

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 31 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*.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:16): I lay upon the table the 23rd report of the committee, 2018-19.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

South Australian State Election 2018—Election Statistics by the Electoral Commission SA.
Regulations under Acts—

Land Acquisition Act 1969—General.

Victims of Crime Act 2001—Statutory Compensation—General.

Return to Work Corporation of South Australia Charter.

Question Time

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE INCIDENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has the minister personally spoken to and checked on the welfare of the nurse who was stabbed by a patient at Flinders Medical Centre last week, as reported by Channel 10 news last night, and what action is being taken to ensure that incidents like this do not happen again?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:20): I haven't personally spoken to the nurse but I have spoken to senior management at the Flinders Medical Centre, including nurse leadership. I have been advised that, of course, the nurse is shaken by the experience but that she is back at work and she is recovering well.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE INCIDENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): Supplementary arising from the answer given to the question: will an independent investigation take place into allegations that a senior staff member at the Flinders Medical Centre told the nurse who was stabbed not to report the incident?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:20): I fail to see how that is a supplementary; nonetheless, claims of a cover-up are without foundation, I am advised. SA Health actively encourages all staff to report any incidents of aggression. This particular incident was reported to senior management immediately following the incident. I am advised there is no evidence that anyone was silenced.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE INCIDENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Supplementary arising from the original answer: is the minister satisfied in relation to the incident that he spoke of in the original answer that no staff member covered up the incident? Is he satisfied of that?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:21): I have confidence in SA Health management and I am advised that there is no evidence that anyone was silenced. Our number one priority is to provide a safe environment for our staff and patients. SA Health is currently strengthening the resources available to nurses in managing situations involving risk and risk of escalation. Nurses are trained in de-escalation techniques when faced with challenging behaviours; however, the public needs to understand that we will not tolerate violence towards our hardworking hospital staff—they do an amazing job.

HOSPITAL SAFETY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary arising from the original answer: has the minister received any advice regarding safety and security measures that need to be improved across our hospital system?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:22): I constantly receive advice in relation to safety. This is a constant part of what SA Health does: we are constantly striving to ensure the safety of our patients and our staff. To give honourable members a couple of examples of recent initiatives: the investment of \$7 million in a car park at Lyell McEwin will significantly improve patient safety.

In relation to country hospitals, in the last 12 months there has been a review undertaken right across our country hospitals to improve safety. The investment in the Whyalla Hospital will specifically reduce the risk of violent incidents, and there have been violent incidents in Whyalla Hospital in recent months. In terms of a system-wide approach, we are currently looking at a document produced by the Victorian Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation to see what lessons can be learnt for our South Australian policies and procedures.

HOSPITAL SAFETY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Further supplementary arising from the original answer in relation to hospital safety: will the minister now relent and implement in full the 10-point plan from the Nursing and Midwifery Federation for improved safety in our public hospitals for nursing staff?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:23): The honourable member is clearly asking questions written by another. In my previous answer, I already indicated that we are looking at that plan and looking at lessons that can be learned in South Australia.

FLINDERS MEDICAL CENTRE INCIDENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary arising from the original answer: are there any further investigations to take place or does the minister now consider this matter closed?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:24): Is the honourable member asking in relation to the incident at Flinders—

The PRESIDENT: I think it is the incident. Leader of the Opposition?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, the incident that was the original answer.

The PRESIDENT: Yes, it was the incident itself.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am not aware of any investigations in relation to that matter.

MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES, SHARES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Has the minister reviewed her compliance with the Ministerial Code of Conduct, and is she able to now make a statement to the council that clarifies whether she complied with all requirements in regard to conflict of interest and the disposal of her shares in private hospital operator Healthscope?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:24): I answered an extensive range of questions in estimates on Friday. There is nothing further to add.

MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES, SHARES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): I am seeking a supplementary because the minister has avoided the question. If she has made full and frank statements in estimates, can she then say whether she has complied with all requirements in regard to conflict of interest and her disposal of shares in Healthscope?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:25): Some of these matters relate to cabinet processes, which I am aware shouldn't, ought not to, can't be and therefore in my situation won't be canvassed, because they relate to cabinet processes.

MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES, SHARES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:25): Supplementary: drawing the minister's attention to the fact the question is about the Ministerial Code of Conduct, did the minister seek the approval of the Premier for exceptional circumstances prior to her disposal of Healthscope shares as per section 4.6 of the Ministerial Code of Conduct, and if so, on what date was that approval given?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:26): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. She really ought to review the estimates *Hansard* because on that particular matter I was asked and I answered, and it was actually reported in the paper. If she doesn't have access to *Hansard* then she should read those comments, and there is nothing further to add.

MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES, SHARES

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:26): One more supplementary: did the minister ever receive, sight or discuss any documents related to proposals for contracting or outsourcing of elective surgery cases during the time the minister held shares in Healthscope?

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Did I ever what, sorry?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Did the minister ever receive, sight or discuss any documents related to proposals for contracting or outsourcing of elective surgery cases during the time the minister held shares in Healthscope?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:27): I think I just have to refer to the first answer that I provided to her original question.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICES, PRIVATE PROVIDERS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:27): My question is for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister outline the process undertaken to contract private hospitals to treat public patients, and can he assure the council that every step has been conducted with integrity, ensuring conflicts are managed and deliver value for taxpayers' money?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:27): The honourable member is clearly asking for a detailed answer, so I will seek a detailed explanation of the time frames and the procedures. I have no reason to doubt that the integrity of the process has been maintained throughout.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Are the Labor benches ready for the Hon. Ms Bourke? She would like to have a go at a supplementary.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:28): Yes; while the minister is figuring out the answer to the original question—

The PRESIDENT: Don't make it worse, the Hon. Ms Bourke. Just get on with it.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Is it correct that five of the 13 hospitals contracted are run by Healthscope?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:28): I think the point the honourable members forget is that my understanding is—I don't know what the fifth one she is referring to is, but I presume that four of the ones she has referred to are ACHA hospitals (Adelaide Community Health Alliance). Let's be clear: they are owned by the community. You could call them private, if you like, but they are community hospitals: Ashford, Flinders Private, etc. My understanding is that Healthscope is contracted by them to provide management services. If the honourable member is really suggesting that the government should—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —that individual cabinet ministers—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —should be aware of every entity—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, Leader of the Opposition, please cease your conversation. I would like to hear from the minister, as would the Hon. Ms Bourke.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I am just trying to make the point simple for the Labor members: if the honourable member is really suggesting that cabinet ministers need to declare a conflict whenever an entity in which they have an involvement provides a service to another entity, I would hate to hold shares in Telstra.

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

MINISTER FOR HUMAN SERVICES, SHARES

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:30): Can the minister assure the council that no proposal for outsourcing public patients to private hospitals was provided to cabinet before minister Lensink sold her shares in Healthscope, if indeed she has sold them?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:30): With all due respect, I have no insight into minister Lensink's share portfolio.

TAFE SA WOMEN'S EDUCATION PROGRAM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:30): My question is directed to the Minister for Human Services about the Women's Education Program delivered by TAFE SA. Can the minister please provide an update to the council about this important program and outline why investing in women's education is wonderful for individuals and for our state?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:30): I thank the honourable member for her question. On 26 June, it was my great pleasure, as well as the Hon. Tammy Franks, Ms Steph Key, the member for Reynell and the member for Florey—I think that was all the MPs who were there—to attend the Adelaide College of Arts for the 2019 TAFE SA Women's Education graduation. We were invited by Ms Jenice Wheeler, who is the Education Manager, Foundation Skills, for the relaunch program for the Women's Education Program.

This program provides women in South Australia with the opportunity to develop skills, knowledge and self-confidence to succeed in further education or employment and deal with career and life changes. Importantly, the program has been critical to supporting women who have

experienced domestic and family violence to regain confidence, make social and professional connections and increase their opportunities for further education and/or employment.

The program has strong working relationships with the Working Women's Centre, domestic violence services and the Zahra Foundation. The program is particularly designed for women who have been out of paid work or studied for several years who wish to return, want to prepare themselves for entry into a specific education course or area of employment, want to develop skills to advocate for women in a variety of settings, are in the workplace and are looking for a career change or promotion, are unsure about career or further study direction and want to explore possibilities, or who want to build confidence or are interested in exploring women's position in society.

The event was to relaunch the program to recognise 40 years of the uniqueness of it and to celebrate the achievements of the new graduates. The Women's Education curriculum has recently been approved by the Australian Skills Quality Authority (ASQA), with a focus on advocacy for women. It was called a relaunch because the ASQA alignment, of course, was previously titled Certificate in Women's Education. The certificates now available through the stream are a Certificate II in Vocational Preparation for Women, Certificate III in Women's Advocacy, and Certificate IV in Women's Advocacy. The program has had support from a range of women from various political parties over the years.

The program has also provided a submission to the federal inquiry into vocational education and training. We also heard from a number of women who had benefited from the program in 40 years. There was a panel that spoke about their experiences of having participated in each of the decades since its inception. It was a great pleasure for me to present the certificates to all of the graduates, and I wish them all the best as they embark on their future endeavours.

NATIONAL ALCOHOL STRATEGY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question about the national alcohol strategy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: According to the ABC's *Background Briefing* program on Radio National on the weekend, the draft national alcohol strategy was meant to be finalised last year but it hasn't been because some states and territories have refused to endorse it because they are concerned it has been watered down by inappropriate alcohol industry involvement.

According to the program, initial drafts of the national strategy prepared by public health experts have been completely rewritten so as to be almost unrecognisable. Even the version sent out for public consultation last year has been further watered down under the influence of the alcohol industry.

The ABC claims to have a leaked copy of the strategy and points to a number of areas that appear to be the victim of industry meddling. For example, references to Australia having a harmful alcohol culture glorified by the exploits of public figures and fuelled by the ready availability of cheap alcohol, have been replaced by a statement that says:

Alcohol is an intrinsic part of Australian culture and plays a central role in most people's social lives.

That is very similar to long-established industry talking points that seek to normalise an alcohol culture. The ABC claims that at least five jurisdictions have not yet signed off on the strategy, with Western Australia and the ACT refusing to endorse it because they believe it has been so badly weakened by industry involvement.

My question of the minister is: what is South Australia's position? Has our state already signed off on the strategy, or is the minister joining with his WA and ACT counterparts, who are insisting that the strategy be redrafted to better reflect public health priorities?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for his question. Let's be clear: South Australia will continue to support a national alcohol strategy. We do believe that it is appropriate to have industry as part of the consultation. The

honourable member's question seems to be predicated on an understanding of the process that differs from mine, but I will certainly check.

The honourable member seems to be suggesting that a version of the national alcohol strategy is available to be signed off bilaterally out of session by each of the members. My understanding is that we as ministers were going to discuss it. I think the relevant body is the Ministerial Drug and Alcohol Forum, and, rather than signing off bilaterally out of session, my understanding is that we would next discuss it when we are in session.

In that context, I will be keen to look at the draft that arrives. I appreciate there have been a number of versions. I will certainly be keen to look at the version that is next presented to the forum and give South Australia's position on that.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Parnell, a supplementary.

NATIONAL ALCOHOL STRATEGY

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:37): Minister, at the forum to which you referred, does South Australia have any alternative proposals to present?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37): My understanding is that we are going to discuss a version. My understanding is that the expectation is that the commonwealth will table the next version. As South Australian minister, I am not preparing a South Australian version.

LAND TAX

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): My question is to the Treasurer. Will someone who holds a significant portfolio—say, of eight investment properties in areas such as Kingston Park, Oaklands Park, Mitcham or Christies Beach—who doesn't necessarily own these properties in the same names, be impacted by your land tax aggregation policy; that is, is it possible that properties held jointly may be apportioned to individuals' land tax liability, or is this aggregation policy just limited to trusts?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:38): As I have publicly indicated on a number of occasions, the government is out to consultation in relation to the final nature, shape and structure of its proposed land tax reforms. The bill is likely to be introduced into the parliament no later than late September, and until then there is no concluded position in relation to the government on this issue.

LAND TAX

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): Supplementary question arising from the answer: does the minister have absolute confidence that his cabinet colleagues understand the effect and nature of his land tax references, both now and as it went through cabinet?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:39): I have absolute confidence in all of my ministerial colleagues in all of their undertakings that they undertake on behalf of the good people of South Australia.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, is this a supplementary?

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:39): Yes, thank you, Mr President. Can the Treasurer explain why one of his own ministers, the Hon. David Speirs, has interests in eight properties but won't be subject to land tax on the aggregated value because he says they are not owned in the same names, and does he consider minister Speirs a tax avoider?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:39): I have no knowledge of the individual tax affairs of my colleagues or, indeed, members of the opposition or the crossbench.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo.

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:39): Well, they actually are available on the register of public interest, Treasurer.

The PRESIDENT: Leader of the Opposition, you have the call; supplementary.

LAND TAX

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): Can the Treasurer please explain to the chamber how there has been no position taken on the final outcome and yet one of his own cabinet colleagues is absolutely definitive in today's InDaily that it's only about trust. How does he reconcile that with his confidence that everyone in his cabinet understands it?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:40): I don't have to reconcile my views about my cabinet colleagues. I have absolute confidence and faith in my cabinet colleagues.

DONATELIFE WEEK

The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS (14:40): My question is directed to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on organ donation in South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:40): I thank the honourable member for his question. Organ donation is an act of great generosity, generosity both from the individual donating and from their families. It also makes a world-changing difference to people needing donations. Last year, 36 South Australian donors saved the lives of 95 people on the organ recipient waitlist, giving them the ultimate gift of life. In this respect, I am very pleased to hear that this year has already proven to be a busy year in terms of the number of donations made. But, still, 1,400 Australians are waiting for an organ transplantation.

The honourable member's question is very timely as we are in the middle of DonateLife Week, a national initiative to raise awareness of organ donation and the importance of open discussions around donation. South Australia leads the nation in organ donation. We have the highest level of donor registrations, at 68 per cent, and when asked to confirm a loved one's wishes to proceed with donation, 73 per cent of families in South Australia give consent—again, leading the nation.

Despite this, with many recipients on transplant waiting lists around Australia, there is an ongoing need for Australians and South Australians to register their donation decision and also to discuss this decision with their loved ones. These two simple steps could save lives. This is a crucial point sometimes overlooked by individuals generous enough to register themselves as organ donors. It is vital to have a discussion with your family about your choice, to make them aware of your choice, to increase their comfort with your choice, and to affirm the importance to you that your choice is respected. It is good that three-quarters of South Australian families consented to their loved ones' organs being donated, but that still means that one in four do not provide consent. Organs which could have had a positive impact on another life are not available.

This Sunday past, I had the privilege of opening DonateLife Week in South Australia. It kicked off with what they called an amazing race, and the weather was perfect for it. The teams were made up of donors, donor recipients, family and friends and some of the health professionals who provide care. SA Health was represented with a team, although they were not on the winner's podium at the end of the day; that honour went to the team assembled by Dr Stewart Moodie, the medical director of DonateLife SA, and I congratulate him and his team for their effort in the fun race and for supporting awareness of organ donation in South Australia.

Organ donation is an important decision for individuals and their families and its impact is also very important. This DonateLife Week I ask South Australians to consider registering as donors, if they have not done so already, and if they have made the organ donation decision, to discuss their decision with their families at the same time.

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer a question about land tax.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The state government's proposed overhaul of land tax laws in South Australia has created widespread anger and uncertainty across the community. The state's economy is being impacted now by proposed changes that might or might not come into force from 1 July next year as investors, from large property developers to hardworking mums and dads, make decisions now in fear of what may lie ahead. A large number of projects have reportedly been put on hold.

In the midst of this controversy, SA-Best is holding a forum this Sunday for all South Australians to air their concerns about the government's proposed land tax reforms. Both you and the Premier have been invited to attend and, while the Premier has already politely declined, we are still waiting to hear from your office about your availability to attend. For the record, the forum is being held at high noon this Sunday 4 August at the Allan Scott Auditorium at UniSA's City West campus on North Terrace. The invitation still stands. My questions are:

1. Can the Treasurer advise how much it will cost South Australian taxpayers simply to put in place the necessary systems to collect these increased taxes?
2. Can he also advise how much it will cost South Australian taxpayers per year to collect these increased taxes?
3. Does he agree with some independent experts that the cost of collecting the taxes could exceed \$8 million a year, putting a sizeable dent in the expected \$40 million windfall he believes the new tax regime will deliver to his coffers?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:45): If the honourable member is happy to provide me with the names of the independent so-called experts and the indication of the estimate of \$8 million, I am happy to take Treasury advice and respond. I have not seen those particular estimates and I have not received them. I have seen many claims in the media of independent experts who have done estimates of various things in relation to the land tax proposals, but I note that none of them have been named.

If the honourable member wants to share the estimate of \$8 million from the independent experts, I am happy to respond. Certainly, the advice from RevenueSA, more importantly than Treasury, is that the costs of collecting are nowhere near the estimated claim of \$8 million a year the honourable member is referring to from an anonymous independent expert.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, a supplementary?

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:46): Could you tell us what the estimate is, Treasurer?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:47): I will take that on notice. It is significantly less than \$8 million but, ultimately, it will depend on the final shape, structure and nature of the government's proposal, which, as I said, will be introduced into the parliament in late September. Depending on whether or not we incorporate elements just of the New South Wales or Victorian model or, indeed, some elements of the Queensland model, will change the potential workload for RevenueSA staff in relation to the implementation of the system.

For the benefit of the Hon. Mr Pangallo, until the legislation is introduced, and ultimately until the good people of the parliament in both chambers have given their view, we will not be in a position to give a definitive final estimate of what the cost of collection will be.

GENETIC MODIFICATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding genetic modification techniques.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: On the day before the federal election the Coalition government announced the planned deregulation of some new genetic modification techniques, and the organisms that are produced as a result, by seeking to classify them as being non-GM. These include

SDN-1 techniques and dsRNA techniques. I understand that earlier this year the minister agreed to support the deregulation of these modification changes, including the above techniques.

The proposed deregulation has now been presented to federal parliament. My question to the minister is: why did the minister support the deregulation of these genetic modification techniques, and what consultation did he undertake before giving his support?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): I must say that the Hon. Mark Parnell's questions on this were more understandable. I presume the honourable member is asking a similar series of questions to the questions the Hon. Mark Parnell asked. I am at a loss to know where the honourable member says I made statements in support of this particular change. My recollection—and I will take this on notice—is that South Australia did not vote on that matter.

GENETIC MODIFICATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:49): Supplementary: what you are saying, minister, is that these regulations have been laid on the table without the support of the South Australian government?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:50): I refer to my previous answer.

WOMEN IN STEM

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about supporting South Australian women and girls. Can the minister please update the chamber about the launch of an initiative to encourage girls into and support women in STEM careers?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:50): I thank the honourable member for his question and for his interest in this area, knowing that he is the father of a daughter who is 12.

This was a very important event that some of us were privileged to attend on 25 June at the South Australian Museum. Indeed, my colleague the Minister for Education, the Hon. John Gardner, and Ms Katrine Hildyard, member for Reynell, attended. The Commissioner for Equal Opportunity was there in attendance, as well as the Chief Scientist, Professor Caroline McMillen; Jim Whalley, the Chief Entrepreneur; and Dr Eva Balan-Vnuk, who is the chair and founder of HerTechPath, which has a significant role in terms of technology on behalf of the South Australian government.

Research has shown that girls and boys have equal interest in science, technology, engineering and mathematics in their early school years; however, a lack of female role models begins to turn girls off STEM in later years. Education, experience, stereotypes and encouragement from parents all help to shape differences that are often labelled inborn. Young people's belief in the importance of STEM is also influenced by the opinions of their friends and other members of their community.

Women currently occupy less than 20 per cent of positions in the majority of ICT occupations. It's clear that businesses looking to grow should seriously start to think about the availability of quality female candidates to them. Initiatives to attract and retain women to study tech and work are key if we are to make the most of their amazing talents. While women are under-represented in the higher paid sectors, this does not correlate with their use of technology. For example, women comprise 47 per cent of Australians who play video games but only 8.7 per cent of those are employed within that industry.

Women are also major consumers of technology, particularly social media. A national survey of 1,500 people conducted by Westpac in January 2013 found that nearly half of women said they could not live without social media compared with about 22 per cent of men who felt the same way. More than three out of four women said that technology had made it easier to save time and money, manage finances and connect with others. It's clear that women can and do develop the skills and knowledge required to use and embrace technology. This is the issue that HerTechPath is seeking to address.

In recognising that 'you can't be what you can't see' HerTechPath supports young women and the people who influence them to see the possibilities and many career options that technology provides. To take advantage of these opportunities, we need to encourage girls and young women interested in believing that they can learn and work in tech fields. HerTechPath is very much in that space. They have recruited a committee of a number of women who work in technology in some very senior roles and they are engaged in going to schools and speaking to schools to encourage young women and girls to think about this as a particular pathway.

On speaking to some of the people who had been there, one of the guest speakers highlighted the fact that having had HerTechPath attend her school—actually, it might have been one of the speakers—the reporting from the students was that it had not been particularly on a number of students' radar prior but, having had a presentation, something like 95 per cent of the students, certainly an overwhelming number, were very interested in engaging in STEM as a possible career.

I would like to thank particularly Dr Balan-Vnuk, who has driven this particular initiative, and her wonderful committee members. People can join the organisation, which will enable them to attend networking events if they work in that field, and then they can participate as well as volunteers going to schools to speak to them about this very important initiative and to encourage our South Australian young women to get involved in STEM as a possible career path.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (14:54): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, representing the Minister for Transport, on the subject of rail outsourcing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL: One of the strategic objectives of the Carbon Neutral Adelaide Action Plan is zero net emissions from public transport. The action plan includes a commitment that the tram and train network will be powered by 100 per cent renewable energy by the year 2021. The government has also announced its intention to privatise or outsource Adelaide's tram and train network. My questions of the minister are:

1. In a privatised or outsourced tram and train network, who will pay for the electricity, gas or diesel? Will it be the state government or will it be the anticipated new private operators?
2. Regardless of who pays for the electricity, gas or diesel, will the commitment to use 100 per cent renewable energy on our train and tram network be maintained under a privatised or outsourced model of service delivery?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:55): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will be delighted to refer that question to my colleague in the other chamber the Hon. Stephan Knoll, Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government.

MEDICAL RESONANCE IMAGING LICENCES

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:56): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister outline whether he is satisfied with the distribution of MRI Medicare licences in South Australia and whether he regards Sound Radiology as an appropriate new licence holder, and has the minister ever discussed MRI licensing with Sound Radiology before the MRI licence was granted by the federal government?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:56): First and foremost, I would like to celebrate the success of the Marshall Liberal government in that medical imaging round. We were able to secure for the people of the western suburbs an MRI licence for TQEH, something that the former Labor government was not able to achieve in their 16 years. The Hon. John Dawkins, having a strong association with the Riverland, will be pleased that there was one for Berri too. Sound Radiology is a well-respected South Australian company. They invited me to provide a letter of support to their application for an MRI licence; I declined.

SONY INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Can the minister inform the council about the great news regarding global gaming giant Sony Interactive Entertainment establishing an office in South Australia?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in growing South Australia's economy. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to tell the chamber about the arrival of the global gaming entertainment giant Sony Interactive Entertainment, the company responsible for the PlayStation brand and the family of products and services to South Australia.

Sony PlayStation has established an office in Adelaide, creating 32 exciting new engineering roles. The new Adelaide premises will provide highly skilled engineers an opportunity to progress their careers with a high-profile global company, without the need to relocate nationally or internationally. A few weeks ago, I had the pleasure of visiting the new offices and I was very impressed with the quality of the premises and the excitement in the room to be working for such a globally recognisable company right here in Adelaide. In fact, when you get out of the lift it is quite an impressive entrance to the particular part of their place.

This investment brings a whole new skill set to the state but also complements the strengths we already have in the digital media, including visual effects, game development and data centre and network infrastructure. The Marshall Liberal government has contributed \$480,000 from the Economic and Business Growth Fund to Sony Interactive to assist with the establishment of the office. To attract a household name like Sony Interactive Entertainment to South Australia is a fantastic win, and I thank the company for their investment in our great state.

The arrival of Sony PlayStation further builds on our creative industries sector and adds a household name to the ecosystem to further accelerate growth and build our reputation as a global player. The Marshall Liberal government is building a culture of creativity and innovation that is helping to inspire new enterprises and encourage leading creative companies to invest in our state.

By building this culture, we are also giving young students who want to work in this field the ability to stay here in South Australia and not have to travel interstate or overseas for these types of exciting opportunities. Sectors like creative industries present huge opportunities for our state to create such a unique, thriving ecosystem of young, skilled workers and entrepreneurs, which is why creative industries was identified in the Joyce review as a key priority for South Australia. I look forward to seeing Sony PlayStation continue to grow and thrive in South Australia, and I am excited about the opportunities to continue to expand our burgeoning creative industries sector.

GAME DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): A supplementary arising from the answer in relation to the game development industry: can the minister outline what funding has been removed by his government for the Game Plus game development incubator in the CBD?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his ongoing interest in the games sector. It is a very important sector, but I don't have those details with me, so I will take them on notice and bring back a reply.

GAME DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): A supplementary arising from the original answer: is the minister able to outline if any funding has been removed from supporting game developers such as Mighty Kingdom?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for his supplementary but, as I said, I will bring back a response as to the nature of any gaming support that has been removed. I did have the opportunity to visit Mighty Kingdom a few months ago—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: Where are they?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: In Pirie Street or one of the streets down here.

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Mr President, I don't have to report the address of every place I visit to the people opposite.

The PRESIDENT: It was not a formal question to you.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I understand that. I reacted to an interjection, and I know I should listen to your advice more often and not respond to interjections.

The PRESIDENT: You really should.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: As I said to the honourable member, I will bring back a response.

GAME DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary arising from the original answer in relation to the absolute importance of the game development sector: can the minister outline who are the biggest few game developers in SA, and does he have any idea where they might be located?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:01): Clearly, Mighty Kingdom is one. ODD Games, which I have visited in Hendon, are a particularly impressive organisation. So I know a couple of them. I continue to have a strong relationship with the sector.

SONY INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:02): Supplementary: can the minister advise when he last met with Sony Interactive?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:02): I will have to check my dates. I thank the honourable member. As I said in my answer, a few weeks ago I had a chance to visit the site and have a tour. I will bring back the exact date for the honourable member.

SONY INTERACTIVE ENTERTAINMENT

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Further supplementary arising from the original answer in relation to Sony Interactive: can the minister outline the role that he played in securing this investment in South Australia?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:02): I know the members opposite were in awe of the fact that I had gone and met with MIT and managed to get MIT to identify South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Members opposite don't understand the concept of building relationships. They don't have any relationships or networks or friends—in fact, they don't have much at all. With Sony Interactive Entertainment, that is what the hardworking Department for Trade, Tourism, and Investment have done. We have a team of hardworking people, who the members opposite continue to mock and ridicule, who are actually working particularly hard. They identified opportunities. One of the of opportunities they identified was Sony Interactive Entertainment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: It was a whole-of-department approach. At the end of the day, Sony Interactive Entertainment is a global giant—these are network engineer jobs that do not exist in Australia; this is one of three offices of its type around the world—and I cannot believe the members opposite are mocking and ridiculing the fact that Sony Interactive Entertainment is here. They should be embarrassed.

GAME DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:03): Further and final supplementary in relation to the stated importance of the game development industry to South

Australia: can the minister outline the value of that industry to South Australia and the number of people employed—even very, very approximately for either of those two figures?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:04): I can't outline it approximately because it is growing so quickly. If I gave a number today, it would be wrong.

The PRESIDENT: I am going to allow one more supplementary.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I wish to hear the supplementary.

GAME DEVELOPMENT INDUSTRY

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): Given the minister had no idea, will he take that on notice?

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment) (15:04): If it helps satisfy the honourable member before the parliament rises tomorrow, I will take that on notice and bring it back. It is growing so quickly that any answer I give will be inaccurate because it will be more the next day.

LAND TAX

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:05): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer questions about land tax.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: In an article in today's InDaily, the Treasurer's cabinet colleague, the Hon. David Speirs, is quoted as saying:

As a member of the cabinet, I'm quite supportive of the change and I'm supportive of our overall aim to reduce land tax across the board, which is the policy direction of the government.

My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Is it a policy direction of the government to reduce land tax across the board?
2. If so, why has the Treasurer been quoted as saying that the new aggregation measures announced on budget day will raise an additional \$40 million?
3. How has the \$40 million been calculated and does it include any advice from the Valuer-General concerning the impact of her ill-conceived revaluation initiative stage 2, effective from 1 July 2020?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:06): I think, as the Premier and I have outlined on a number of occasions, the land tax reform package the government has introduced comprises three essential elements. One is the increase to the threshold to \$450,000, where many thousands of South Australians who are currently paying land tax will no longer pay land tax. Secondly, there is a legislated proposal and a proposed extension of that to reduce the top rate of land tax from 3.7 to 2.9 per cent.

A culmination of both those factors in 2020-21 is estimated to reduce land tax collections by just under \$50 million a year. Aggregation is estimated in the same year to collect \$40 million. A simple comparison of the almost \$50 million and the \$40 million shows a reduction in total land tax collections, which is the point that the Hon. Mr Speirs is referring to. In 2022-23, if you look at the budget papers, the estimated land tax reduction through the increase of the threshold and the reduction of the top rate is estimated to cost revenue just under \$60 million a year. With aggregation estimated to collect \$40 million, the net reduction in land tax is about \$20 million.

The Hon. Mr Speirs is entirely correct to say that the land tax reform proposals are geared towards reducing the total amount of land tax to be collected from the land tax reform proposals. The honourable member needs to refer not just to the aggregation aspect of the land tax reform package, but also the increase in the threshold and the reduction of the top rate as being the three elements of the land tax reform package.

What the Premier and I have said on a number of occasions is that if, for example, it transpires that the \$40 million to which the honourable member is referring to—the estimate of what might be collected from aggregation—is an underestimate of the collection, then the government's commitment to reducing total land tax collections from its land tax reform proposals will mean the capacity to either more quickly reduce the top rate or, indeed, potentially look at further reductions in the top rate of 2.9 per cent to something closer to the national average in relation to the top rate for land tax.

So the government's commitment is clear from its land tax reform proposal: those three elements. We are looking to collect less land tax from the community, rather than more, and the commitment the Premier and I, as Treasurer, have given is consistent with that particular aspect.

In relation to the estimate, we have discussed this before. The government has commissioned one of the four big accounting firms to look at the reasonableness and the accuracy of the Treasury estimate of the \$40 million. It is complex. No one can say definitively, because ultimately it will depend on the numbers of people who are currently not paying any land tax at all. I have given an example on any number of occasions where if I as an individual were to own seven separate properties next year at \$400,000 site value each and own \$2.8 million in property, under the proposed arrangements, if they were in separate companies or separate trusts, I would not pay a single dollar in land tax to the state of South Australia.

Treasury's estimate in 2015 for the former Labor government of the same proposals was an estimated collection of \$30 million. The estimate they have given the new government is \$40 million, but as I said if the number ultimately proves to be higher than that, should the reform package be accepted by the parliament, the government is committed to further reducing land tax collections so that there is a net reduction in terms of the land tax reform proposal.

Finally, in relation to the honourable member's question about the revaluation initiative, he has had a long history in relation to this. He knows it was an initiative first commenced by former Treasurer Mr Koutsantonis. The Valuer-General is completely independent of the government of the day and of me as Treasurer. She has to undertake her statutory responsibilities in relation to fair and accurate valuations of property, and the new government, unlike the former government, has actually made it easier to challenge the accuracy of the valuation.

I know the Hon. Mr Darley often refers in his radio interviews to the fact that if you do not believe the valuations of the Valuer-General, why don't you challenge it? The new government has actually made that easier by allowing a lower cost jurisdiction, in the SACAT, rather than having to go to the Supreme Court to undertake that challenge, which was much more difficult under the former Labor government.

So we have made it easier for people to challenge the accuracy of the valuation, and if ultimately the SACAT determines that the Valuer-General got it wrong, then the valuation will be changed accordingly, consistent with the decision of SACAT.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, a supplementary?

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:11): Yes. Can the Treasurer explain how long it will take for a person to be able to get a response, after challenging a valuation from the Valuer-General's office? Is there a set time frame, and what is the cost of getting that?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:12): I would have to take some advice. There is certainly not a set time, but I might be able to get some information in relation to the time frames that are involved. Again, I suspect it will depend on the complexity of the particular claim. My guess would be the Hon. Mr Darley would probably have a much better sense, given that he channels quite a number of people through the SACAT process and has provided advice. He may well be able to anecdotally give the honourable member some indication of his experience of valuation challenges before SACAT. Whatever it is, it is certainly going to be much cheaper and quicker than going through a Supreme Court process.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, a further supplementary?

LAND TAX

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:12): Yes. Can the Treasurer also take on notice: can he provide this chamber with a figure of how many South Australians actually have seven properties at that value where they do not pay land tax? Can you provide the numbers of people that actually have those holdings?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:13): I would love to be able to say that I have got those numbers in my back pocket but, no, I do not have those particular numbers, and I don't have access to those particular numbers. What I can say is that there are a very significant number of mum-and-dad investors, to use the phrase that is being used by many, who currently own multiple properties who are paying land tax at the aggregated rate.

I think the point that is missed by many of the critics of the government's reform proposal is that in some way aggregation is being introduced. Aggregation has always existed in South Australia. The rules are actually being proposed to be changed to be consistent with New South Wales, Victoria or Queensland, but aggregation has always existed. What I have identified is that there are some currently legally available devices, such as trusts and companies, which allow the aggregation provisions to, in essence, not have the impact that was originally intended by the legislation.

There are many, many people who own multiple properties who are aggregated and who are paying tax at the aggregated rate. Why? Because they haven't set themselves up into three, four, five, six or seven separate companies and trusts. I run into these people at lunches and dinners on any number of occasions who say, 'I own four properties. I currently pay land tax at the aggregated rate. I think 3.7 per cent is outrageous because when I first bought the properties they were under the \$1 million threshold for the top rate of land tax, but over 10 or 20 years, if I have owned properties in the north-eastern suburbs, the site values have gone up and I now own property over \$1 million. I am paying land tax at 3.7 per cent and it is outrageous.' I say, 'Well, I agree with you. That's why we are trying to reduce the 3.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent,' but they are currently paying land tax at the aggregated rate.

I think everyone assumes that everybody who owns multiple properties is using trusts and companies. The answer is that that is not correct. We are trying to get some numbers to better inform this debate as to how many South Australians, individuals and others, currently own multiple properties and are currently paying land tax at the aggregated rate and will be assisted by a reduction in the top rate from 3.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent.

To repeat the response to the member's question: no, I don't know the number of individuals who own seven properties at \$400,000 site value and are currently not paying a single dollar in land tax, but I might say that when I have raised the issue there is not one opponent of the government's reform package who was able to dispute the accuracy of the claim.

LAND TAX

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:16): Supplementary: can the Treasurer tell us if any legislation that is brought into this chamber can have a provision that prevents landlords from passing on any increase in their land tax to small businesses and tenants?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:16): This particular issue has been much discussed over many years in relation to residential and commercial tenancies and the like, so, yes, there is legislation that seeks to look at these particular issues, but it's residential and commercial tenancies-type legislation that has sought to involve itself over past years in relation to these particular issues between landlords and tenants. We, in this chamber, and I suspect in the time the Hon. Mr Wortley has been here, have debated those issues on a number of occasions.

AMBULANCE SUPPLIES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:17): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question regarding ambulance supplies.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: I refer to Carol, a caller to ABC radio Adelaide on Monday who explained her experience with overworked paramedics. She said:

...she was looking for a pen...she said, 'Oh no, they don't give us pens now or paper.'

My question to the minister is: why are paramedics no longer being provided with pens or paper?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for his question. I have no information that suggests that ambulance officers are not being provided with pens and paper. I will make inquiries and provide the member information on notice.

AMBULANCE SUPPLIES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:18): Supplementary: does the minister believe that paramedics can carry out their life-saving duties without pens or paper?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:18): I don't propose to add to that. The fact of the matter is that ambulance officers have access to both electronic material and paper records. The information the honourable member seeks, I will seek on notice.

BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER SUPPORT

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the council on services designed to reduce ED presentations and support the recovery of South Australians living with borderline personality disorder?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:19): I thank the honourable member for his question. It gives me an opportunity to acknowledge the establishment of the Borderline Personality Disorder Collaborative. It was launched last month and from 1 July commenced operating as a service at 100 Greenhill Road, Unley. This much-needed service, referred to as BPD Co, will provide statewide recovery-focused care to people living with borderline personality disorder in South Australia.

BPD Co is the result of a broad-based response to the need for enhanced evidence-based borderline personality disorder service development in South Australia tailored to the needs of consumers, carers and clinicians. I would particularly like to acknowledge the advocacy of the Hon. Tammy Franks and a former member of this place, Ms Kelly Vincent.

The BPD service has been codesigned with people with lived experience, their carers and clinicians, and in consultation with stakeholders, including other government and non-government agencies. The Marshall Liberal government is investing \$13.1 million over four years to establish and run the service.

This initiative is being realised through the extraordinary efforts of many dedicated people. In particular, I would like to acknowledge the BPD Co project team, led by Dr Martha Kent and Ms Judy O'Sullivan; the Country Health SA mental health leadership team of Umit Agis and Dr Brian McKenny; and the BPD community of consumers and carers.

In that context, I would specifically like to honour the work of Janne McMahon OAM, who has for more than 10 years united consumers, advocates, carers and clinicians in efforts to highlight to politicians and policymakers at the state and federal level the cost of BPD to the community and the benefit of investing in quality care. Ms McMahon has been awarded an Order of Australia medal and won the national Mental Health Prize in 2008 and again in 2018.

BPD is a common mental illness experienced by up to 68,000 South Australians. Historically, those diagnosed have suffered significant levels of stigma and negative discrimination within the health and mental health systems. Yet, people with BPD can and do recover, particularly when they are provided with appropriate evidence-based treatments.

BPD Co will support clinical services for people with severe and complex borderline personality disorder. In particular, it will provide services for parents who have infants and young children, and also young people at risk of developing BPD or with early signs of BPD. I wish BPD Co all the best in their important venture. To South Australians living with BPD and those who care for them, I trust that BPD Co will help provide better access to the treatment they need for their mental health.

*Matters of Interest***LAND TAX**

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:22): Today, I will shine a bright light on the biggest broken promise so far of the infant Marshall government: fixing the land tax mess. Until the Treasurer handed down his second budget a few weeks ago, aspirational South Australians, big and small, who worked hard to try to secure their futures and those of their families through property investment had no clue of the shockwave coming their way.

Yet, seven days before this government was elected, leader Steven Marshall pledged to increase the tax-free threshold while dropping the top marginal rate from 3.7 per cent to 2.9 per cent for holdings valued between \$1 million and \$5 million, effectively giving a tax cut to around 3,200 people. How good was that? Now some quotes from that statement are coming back to haunt the Premier and his Treasurer:

These amendments will assist small to medium businesses operating out of their own premises, as well as benefiting hardworking people who have investments in residential property which have appreciated over time and those whose superannuation includes property holdings... We need to even out the playing field and incentivise people to invest in South Australia.

There was nothing in there about the aggregation of their properties, many of which are split into trusts for legitimate reasons. As for lowering the highest rate in the country, it was going to occur at a snail's pace over seven years, and even then it would not come near the national average. Compounding that, however, the Valuer-General is rolling out revaluations of properties, which have already led to substantial increases in Unley council rates.

This is creating the perfect storm which will mercilessly batter business confidence and investment, as well as hurt the retirement hopes of so many who played by the rules, yet the Treasurer demonises them as tax cheats. This is risky territory for a government still on L-plates because they have turned on the very people, big and small, who swallowed their pre-election bull and put him in office.

However, it gets even more perilous because it has created dissent within their own ranks. Several members have voiced to me their extreme displeasure at what is going on. The hostility towards the captain and his first mate in the upper house is palpable. They think it will die down but I have been around long enough to spot a crisis when I see one, although I cannot say I have experienced one as early into a new government's first term as this one. As history often proves, it only takes one contentious issue before dissatisfaction builds to outright mutiny.

Property Council polling in marginal Liberal-held seats also made for disquiet, even though the Treasurer brushes it aside as the most obvious push polling he has seen in 30 years—just like the polling the Liberals trotted out about shop trading hours, I suppose, or their own bungled robocalls. The Treasurer only needs to study Bill Shorten's *Voyage of the Damned* to get a clearer picture of the iceberg where his ship is heading. Shorten wanted to take—like negative gearing and franking credits—from retirees, while Scott Morrison gave stuff, like tax cuts.

The land tax regime is Mr Lucas' reiteration of Shorten's retiree tax debacle and, like Shorten, he is dabbling in class warfare. His Treasury buddies have sold him the same pup they could not convince Labor to adopt. He keeps telling us they are still tinkering with it so we will not know what it will look like until the legislation lobs. That is not satisfactory, Mr President, because the lack of any detail has spooked many. Why would you now want to buy a block of flats in Clovelly Park, old Housing Trust houses in Parafield Gardens or shops in Salisbury when you can put that money, at record low interest rates, into the Australian share market, which this week beat the all-time high it set 12 years ago.

Everyone, from the state's top economists to our most prominent and successful business brains, is telling Mr Lucas and Mr Marshall, 'You've got it wrong; listen to what we're saying.' But egos have got in the way. Pat Gerace of the Urban Development Institute of Australia puts it into proper perspective in calling for sophisticated tax reform. I have also urged the Premier to refer it to his new Productivity Commission or a select committee, but he has flatly rejected it. South Australians

only want a fair go. I am certain that they would support tax measures if the goalposts were not abruptly shifted. Thank you.

MULTICULTURAL COMMUNITIES COUNCIL OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:27): It is a great honour to rise today to speak about the Multicultural Communities Council of South Australia, which is affectionately known as MCCSA. This year, MCCSA is celebrating its milestone 45th anniversary. The Governor of South Australia, His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le, generously hosted a reception at Government House last night to mark this special occasion. It was a great privilege to represent the Premier at the reception and I was glad to see the Hon. Emily Bourke there as well. What a wonderful occasion to recognise the great work of MCCSA and pay tribute to the board, staff, volunteers and supporters of MCCSA.

The Marshall government is very supportive and proud of the achievements of our diverse multicultural communities and it is, indeed, a great pleasure for me to highlight the outstanding work of MCCSA. Deputy chairperson of MCCSA, Dr Ian Harmstorf OAM, spoke about the long history of the organisation that spans back to 1949 when the Good Neighbour Council was established to assist migrants to settle in South Australia. At the time, the Good Neighbour Council focused on helping migrants to assimilate into the Australian way of life.

In 1974, the Ethnic Communities Council of South Australia was established to meet the needs of increasing numbers of diverse migrants who were making their home in South Australia. The Ethnic Communities Council expanded on the services previously delivered by the Good Neighbour Council and also took on an advocacy role for new arrivals. In 1995, a new phase began when the Ethnic Communities Council merged with the United Ethnic Communities of South Australia and was renamed the Multicultural Communities Council of South Australia.

Today, the MCCSA proudly carries the legacy of the previous councils by constantly evolving to reflect the changing nature of multicultural South Australia and the needs of established as well as emerging new communities. Special thanks must go to founding members, past committee members, current chairperson Miriam Cocking, deputy chairperson Dr Ian Harmstorf OAM, and CEO Helena Kyriazopoulos for their passion, leadership and hard work in advancing multiculturalism in our state.

I would also like to take this opportunity to express my deepest condolences on the sad passing of Mr Ron Tan OAM. He was our dear friend, a wonderful gentleman, a former president and board member of the MCCSA. Those of us who had the pleasure of working with Ron will know that he was such a dedicated leader in his role. He worked tirelessly for the benefit of multicultural communities and was awarded the Medal of the Order of Australia in 1991 for his contributions to culturally and linguistically diverse communities. Ron will be sadly missed, but his legacy will certainly live on in the many important programs and services delivered by MCCSA.

The MCCSA offers a vast range of activities and programs aimed at supporting all South Australians to become active members of the economic, social and cultural life of our state and the benefits they deliver and contribute to our state. Last year it was a pleasure to be a guest speaker at the 2018 AGM, where MCCSA celebrated 30 years of their community visitor and transport program. Hundreds of volunteers have provided thousands of unpaid hours visiting elderly residents in care and driving MCCSA buses for CALD members to get to functions and attend activities.

There is always something happening at MCCSA. I have had the pleasure of working closely with MCCSA now since 2010, and the hardworking and capable team runs fantastic programs and events throughout the year. Once again, I wish to express my heartfelt congratulations and thank all those who have contributed to MCCSA's incredible legacy and who have worked tirelessly to sustain the organisation for over four and a half decades.

GENETIC MODIFICATION

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:32): Earlier this year, the day before the federal election, the Liberal Coalition announced the planned deregulation of some new genetic modification techniques and the organisms that are produced as a result by seeking to classify them as being non-GM. These include SDN-1 techniques and dsRNA techniques. In April of this year, our health minister—I

presume it was at a meeting of health ministers—did not oppose these regulations and, as such, they are now being laid on the table in the federal parliament.

Numerous scientific papers have been published showing that SDN-1 techniques are not as precise as previously thought and can have numerous off-target effects, such as affecting other genes in the organism. Indeed, I note that the European Union's Court of Justice has ruled that this technique needs to be assessed for safety in the same way as the previous techniques. New Zealand will regulate organisms derived from these techniques as GMOs. Over 60 international scientists have signed a statement calling for them to be strictly regulated.

There are many organisms that could be quickly released into the Australian food supply if this technique was deregulated. They include crops such as wheat, rice and canola, fruit such as strawberries, grapes and apples, vegetables such as potatoes, tomatoes and cucumbers, animals such as fish, sheep, chickens, pigs and cows, microorganisms such as yeast used in making bread, beer and wine, bacteria used to make yoghurt, and viruses. I have also had concerns raised with me that unskilled bio-hackers may be able to alter genes in bacteria and viruses in their own kitchen and then release those microbes—all without any government oversight.

Meanwhile, the aim of dsRNA methods is to put a small section of dsRNA into an organism such as a plant or an insect by methods such as spraying, dipping, injecting, using a virus or by eating something that contains dsRNA. This process can silence or activate genes. One use would be to kill insects by silencing genes in them. The deregulation means that dsRNAs can be released into the environment and into people's food without determining how they may affect other organisms, including people, and whether any changes to gene expression can be inherited.

I understand there is no consensus that organisms produced by these methods are safe for your health. Indeed, the Public Health Association of Australia, the peak health body in Australia, has called for these techniques to be regulated. Deregulating these new techniques, and the organisms that are produced using them, means that these organisms can enter your food without any safety assessment, including for any allergic, toxic, reproductive or cancer-causing effects. There will be no labelling either, so you will be eating them whether you want to or not.

Deregulation also means that the GMO can be planted without any requirement for farmers to be told that the crop was developed using such techniques without determining how easily that organism could spread and without any need to segregate it from non-GMOs. There will also be no requirement for any assessment or environmental harm before release.

I understand that the DNA and dsRNA sequences developed using these techniques will be patented. This means that wherever the sequences land, they can be covered by patent rights. The patent holder, therefore, can enforce their patent rights. In the USA and Canada, this has resulted in farmers whose crops were contaminated with past versions of GM crops being sued for growing GM crops without a licence.

The situation in Australia could potentially be worse. Under our existing end point royalty system, a positive test of the patented material in a farmer's product gives the patent holder the legal right to deduct their user fee from the farmer's produce payments. Even a presence of as low as 0.01 per cent could result in a positive test and any subsequent action against the farmer is entirely at the patent holder's discretion.

If an agricultural spray contains patented dsRNA, any spray drift onto a neighbouring farm could result in the affected farm's produce being affected by patent rights. If a GMO spreads to the fields of an organic farm, the farm could also lose its organic status. Farmers who object to this fee being deducted from their payments will need to take legal action against the patent holder to try to recover their money.

Most importantly, if it is approved, it will occur without any need to assess the economic impact on our exports. If Australia deregulates these techniques, it does not mean that importing countries have also deregulated them. In many countries, these products will still be considered as either approved or unapproved GMOs.

CONFUCIUS INSTITUTE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:37): I rise today to speak about my concerns about the Confucius institutes in our nation and in particular the one at Adelaide University. Last week, it was revealed through a media investigation that, of the 13 Confucius institutes at Australian universities, 11 of the contracts that were able to be accessed through freedom of information laws found that our academic institutions are being compromised.

I note that with Victoria University, their agreement said that the institute must accept Hanban's assessment on teaching quality, although it added that, 'If teaching relates to a Victoria University award course, the teaching quality must also satisfy Victoria University's requirements.' The University of Melbourne's agreement states only that its facility must take into consideration any assessment by the headquarters, that being Hanban, on the teaching quality at this institution. The University of Sydney's agreement stipulates that it must accept Hanban's assessment of the quality of teaching 'unless it is inconsistent with the university's academic rules, policies and procedures'.

The University of WA stated in its contract that it has the right to determine the content of the curriculum in the manner of instruction for all programs administered by the institute at UWA, but Hanban 'ultimately has the right to determine the programs to which it provides funding'. The contracts signed by QUT and the University of Newcastle similarly stated that the universities had control over content and instruction while Hanban had discretion over its funding.

The University of New South Wales agreement was unique, in that it did not have a relevant clause clarifying where the authority actually sat. This revelation is even more concerning when it was reported that RMIT and the University of Adelaide refused to provide their agreements whatsoever, despite multiple requests. A spokesperson for RMIT said that the university considers agreements with third parties to be confidential and a spokesman for the University of Adelaide cited the fact that the contract was 'a legal document', which is precisely the point of concern.

I have raised in this place before and I have hosted in this building a film *In the Name of Confucius*. This film raises concerns about Confucius institutes and Confucius classrooms, which have led to them being close down in Canada and have exposed time and time again the Chinese Communist Party, through Hanban, having control of the appointment of staff and the content of curriculum. That content, and certainly the translation of what is specified for someone to be employed by a Confucius Institute via Hanban, is that they 'have good political and professional qualities, love the motherland, voluntarily worked for the cause of Chinese language internationalisation, have the spirit of devotion, strong sense of organisational discipline and team spirit, good character, and no criminal record', which is seemingly innocuous.

However, what that love of the motherland equates to is a hatred of all that is not espoused by the motherland. It leads to the erosion of the identities of Tibet and Taiwan. It has seen practices where children at schools where there are Confucius classrooms in New South Wales have come back bullied because of their Tibetan names or their culture. It has seen the New South Wales government last year suspend all Confucius classrooms from the overseas trips that they were taking and from continuing to expand in that jurisdiction.

I note that next month the New South Wales internal desktop review of their Confucius classrooms will be released. I urge our South Australian government to take on notice that that report will be available, given that we have three Confucius classrooms in this state. I also note that the federal Attorney-General has exercised his concerns and raised them with Australian universities, and I urgently urge the University of Adelaide to release their contract to provide assurances that academic freedom in this state has not been compromised for the pursuit of about a quarter of a million dollars. It is far too important for these things to go unchallenged. I also call on the Marshall government to do all they can to provide that transparency.

CAROLS BY THE CREEK

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:42): I rise to speak today on a matter that members are likely to be aware of, and that is the Mitcham city council's decision last night to continue to host its annual Carols by the Creek event, which has been a popular Christmas tradition for some 25 years, I understand, in that region, providing free family entertainment, with the involvement of numerous

community and church groups, as well as media personalities and obviously very many people from the local community.

The carols are a much anticipated event, attracting an extraordinary 5,000 people each year from throughout the council area and even beyond. Last week, the City of Mitcham voted in favour of cancelling the carols, citing that it was 'too religious and not inclusive enough'. Not surprisingly, this provoked a public outcry, prompting council to call yesterday's special meeting, where the vote on a motion to rescind its previous decision was unanimous. This outcome was no doubt at least partly due to the overwhelming backlash in response to the council's actions, revealing just how out of touch some of the decision-makers were on this particular issue in terms of being in touch with ratepayers' views.

Not unlike these residents, when I first heard about the City of Mitcham's position and its reasoning for the cancellation I, too, was disappointed. Christmas is certainly fundamentally an observance of the Christian faith for many people, and obviously for practising Christians, but we cannot deny that these songs and carols that are sung at these sorts of events are not just sung by religious people. In fact, many non-religious people who I call friends enjoy singing the songs, some of whom have no religious faith whatsoever. Indeed, it can form a part of the fabric of one's upbringing. Many people who may or may not have religious faith reflect on these songs as a reflection from their childhood, and it brings back positive memories of their upbringing and their early years when Christmas is a little bit magical, as it tends to be for children.

The carols events held throughout our state always convey positive messages that offer hope and a sense of peace at a time when many need it most. They are appreciated by many South Australians who would not necessarily—or, in some cases, would not at all—consider themselves religious. Like many celebrations at that time of year, they bring families and communities together, promote a sense of goodwill and provide a unique opportunity for various groups from diverse sectors to work in collaboration. In my view, removing such celebrated occasions from the Christmas calendar, religious or not, is ill-founded. It is my hope that all councillors and, indeed, those serving in all levels of government will recognise that the majority of people in our communities do not support such unnecessary preoccupations with overreach of political correctness.

In fact, I am aware that our colleagues in the other place, the members for Elder and Waite, whose electorates have been primarily affected by the proposed cancellation, have been very active in the last week encouraging their constituents to raise their concerns on this matter with the City of Mitcham. These members have personally received hundreds of signatures in response to a petition they created calling for the reinstatement of the carols. This was in addition to countless more emails and calls to their offices from people voicing their concerns and, in some cases, outrage.

It is somewhat reminiscent of a situation a few years back under the former Labor government's education policy pertaining to religious activities in state schools. You may recall at that time there was some ambiguity surrounding whether or not Christmas carols would be allowed as part of end-of-year plays and end-of-year Christmas celebrations. The South Australian Association of State School Organisations (SAASSO) proceeded to conduct a survey inquiring whether people thought carols should be banned, and over 98 per cent of respondents indicated that the carols should be allowed. Similarly, the results from a poll *The Advertiser* has run over the last few days in regard to the City of Mitcham's carols event is now showing that over 90 per cent of respondents believe it should not be cancelled. Community sentiment on this issue could not be clearer, in my view.

I have been heartened both by the impassioned pleas from the community for the City of Mitcham to continue hosting Carols by the Creek and by its councillors' swift action in righting what was considered a wrong. I take this step of encouraging the councillors for reconsidering their position, which was misguided in my view. I hope that all involved in this production in the future will continue to hold this event with the assurance that it is welcome and, indeed, loved by their constituents and by the members and ratepayers of the City of Mitcham, and I wish them well for the future events.

CLIMATE CHANGE

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (15:47): I and, I assume, other members recently received an invitation from Flinders University's—the greatest university in the world—Southgate Institute to an

oration in October to be delivered by Adjunct Professor Peter Sainsbury on the question of 'Are humans smart enough to avoid making themselves extinct?' Unfortunately, most of us will not be able to duck out to attend as it will be on a sitting day, but the topic struck a chord with me because, unfortunately, there is evidence to suggest that maybe we humans are not smart enough to avoid making ourselves extinct.

Research published recently in the journal *Geophysical Research Letters* has revealed rapid loss of Antarctic ice driven by warming seas in the Southern Ocean. Professor Andy Shepherd from Leeds University, who led the study, told the *Guardian* that 'the speed of drawing down ice from an ice sheet used to be spoken of in geological timescales'—hundreds of thousands, if not millions, of years—'but that has now been replaced by people's lifetimes'.

Research suggests that the Antarctic Peninsula has experienced faster air temperature increases over the past century than any other place in the Southern Hemisphere. A review of research published in January in *Science* journal concluded that 'multiple lines of evidence from four independent groups thus now suggest a stronger observed warming' in Earth's oceans, which is an obvious threat to the huge masses of ice lying below Antarctic waters.

This will have significant consequences for us all. The loss of Antarctic ice sheets and similar melting in the Northern Hemisphere are clear consequences of climate change. Just this morning, I was doing a bit of light reading and came across further research from the Scripps Institution of Oceanography highlighting the Arctic's reflective sea ice will advance global warming by 25 years. Given our limited time, I will not go too much through this article. I encourage members to check it out for themselves. It is from the Scripps Institution of Oceanography, published again in the *Geophysical Research Letters* in 'Radiative Heating of an Ice-Free Arctic Ocean'. I quote from them:

'Losing the reflective power of Arctic sea ice will lead to warming equivalent to one trillion tons of CO₂ and advance the 2°C threshold by 25 years. Any rational policy would make preventing this a top climate priority for world leaders,' said Ramanathan, a professor of atmospheric and climate sciences at Scripps.

We used to think, just a few years ago, that we had 50 years to address these issues; now we are being told we have less than 25.

This is not a question of ideology, of values or, indeed, of beliefs; this is a very simple question—it is an existential question: will we, the human race, actually be smart enough to act on the information being given to us by scientists and leading experts in the field to reverse global warming in time to prevent a greater than 2.5° increase in global temperature? Asking such a question is Adjunct Professor Peter Sainsbury. I hope that he will tell us at his oration that we will be smart enough but, quite frankly, I have my doubts.

Motions

NATIONAL HOMELESSNESS WEEK

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:51): I move:

That this council—

1. Recognises National Homelessness Week being held from 4 to 10 August;
2. Notes that National Homelessness Week is an annual week coordinated by Homelessness Australia to raise awareness of people experiencing homelessness, the issues they face and the action needed to achieve solutions; and
3. Acknowledges and thanks all service providers working in our community to support people sleeping rough and to end homelessness.

I rise today to speak on the importance of National Homelessness Week, the issues facing people in our community living and experiencing homelessness and to pay my respects and thanks to all those working hard to make life a little better for people experiencing homelessness.

National Homelessness Week is an annual event. It runs from 4 to 10 August and this year's theme is 'Housing ends homelessness'. Secure accommodation and having a safe home to live in, where you are free from domestic violence and the threat of physical violence that can come from living rough on the streets, as well as the poor health outcomes that can come with it, are real everyday circumstances that confront homeless people living in our community.

On a broad level in South Australia, the rate of homelessness for every 10,000 people is 37.1, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics. If this does not immediately shock us, a short scratch at the surface starts to provide the urgency of the problem. Recent figures reveal that every night in South Australia, around 6,000 people are homeless or sleep rough. Almost one in five homeless people in our state are between the ages of 25 and 34, and 15 per cent of homeless people in South Australia are from an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander background.

Earlier this year, I visited the Hutt St Centre and toured the facilities provided there, which are helping people experiencing homelessness, addressing the issues they face and seeking to achieve enduring solutions. The numbers provided to me by the Hutt St Centre should concern us all. Each year, the Hutt St Centre serves around 50,000 meals and offers social work and support to nearly 2,000 people. I have spoken to those who work there, those who run the programs and some people who use those services. It goes without saying that not just during Homelessness Week but every week the centre deserves all the commendation and help we can provide but, in doing so, we must acknowledge that it is simply not enough to just provide crisis care.

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

What causes poverty and homelessness? That is an excellent question, albeit it might seem like an obvious one and one that the theme of homelessness, this week, seeks to make an issue of. Forty-five per cent of households in poverty in this state are renters. In the 10 years since 2006, more than one new family was forced into homelessness every single week. Between 2003 and 2015 the lowest 20 per cent of income earners in Australia saw their income actually drop by 9 per cent.

Recent research from SACOSS reveals that almost 132,000 people, including over 22,000 children, live below the poverty line in South Australia. If these figures are not bad enough, those in regional South Australia are much more vulnerable, with those who live there being statistically twice as likely to be in poverty as those in metropolitan Adelaide.

The fact is that in all aspects of government, policy and society, inside and outside of Homelessness Week, we need a proactive focus on speaking to those in poverty—those who are in and those who are at risk of being so. We need a focus on what they earn, where they live and their costs of living. In the land of the fair go it is worth asking: what went wrong? And: should we give it another go? I think we should.

The statistics say that working Australians and indeed South Australians are more productive now than we have ever been, so where is that wealth? Working families in our state are delivering wealth on an unprecedented level, and at the same time the workplace and indeed the world has never changed faster or been influenced by things more beyond our everyday control. But are we sharing the results of this productivity fairly? Are we helping those who are attacked by the constantly changing world? I do not believe we are, or at the least I have to say it is obvious that we should be doing more.

If you work hard you should receive a fair reward, but I actually see it as a problem for our economy, not a success, that nationally the highest 1 per cent of the population in Australia earns as much in a fortnight as the lowest 5 per cent receives in a year—when the top 1 per cent earn more than those on a pension or Newstart are going to receive as a whole in the nation.

It should not be controversial at all to say that those who work hard deserve better pay and fairer conditions because they want to work hard or they do work hard or because they have worked hard all their working lives, and for those same reasons it should not be controversial to say that we should raise the rate of unemployment benefits like Newstart. Raising the rate of Newstart benefit, while not the solution to poverty or the solution to homelessness alone, would have an impact on poverty and homelessness. We need to raise the rate.

Indeed, it has been made clear that should we raise the rate of Newstart by an amount of \$75 a week, it would lead to a boost in consumer spending and create more than 10,000 jobs

nationally. The longer we dither and ponder what to do about homelessness and poverty, the worse it shall become.

Since 2011, the number of people experiencing homelessness nationally has increased by more than 12 per cent. In the 10 years after 2006, more than one new family in South Australia was homeless every single week. We can all do our part to raise awareness and support those in our community experiencing homelessness, but the simple fact is we have to do more. We have to do more nationally, we have to raise the rate and we have to raise the awareness of what homelessness and poverty is doing in our community.

In this regard, Homelessness Australia, in conjunction with the Hutt St Centre, is hosting the Walk a Mile in my Boots event. It encourages everyone to step up and step out to show support for people experiencing homelessness while helping raise much-needed funds for the programs run by the Hutt St Centre and for all the programs that support the homeless in South Australia. I encourage everyone to attend; it is literally the least we can do.

More needs to be done to support the complex needs of people experiencing homelessness in our community. I take the opportunity again here to thank the hard work of organisations like the Hutt St Centre, Homelessness Australia and many other non-government organisations working tirelessly for the less fortunate in our community. This national Homelessness Week I encourage you all to do your part to support those who need our help; it has never been more important. Thank you. I commend the motion.

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

Bills

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (RESERVES) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The state government has declared that it is looking for opportunities to give private developers access to public national parks. This policy has come to attention most recently in relation to the approval by the State Planning Commission of private luxury developments in the Flinders Chase National Park. There will be around 20 private buildings in total as part of that development.

At this point, I would make it quite clear that there are different views about the merits or otherwise of private developments in national parks. I have certainly put my views on the record: I think that these developments should be scaled down and moved to a more appropriate location. But this bill has nothing whatsoever to do with the actual merits of individual proposals for development in national parks.

This bill is about two aspects of the Kangaroo Island matter that have received almost universal condemnation. These two issues are: firstly, the fact that the public were prevented from making submissions to the State Planning Commission about the development applications and were denied the opportunity to have their say at the hearings. Even the presiding member of those planning hearings acknowledged the frustration of those who attended the hearings but were not allowed to participate. That is the first problem: the inability of the public to participate in decisions about development in a national park.

The second issue was that many people have said—and I agree—that it is ludicrous that the main statutory document guiding the management of our national parks is ignored by the State Planning Commission when they are assessing development applications. I will deal with that second point first.

Under the National Parks and Wildlife Act, all parks and reserves should have an approved management plan. This management plan goes through a comprehensive process of public consultation and, when completed, it sets out the principles under which the park will be managed, including future development and priorities for infrastructure. It is the guiding document for the minister, for the department and for the hardworking rangers and other staff, including volunteers, who look after our parks on a day-to-day basis.

It makes absolutely no sense that a planning authority, when deciding whether or not to approve development in a national park, should ignore the park's management plan. So why is it so? The answer lies in a dodgy set of planning rules that have been around for many years and which have now been copied and pasted into the new planning system. In a nutshell, the rules say that a national park management plan can only be used to guide development decisions if the Minister for Planning puts a notice in the *Government Gazette* to that effect. In fact, in the 25 years since the Development Act commenced, this has never happened. No planning minister has ever put a note in the *Government Gazette* incorporating a national park management plan into the planning rules for this state.

This means that, while the general public is being sidetracked by engaging with the environment department and helping them to write the best possible management plan for the park, the planning authorities are completely ignoring that work and they are using their own documents to decide what is or is not appropriate in the way of development in national parks.

My bill seeks to fix this ludicrous situation by providing that approved management plans for parks and reserves under the National Parks and Wildlife Act are automatically incorporated into the Planning and Design Code, which is the new rule book that the State Planning Commission will use in assessing development applications, so there is no need for a separate *Government Gazette* notice. Once the environment minister has signed off on a national park management plan, it becomes part of the Planning and Design Code. Most people would have assumed that that was how the system worked, but it never has. My bill provides that that will be the case from now on.

The second thing my bill does is that it makes sure that all private developments proposed for national parks and other reserves under the National Parks and Wildlife Act will be subject to full public notification, representation and appeal rights. This means that situations such as that which occurred on Kangaroo Island will not happen again.

The tragedy of the current situation is that decision-makers are denied the ability to hear from anyone other than the developer, or perhaps the department, when they are assessing private developments in public national parks. Conservation groups are denied a say, park volunteers are denied a say, neighbours are denied a say. In fact, everyone other than the developer is denied a say.

This is an appalling breach of trust, in my opinion. The government holds these precious natural areas on trust for this and future generations, so to deny the community the right to participate in decision-making is just unacceptable. My bill proposes to fix that situation by providing that all private developments in public parks must go through full third party consultation and appeal rights.

When I say private developments, we need to be clear that we are not talking about routine developments in parks, such as picnic grounds or walking trails. We are talking about developments such as in Flinders Chase, with private dwellings for private fee-paying customers. My bill does not affect the ability of the government to undertake routine development, such as facilities for park visitors or for park management, or even for scientific research, but if a private developer comes along, their project will be put through full public consultation.

Getting these planning rules right should be a top priority for the government, especially in light of our declining biodiversity and more and more species being added to the endangered species list. The Kangaroo Island echidna is one species soon to be added, according to media reports today. With the dual environmental challenges of the extinction crisis and the climate emergency, our protected areas will become more and more important as refuges for wildlife struggling to cope with the pressure we are putting on the environment.

This bill does not say what can or cannot be done in a national park, but it does ensure that the rules will be more rigorous and comprehensive and that key stakeholders will not be denied a voice. If left to their own devices, planners would give scant regard to environmental considerations, and as a result decisions will be made that add even more pressure to our struggling natural environment. I commend the bill to the chamber.

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

Motions

ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES ACT

The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:09): I move:

That regulations under the Advance Care Directives Act 2013 concerning exemption, made on 11 July 2019 and laid on the table of this council on 23 July 2019, be disallowed.

Ten years ago, 26-year-old British woman, Kerrie Woollorton, was taken by ambulance to Norfolk and Norwich University Hospital after having consumed poison in a suicide attempt. She carried a letter on her which was dated three days earlier. It began:

To whom this may concern. If I come into hospital regarding an overdose or any attempt of my life, I would like for NO life-saving treatment to be given. I would appreciate it if you could continue to give medicines to help relieve my discomfort, painkillers, oxygen, etc. I would hope these wishes would be carried out without loads of questioning.

The letter continued for three further paragraphs to assure the reader that the author knew the consequences of her refusal, including the likelihood of renal failure should she survive. It also stated specifically that she did not want dialysis and insisted that she had called the ambulance only because she did not wish to die alone at home, not because she had wanted treatment.

When questioned in hospital soon after her admission, Ms Woollorton simply said, 'It's in the letter, it says what I want.' Clearly, this posed an awful dilemma for the treating medical team. They consulted widely and they sought legal advice. Ultimately, they took the view that Ms Woollorton was competent to refuse treatment and, on that basis, they believed they were obliged to act in accordance with her wishes. She was not given life-saving treatment and she died in hospital two days later.

Later that year, the Norfolk coroner endorsed the doctors' decision to not provide treatment. The coroner found that Ms Woollorton had full knowledge of what she was doing and said that it would have been unlawful for the doctor overseeing her care to intervene. It is probably also important to note that the letter was not just a scrap of paper in her pocket, but was a document that was also signed by a solicitor as witness. It is what is commonly known as a living will or what we call an advance care directive.

That was 10 years ago in England. The South Australian regulations that I have today moved be disallowed deal precisely with cases such as this. They are dreadful cases. They are heart-wrenching cases but they are governed by state law and, as a state parliament, we have an obligation to deal with it.

In order to understand this motion, you need to understand the regime under the Advance Care Directives Act 2013. The act says that if, as a person of sound mind, you set out your wishes in writing in a properly executed advance care directive and if you subsequently develop impaired decision-making capacity in respect of a decision about your health care, then a health practitioner is legally required to comply with any binding provisions of that directive. They are also required to comply with any non-binding provisions as far as is reasonably practicable. The objective here is to avoid any outcome or intervention that the person who gave the advance care directive would wish to be avoided.

Probably the best example of this is a 'do not resuscitate' instruction. If that is your clear wish, then that is what your health practitioner should do. This obligation is set out in section 36 of the act under the heading 'Health practitioners to give effect to advance care directives'. The act then sets out a range of exemptions and qualifications, including the right of conscientious objection on the part of a health practitioner.

That brings us to the regulations under the act. We need to consider how this regulation would apply in situations similar to the sad case of Kerrie Woollorton. Under the regulations, the government has added a new exemption. The government has added a new circumstance in which a health practitioner is exempt from having to comply with the wishes of a person with a valid advance care directive. Those circumstances are as follows: if the health practitioner believes on reasonable grounds that the person has attempted to commit suicide and if the health care in question is directly related to that attempt, then the person's advance care directive is effectively made null and void. That is paraphrasing the effect of the regulations.

I believe it is these new exemptions that should be the subject of more thorough debate, and for that reason I have moved the disallowance. However, having so moved, I do not think for one moment that this is a black and white matter. It is complex, and there are contradictory and mutually exclusive outcomes at stake. As a society, suicide prevention should be our collective responsibility and every possible measure should be put in place to prevent people getting to that point in their life where they see no other way out.

I know this issue is close to the heart of many people in this place, me included. Certainly, the Hon. John Dawkins has been persistent in his advocacy for suicide prevention over many years, and I acknowledge his work in that regard, including securing more government funding and priority for suicide prevention programs. However, the sad reality is that in Australia around 3,000 people take their own life each year. The reasons are many and they are varied, but behind each statistic is a person, a family and a community that is impacted.

Also amongst those impacted are the health practitioners who face the dilemma confronted by Kerrie Woollorton's doctors and nurses: do they try to save her life or do they accept her clearly articulated wishes that she does not want life-saving treatment and that they should let her die? Whilst Kerrie Woollorton was a young person, it is probably the case here in South Australia that the vast bulk of advance care directives are made by older people, and it is also generally acknowledged that this demographic has above average suicide rates, with men over 85 representing the highest percentage by age profile.

One likely effect of the South Australian regulations could be to undermine public confidence in the whole advance care directive regime, especially for older and more vulnerable people. The whole rationale of the advance care directive system is to recognise our fundamental right to autonomy in medical decision-making. The core principle that underpins the act is to entrust people with a strong sense of autonomy and a right to make their own medical decisions, and not to have them made by others, no matter how well-intentioned.

Of course, in cases such as this there may well be family members who desperately want to save their loved one and who do not accept that their decision to be allowed to die be honoured. They want their loved one saved, even though that is not what the dying person wants for themselves. According to UK media reports of Kerrie Woollorton's case, her parents were planning to sue the hospital for failing to intervene. They were also reported to have called for an urgent change in the law to remove the right of the terminally ill to decline treatment following suicide attempts.

This disallowance motion allows parliament to have this debate. It is not an ideal process but, given that these regulations have now been gazetted and are operative, it is really the only way for us to deal with it. I certainly think this matter is bigger than just the government of the day resolving, through delegated legislation, to make such a fundamental change to the advance care directive regime. I think the parliament and others in this community should also be involved in this discussion.

Under parliamentary rules I could have postponed giving notice of disallowance until the end of October but, realistically, this debate will take some time and the clock is ticking. That is why I gave notice on the same day the regulations were tabled in this chamber.

At this point I would also like to acknowledge the assistance of two people who originally brought this to my attention and who have also agreed to advocate on behalf of the disallowance motion. These are Martyn Evans, a former minister for health, and also Margaret Brown, Adjunct Research Fellow in the School of Psychology, Social Work and Social Policy at the University of South Australia.

Both Martyn and Margaret have been involved in the formulation of laws and policies around advance care directives for many years. Martyn Evans was the minister for health when the original concept of anticipatory directions, as they were called under the Consent to Medical Treatment and Palliative Care Act, were being developed. Both these people are happy to speak to members about this difficult matter.

I would also like to reflect briefly on the process behind these regulations. What is surprising about the timing of these regulations is that they were made only a few weeks before the government releases the results of a review into the operation of the Advance Care Directives Act 2013. According to the government website, the purpose of the review was to make sure that the act is working well for South Australians. Public submissions were solicited through various channels, including the YourSAy government website, and they closed on 24 May.

The government advised that the report of the review will be made publicly available in August. My understanding is that we will see this report tomorrow. The question that arises from this timing is why it was necessary to urgently introduce regulations just three weeks ahead of the release of the findings of the review. This may or may not be one of the recommendations of the review, and we will not know that until later, perhaps tomorrow.

Nevertheless, I can see no logical administrative, governance or technical reason why these regulations had to be rushed through without debate so soon before the results of a review are announced. So the only reason that I can think of is that somewhere in South Australia today there is a real-life case that has spurred the minister to action.

Presumably, it is a situation like Kerrie Woollorton's and that this is happening or has happened in one of our hospitals or one of our aged-care facilities and that there is a conflict of views over whether or not a person who has tried to take their own life should be medically treated or provided with food and water against their clearly expressed wishes. This is pure speculation on my part but I can think of no other reason why regulations such as this would have been gazetted only three weeks before a comprehensive review report was to be released.

It goes without saying that these cases are nearly always tragic. They are heartbreaking and they are challenging for everyone involved: the person at the centre of the dispute, medical professionals, families and, in our case, legislators. I do not want to add harm to any tragedy that may be unfolding in South Australia; however, our role as a parliament is to ensure that laws that are made for the benefit of South Australians actually do work well for all of us.

There is an old saying that 'hard cases make for bad laws'. We have seen this many times over the years. Sometimes the genesis of these laws is a difficult report from the Coroner; sometimes it is the observations of a judge in a court trial. My long experience of the law tells me that when we try to fix genuinely wicked dilemmas on the back of individual cases, we often get unintended consequences, and that is my fear in this case.

So, until we hear more from the minister about why these regulations were introduced, we can only speculate. In the meantime, the prudent course of action is to maintain the status quo and to buy the parliament some time to consider the issue more fully, and that is why I have moved for disallowance. The question of whether a person's advance care directive should prevail in circumstances such as attempted suicide will clearly attract divergent views, which is why I think it will be important to hear directly from various stakeholders.

Fortunately, this parliament has in place a ready-made vehicle to explore this issue relatively quickly. The Joint Committee on End of Life Choices was established primarily to look at the question of voluntary euthanasia, but the terms of reference also clearly cover this situation. These regulations are precisely about the choices that some people make at the end of their life.

As a member of that committee, my intention is to put this on the agenda for consideration. I am not proposing a formal referral, because that is unnecessary, but I think this is the right committee to look at this issue. Of course, the Legislative Review Committee might also be interested, but I think the end-of-life choices committee is the more logical choice.

I know that former health minister Martyn Evans and Margaret Brown have made a written submission to that committee and I hope the committee will agree to hear from them in person. I also

hope that the committee extends an invitation to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing or a senior health official to provide some background and context to these regulations.

Because I want this issue to have a broader debate than we can offer here in this chamber today, I will shortly seek leave to conclude my remarks at a later date. I want to give the parliamentary committee a chance to look at this and to hear from stakeholders. I do not expect this motion to linger on the *Notice Paper* for too long because, in the event that parliament is prorogued over the summer break, the motion would disappear, so I expect it to come to a vote before Christmas.

I note that the act itself was the subject of a conscience vote by both the Liberal and Labor parties, so I would expect that a motion to disallow regulations that create exemptions to the operation of that act would also be a conscience vote; however, that is a matter for the other parties. I seek leave to conclude my remarks at a later date.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

COORONG ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 April 2019.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:25): The opposition supports the bill and supports the proposal that it might go to a committee. The Coorong is a beautiful part of South Australia, home to important wildlife and both Australian and international migratory birds. It is largely within a national park and is a stunning tourism destination. The Coorong and Lower Lakes are at the heart of the wellbeing of the Ngarrindjeri nation, and for tens of thousands of years have been cared for and are still a critically important part of Ngarrindjeri people's lives.

The Coorong is also under threat, and it has been for decades due to overextraction from the Murray-Darling Basin. This proposal, which will no doubt be looked at and perhaps refined in a committee, will create a trust that will have two important benefits for the Coorong. The first is that the community and experts will be able to give independent advice to parliament as well as to the wider community about the state of the Coorong and what is required to improve its condition. Second, it will allow funds to be raised and spent by the trust, independent of any level of government. With those brief comments, I look forward to the passage of the second reading stage.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:26): I rise to speak briefly in support of the second reading of the Coorong Environmental Trust Bill 2019. The Coorong is not just famous for *Storm Boy*; it is so much more than that and, fittingly, deserves our respect and protection. The Coorong is a national treasure, recognised under the Ramsar Convention as a wetland of international significance. It is home to many local species, as well as migratory wading birds flying in from as far as Siberia and Alaska.

The Coorong's natural beauty, abundant wildlife and unspoiled coastline make it one of South Australia's most visited tourist destinations. It is located at the end of the River Murray, stretching around 200 kilometres from Encounter Bay to Lacedpede Bay, uninterrupted when the mouth of the great Murray River opens to the sea.

I take a moment to commend my federal Centre Alliance colleague Senator Rex Patrick on passing a motion in the Senate last week for the establishment of a select committee into the multijurisdictional management and execution of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. It is clear we need to get a solid understanding of the detriment that having multiple jurisdictions trying to manage the basin has on this mighty river system.

The Murray-Darling is a national river system important to not just South Australia but the nation. It is an integral part of the nation's food bowl, responsible for a \$22 billion hub of economic activity and, as such, it must be governed properly. The Coorong Environmental Trust Bill 2019 establishes the Coorong environmental trust with the objective of driving the restoration of flows and ecological stability for the Lower Lakes and the Coorong.

It is envisaged that the trust will consist of members representing organisations with a professional, financial, physical or legal commitment to the ecological wellbeing of the Coorong, who will assist the government to make well-informed decisions about the health of the Coorong. The trust will operate independently and outside the government to manage the Coorong Ramsar site. The trust will have a number of functions and powers already outlined by the Hon. Tammy Franks in her second reading explanation on the bill.

As part of the bill, the trust is also required to establish a fundraising committee and wetland science committee. The Hon. Tammy Franks foreshadowed that she will seek to refer the bill to a select committee for inquiry and support.

On behalf of SA-Best, I support this move, as it is our view that there should be more, not less, scrutiny of legislation before us. This represents an important opportunity for more transparency in the political process and allows all South Australians to contribute in a meaningful way by way of submissions to help inform us as politicians when making decisions on the legislation before us. I look forward to a detailed analysis of the measures proposed in the bill through the select committee. With those words, I commend the second reading of the bill.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (16:30): I rise to address this particular bill. It goes without saying that the Coorong holds a very special place in the hearts of South Australians not just for its spectacular scenery but also because of its very diverse environmental values. During the Millennium Drought, we were all very concerned about the health of that particular area, together with the Lower Lakes.

Clearly, there was a deprivation of environmental flows that have impacted that area negatively. During that period, we heard from Associate Professor David Paton in relation to the plant species and the water birds. We are pleased that there has been improvement in environmental flows to the area, but clearly it is an area that needs to be closely monitored.

The Coorong environmental trust concept advocates for an independent board responsible for managing this particular waterway. It is understood that the aim of the Coorong environmental trust would be to facilitate independent scientific and community-based management of the Coorong and Lakes Alexandrina and Albert Ramsar wetland, listed under the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. I note that the mover of the bill stated in her second reading explanation:

It will be an independent trust that operates outside government to manage the Coorong Ramsar site. We want this trust to be independent from the state government whilst still affording the state government the opportunity to use the information and reports from the trust to inform decision-making

She also said:

The objective of the trust is to drive the restoration of flows and ecological stability within the lakes and Coorong, with a strong focus on the Ramsar principle of sustainable use.

Further in her speech, the honourable member explained that 'the trust that would take on or take over any work that is done by government or public sector employees in government departments'. There are some concepts to further explore, including how the trust will drive the restoration of flows and ecological stability and how this will interact with the existing government responsibilities in this regard. Some of the functions of the trust are similar to responsibilities of the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) under international agreements such as Ramsar, including reporting to the commonwealth and Ramsar Secretariat.

There are existing governance arrangements that support community and scientific advice into the management of the Coorong. This includes one which the government is establishing, the Coorong partnership, to guide community input into Project Coorong, which seeks to improve the long-term health and resilience of the Coorong wetland. Consultation is underway on the Project Coorong action plan. The Coorong partnership will comprise a community chairperson and local members with a broad range of interests and expertise, including but not limited to Aboriginal culture, conservation, recreation, science, agriculture, tourism and heritage.

There are some potential opportunities for aspects of the bill, particularly with respect to raising and holding funds, which may be beneficial to achieving long-term management outcomes

for the Coorong. The government supports the bill being referred to a select committee to be established by the Legislative Council. I look forward to it reporting in due course.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:33): I rise to thank those members who have made a contribution: the minister, the Hon. Michelle Lensink; the shadow minister and Leader of the Opposition in this place, the Hon. Kyam Maher; and the Hon. Frank Pangallo from SA-Best. I note that this has been very much a cross-party and collaborative approach. The Coorong environmental trust is designed to take the politics out and put the community back at the heart of the management of our Coorong and Lower Lakes—our precious, precious place there.

This trust, I hope, will empower the local and scientific communities to take and manage the Lower Lakes and Coorong in the way that they know and can demonstrate is best, taking some of the politics out of the management of the waterway for the benefit of the local community and the environment. I know that it has had very strong support from groups such as the River Lakes and Coorong Action Group. I want to acknowledge the hard work in particular of Faith Coleman in getting us to this point and, indeed, the strong community support that is again reflected even in our gallery today, where Faith Coleman is joined by both Rosa Hillam and Tracy Hill.

At the launch of this event, which again was a cross-party affair, it was quite commendable just how broad a range of different stakeholders and groupings came together to first champion this. I thank the minister, David Speirs; the shadow minister, Susan Close; and in that case in particular, Centre Alliance senator, Rebekha Sharkie, for also sharing a platform with me but also listening and supporting the community that day.

This is a bill, by its very nature, that must go to a particular select committee. Again, I thank the government, the opposition and the crossbenchers for their willingness to take part in that process. I look forward to now finally seeing the community voices heard clearly and strongly, getting on with establishing a Coorong environmental trust through the processes that are now to come and having this bill returned to this place well before the end of the year to get the job done.

Bill read a second time.

Referred to Select Committee

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:36): I move:

1. That the bill be referred to a select committee of the Legislative Council for inquiry and report.
2. That the select committee consist of four members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at three members and that standing order 389 be so far suspended as to enable the chairperson of the committee to have a deliberative vote only.
3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.
4. That standing order 396 be suspended to enable strangers to be admitted when the select committee is examining witnesses, unless the committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

That a committee be appointed consisting of the Hon. C. Bonaros, the Hon. I. Pnevmatikos, the Hon. T.J. Stephens and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

That the committee have the power to send for persons, papers and records; to adjourn from place to place; and to report on 4 December 2019.

Motion carried.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (VOLUNTEER CHARTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

At 16:40 the council adjourned until Thursday 1 August 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***MULTICULTURAL GRANTS PROGRAM**

137 The Hon. T.T. NGO (15 May 2019).

1. What is the dollar figure for the total grant funding pool for the Multicultural Grants Program 2019-20 that was recently announced?
2. What is the dollar figure for each of the four categories of funding (Advance Together, Celebrate Together, Expand Together and Stronger Together) being offered under this grants program?

The Hon. J.S. LEE:

1. The Marshall government is a proud supporter of our diverse multicultural communities in South Australia. I have been advised that the total figure for the Multicultural Grants Program 2019-20 is \$3 million to build community capacity and social inclusion.
2. I have been advised that the dollar figure for the four categories of funding are, Advance Together \$150, 000; Celebrate Together \$1 million; Expand Together \$600,000; Stronger Together \$600,000.

MANDATORY RAINWATER TANK COLLECTION

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (18 June 2019).

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment): The Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government has provided the following advice:

1. Since 2006, new houses (and some extensions) in South Australia have been required to have an additional water supply in the form of a 1,000-litre tank plumbed to at least one sanitary fixture to supplement mains water.

These requirements are applied through the National Construction Code (NCC) and were introduced as a sustainability measure during a period where prolonged drought posed a threat to the state's urban water supply.

The new Planning and Design Code (the code), phase 1 of which was adopted on 1 July 2019, has a significant role to play in this regard, given it will be the single source of planning policy for assessing development applications across the state.

No specific modelling has been done to date, however, in the developing of phases 2 (regional areas) and 3 (greater Adelaide) of the code, a range of measures to deal with both stormwater issues and environmental sustainability measures will be investigated, including water-sensitive urban design measures. Each alternative would be subject to a wide cost-benefit analysis, testing and consultation.

This process would also consider the potential costs that may fall to ratepayers if local government were required to upgrade infrastructure to accommodate increased stormwater flows and the management of local flood risks.

In summary, there is no intention to amend the NCC requirement for plumbed rainwater tanks until an evidence base for the ongoing management and reuse of water is gathered on the costs and benefits to ratepayers. The evidence base will be gathered as part of the development of phases 2 and 3 of the state-wide code, which will be a staged approach to consider and refine the existing policies within the South Australian Planning Policy Library.

2. For a number of reasons it's timely to reconsider both state and local policies relating to rainwater tank use. These include the need to encourage water reuse and manage stormwater flows.

Any such changes would be consistent with the state's move to the new natural resources management model—Green Adelaide—for the metropolitan area.