, so delete it in its entirety, and the Minister for Human Services has a discrete amendment to leave out the words 'should also be similarly protected' and insert 'is already afforded significant protections'. If I understand where we are at, the council will find favour with the minister's amendments to paragraph 4; is that correct? The Hon. Mr Parnell.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** It might be that it is possible for the Leader of the Opposition, in light of the result on paragraph 3, to not move that paragraph 4 be struck out, in which case he may then find favour with the paragraph 4 as originally printed, which is certainly my preference.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** I thank the Hon. Mark Parnell—

**The PRESIDENT:** Before you do, I just have to see if you can do it.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** No, I am not going to do it.

**The PRESIDENT:** No, there are no more movements, the Hon. Mr Parnell. Are we clear? It is an indication that you might change the way you vote.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** No, we will be supporting our own amendment; that is, to strike out the paragraph. Again, in discussions, I know it is the preference of the mover that it stand as originally printed but, from discussions, I suspect the least worst option for the mover is that it gets left out rather than be amended to reflect the government's amendment. I suspect that the chamber will find favour with leaving it out in its entirety rather than having the words as proposed to be amended by the government, but we will be continuing with our—

**The PRESIDENT:** Thank you, I have it. I am keen to get paragraph 4 done now. The question I am going to put is that the amendment moved by the Minister for Human Services to paragraph 4 be agreed to, and as I understand it that will be successful in the council. I am going to put the question that the amendments moved by the Minister for Human Services to paragraph 4 be agreed to.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** I now have a secondary question which will also be agreed to; that paragraph 4 as amended by the Minister for Human Services stand as part of the motion.

The council divided on the question:

Ayes ..... 7  
Noes ..... 10  
Majority ..... 3

**AYES**

Darley, J.A.	Dawkins, J.S.L.	Hood, D.G.E.
Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)	Lucas, R.I.
Stephens, T.J.		

**NOES**

Bourke, E.S.	Franks, T.A.	Hanson, J.E.
Hunter, I.K.	Maher, K.J.	Ngo, T.T.
Pangallo, F. (teller)	Parnell, M.C.	Pnevmatikos, I.
Scriven, C.M.		

**PAIRS**

Ridgway, D.W.	Bonaros, C.	Wade, S.G.
Wortley, R.P.		

Question thus resolved in the negative; paragraph deleted.

**The PRESIDENT:** The minister has no amendments in relation to paragraph 5. The Hon. Mr Maher has amendments to paragraph 5. The Hon. Mr Maher, can you indicate what you think the numbers are?

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** I can indicate from discussions—again noting that the mover would much prefer the paragraph to remain unamended—that I suspect that both the government and the opposition will be supporting the amendments to paragraph 5, and that may make the numbers overwhelming.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I can confirm that the government supports these amendments.

**The PRESIDENT:** The question I am going to put is that the amendments moved by the Hon. K.J. Maher in paragraph 5 be agreed to. It is my understanding that that will find favour with the council.

Questioned agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** I then put the secondary question, which I understand the council will find favour with, which is that paragraph 5, as amended by the Hon. K.J. Maher, stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** We now come to paragraph 6. The minister is seeking to amend paragraph 6 and the Hon. Mr Maher is seeking to leave out paragraph 6.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** As you stated, the opposition is seeking to leave out paragraph 6 in its entirety. The minister is amending it. I think leaving out 'of the majority' is an additional thing to be left out of that paragraph. From discussions, although the mover's distinct preference is for the paragraph to remain unchanged, I suspect the council will not find favour with the opposition leaving it out entirely and will find favour with the government's amended form of that paragraph.

**The PRESIDENT:** As no-one disagrees with that assessment, the questions I intend to put are that the amendments moved by the Minister for Human Services to paragraph 6 be agreed to. My understanding is that will find favour. Then, when I put the secondary question, which is that paragraph 6 as amended by the Minister for Human Services stand as part of the motion, that will also be successful. The President does not want to get caught again. As no member has disabused me of that understanding, I intend to put the question that the amendment moved by the Minister for Human Services to paragraph 6 be agreed to.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** I put the secondary question now that paragraph 6 as amended by the Minister for Human Services stand as part of the motion.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** We now come to new paragraph 7, which is proposed to be inserted by the Hon. Mr Parnell. Can he indicate whether he has the numbers?

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I have moved it but, to be honest, I have not heard whether it has favour. I would be very surprised if it did not, because it is the action item, if you like: it requires you to do something, Mr President, and that is to pull out your fountain pen and write a letter to the Norwegian parliament.

**The PRESIDENT:** You do not require, you actually request me, as the Clerk has rightly pointed out. Let's hope I am in a good mood, the Hon. Mr Parnell, if it passes.

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** Whilst the Greens would require things of you, Mr President, we would never be as presumptuous and we would merely request. My guess is that this will find unanimous support in the chamber. I might add that our unsuccessful attempt at leaving out paragraph 3 and inserting a new paragraph 3 has much of what would have been in that new paragraph 3 covered by the Hon. Mark Parnell's amendment, which I think will find unanimous favour in the chamber.

**The PRESIDENT:** Unless any honourable member disagrees with that assessment, the question I am going to put is that the new paragraph 7, as proposed to be inserted by the Hon. M.C. Parnell be so inserted. That should find favour with the council.

Question agreed to.

**The PRESIDENT:** I now put the all encompassing last question, which will find favour with the chamber—

**The Hon. K.J. MAHER:** How do you know?

**The PRESIDENT:** I think; I am just giving my assessment. The question I put—so that you can guide me, the Hon. Mr Maher—is that the motion moved by the Hon. Mr Pangallo as amended by the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. K.J. Maher and the Hon. Mr Parnell be agreed to. I am taking a punt and my assessment is that that will find favour with the council, unless any honourable member wishes to correct me.

Motion as amended by the Hon. J.M.A. Lensink, the Hon. K.J. Maher and the Hon. M.C. Parnell carried.

### *Bills*

## **APPROPRIATION BILL 2019**

### *Estimates Committees*

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

**The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (17:46):** I move:

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

Motion carried.

At 17:47 the council adjourned until Thursday 4 July 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***RIDE-SHARE VEHICLES**

**140 The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition)** (5 June 2019). Can the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government advise:

1. How many ride-share vehicles are currently operating in South Australia, and how many ride-share vehicles were accredited to operate in 2015-16, 2016-17, 2017-18, and 2018-19?
2. Is the government enforcing on-road vehicle inspections for ride-share vehicles, and if so, how are those vehicles being identified, how many ride-share vehicles have been inspected, and how many were found noncompliant?
3. Is the government enforcing all driver accreditation conditions, including child-related employment screening clearances and a national criminal history check, for ride-share vehicle drivers, and if so, how many ride-share vehicle drivers have been found compliant and how many have been found noncompliant?
4. Given the flexibility of ride-share vehicle identification, how is the government enforcing the requirement for ride-share drivers to not have any alcohol/illicit drugs in their system, how many ride-share drivers have been tested in 2017-18 and 2018-19, and of those tested how many ride-share drivers have been found to breach that condition in each of those years?
5. How is the government enforcing vehicle identification requirements for ride-share vehicles, and how many ride-share vehicles have been found to be noncompliant with those requirements?
6. Is the minister aware of ridesharing vehicles using taxi ranks and if so:
  - (a) What is the fine for a ridesharing vehicle using a taxi rank?
  - (b) What is the nature of enforcement in relation to vehicles using taxi ranks without an appropriate taxi licence?
  - (c) How many ride-share vehicles have been detected using taxi ranks illegally?
  - (d) How many ride-share vehicles have actually been fined for using taxi ranks?
7. Have all ridesharing companies complied with collecting the \$1 surcharge, how much has been collected via the \$1 surcharge directly from ridesharing companies, and how much has been collected in total?
8. Has any spending been allocated against the money collected via the \$1 surcharge, or has that money been returned to consolidated revenue?
9. Has the government been asked to use some of the funding collected via the \$1 surcharge to operate managed taxi ranks and concierge services, and will the government commit to doing so?
10. Under the new CTP arrangements, why have taxis been allocated to class 5 with CTP premiums between \$3,220.12 and \$3,630.41 while ride-share operators have been allocated to newly created class 48 with CTP premiums between \$570.87 and \$639.98, and does the government believe this fee structure establishes a level playing field?

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment):** The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government has received this advice:

1. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) is not aware of the number of ride-share vehicles actively operating at any point of time as it varies.

The number of vehicles accredited to operate ride-share services since 2015 are:

- at 1 July 2015, the Passenger Transport Regulations 2009 did not allow for ride-share services to operate as they do now;
- at 1 July 2016, zero vehicles were accredited to provide ride-share services;
- at 1 July 2017, one vehicle was accredited to provide ride-share services;
- at 1 July 2018, 483 vehicles were accredited to provide ride-share services;
- at 1 June 2019, 3 880 vehicles were accredited to provide ride-share services.

Note these numbers relate only to vehicles specifically accredited to provide ride-share services only. Metropolitan chauffeur vehicles have been able to provide ride-share services with their accredited chauffeur vehicle throughout these periods, including in 2015.

2. The DPTI Compliance Unit conducts on-road compliance activities relating to all passenger transport vehicles. Statistics are not kept by accreditation type.

For the 2018-19 financial year up to 12 June 2019, a total of 11,857 taxi and small passenger vehicles (includes chauffeur and ride share) have been checked through on-road compliance activities. Of these, 1,102 were found to be noncompliant with either roadworthy standards or requirements under the Passenger Transport Act 1994.

For the 2018-19 financial year to 12 June 2019, a total of 44 vehicles (taxis and small passenger) were found to be operating without a current vehicle inspection.

3. The criteria for all categories of driver accreditation includes a child-related employment screening and a national criminal history check. This is required prior to approval. Applicants who do not pass or complete a child-related employment screening and a national criminal history check are not issued with driver accreditation.

4. Only police officers are authorised to conduct tests to determine if a driver of a motor vehicle is under the influence of alcohol/illicit drugs.

5. Ride-share vehicle identification requirements are enforced by the DPTI Compliance Unit through on-road compliance. On-road compliance is focused in areas where use of passenger transport services is high, including at public events as well as other areas around the city and suburbs.

DPTI compliance officers have discretion as to how a particular matter of non-compliance with relevant legislation is handled. This can range from roadside education, an informal warning, formal caution, an expiation or referral to the Passenger Transport Standards Committee (for breaches of the Passenger Transport Act 1994).

Given the use of education and informal warnings, statistics are not kept in relation to the total number of ride-share vehicles that have been detected as not complying with identification requirements.

6. DPTI Compliance Officers have identified some non-taxi vehicles, including ride-share and private vehicles, in taxi zones.

- (a) The expiation amount for a vehicle that is not a taxi stopping in a taxi zone is \$130 plus a \$60 victim of crime levy.
- (b) DPTI compliance officers have discretion as to how a particular matter of noncompliance with relevant legislation is handled. This can range from roadside education, an informal warning, formal caution, an expiation or referral to the Passenger Transport Standards Committee (for breaches of the Passenger Transport Act 1994).
- (c) Statistics are not kept in relation to the total number of ride-share vehicles detected stopping in taxis zones, due to the use of education and informal warnings and in some instances drivers of private vehicles are found stopping in taxi zones.
- (d) For the 2018/19 financial year to 12 June 2019, a total of 176 drivers have been expiated by DPTI for stopping in a taxi zone by its compliance officers. Note some of these drivers include drivers of private vehicles. Separate statistics are not kept.

Note these answers are provided on information maintained by DPTI. However, it should be noted that parking zones and parking matters are primarily the responsibility of councils.

7. All centralised booking services have been complying with the collection and reporting of the \$1 point to point service transaction levy. Since commencement of the levy to 31 May 2019, the total raised through the levy is \$19.4m.

DPTI cannot accurately report because some relevant providers operate more than one service.

8. The levy is being used to fund industry assistance packages paid to eligible taxi licence owners and lessees (total paid \$32m), decreased fees to industry (including free driver accreditation), and a lifting fee paid to drivers for the loading and unloading of wheelchair or scooter bound passengers.

9. The levy has been approved to be used for the items outlined in the previous answer.

10. CTP insurance premiums is a matter for the independent CTP Insurance Regulator.

#### SA POWER NETWORKS

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (16 May 2019).

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

On 15 May 2019, the Australian Energy Regulator (the regulator) approved SA Power Networks' 2019-20 pricing proposal. This follows an assessment by the regulator under the National Electricity Rules that the pricing proposal is consistent with the regulator's revenue determination for 2015-20 (approved in 2015) and the 2017-20 SA Power Networks' Tariff Structure Statement (approved in 2017).

For the distribution network costs, the regulator approved an increase of \$46 for the average South Australian residential customer. However, the approved pricing proposal also includes pass-through increases for transmission costs and for solar PV feed-in tariff costs. These increase by \$6 and \$7 respectively for the average residential customer.

The drivers of the approved network prices include:

- An increase in the allowed distribution revenue as per the 2015-20 revenue determination
- An increase in revenue to address under-recovery of revenue in previous years, and
- A forecast decline in electricity sales from 2018-19 to 2019-20 due to higher solar PV penetration and greater energy efficiency.

It should be noted that the network charges approved by the regulator's decision are not the total electricity bill for customers. South Australian electricity retailers incorporate the network tariff with the cost of wholesale electricity and retail costs. The regulator has indicated in their determination for the default market offer that these non-network components are forecast to go down in 2019-20, which would offset the network tariff increases.

The pricing proposal also outlines the three tariff trials that SA Power Networks is conducting in 2019-20:

- An alternative agreed demand tariff for a small number of large business customers in the Riverland
- A voluntary residential time-of-use trial to incentivise customers moving their energy usage to the middle of the day to use excess solar PV generation, and
- An off-peak controlled load tariff for residential customers with smart meters.

Lastly, the regulator is currently considering SA Power Networks' revenue proposal for 2020-25. It is expected that a draft determination will be released in late September 2019 and a final determination in April 2020.

I am further advised that the member's claim that the Minister for Energy and Mining had conceded on radio that the government 'will not be able to meet their election promise' is not accurate.