

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 9 June 2021

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins)** took the chair at 14:16 and read prayers.

The PRESIDENT: We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (14:17): I bring up the 40th report of the committee.
Report received.

Question Time

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Assistant Minister to the Premier regarding multicultural affairs. How exactly were attendees at a multicultural dinner, held at the Convention Centre on 29 May, made aware that this dinner was in fact a Liberal Party fundraiser?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:19): I thank the honourable member and the opposition members for their many, many questions of interest in the event that was very successfully held at the Adelaide Convention Centre. I think that unless somebody actually sleeps under a rock then they will know that I am a Liberal member of the Legislative Council, so that in itself is going to be a Liberal Party function, is it not?

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Assistant Minister to the Premier regarding multicultural affairs. Assistant minister, given that you were quoted in *The Advertiser* today saying, and I quote, that the dinner was 'to celebrate us as a multicultural diverse state', can you understand that some people would be confused to now learn that in fact it was a Liberal Party fundraiser?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:20): We live in a multicultural state and we ought to be very proud of it. Everybody that wished to pay to come to a dinner, whether it is to mark the 10th anniversary or 10 years in parliament for myself, or to celebrate all of us as a multicultural and diverse state, it is up to the individuals who want to come to the dinner. I do not see there is really an issue. Also, I do not feel that this particular question is actually in the public interest in any way that is affecting the way that I carry on as Assistant Minister to the Premier. The question has nothing to do with the portfolio of multicultural affairs.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Supplementary in relation to the answer given: in any of the material, including any invitations that were sent out by email or posted, was there any reference to it being a Liberal Party fundraising event?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:21): People who actually come to a dinner know that I am a Liberal member of the Liberal Party; therefore, they know that they are coming to a Liberal Party function. When they go on and pay for the tickets, the receipts come from the Liberal Party of South Australia. If that is not enough to say that it is a Liberal Party function—it's a private function, sir, and the opposition needs to know better. I never questioned the Hon. Emily Bourke, who is not in the chamber today, but I saw a Facebook posting—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Just hold on a minute. I can answer however I wish—

The PRESIDENT: I don't need the point of order. The assistant minister will resume her seat. It is against the standing orders to reflect on whether someone is absent in this chamber or not, but I understand the context. I will let the assistant minister continue.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Thank you, sir. What happened is that I saw that Facebook posting. There was an honourable member in this place who actually hosted a particular fundraiser for the Labor candidate Lucy Hood. In those photos were members from the Labor Party, including the opposition leader, who was there. I never then asked the questions: was it a fundraiser? Was it a fundraiser organised by the Labor Party? To put that in context, each political party can organise their functions, and it is in the knowledge of the fact that we have carried the organisation in accordance with the rules and there is nothing wrong with it.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Final supplementary: assistant minister, is it your contention that any time someone comes to an event that you are hosting or you are at they should assume it's a Liberal Party fundraiser?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:24): I believe that if people want to come to an event at my invitation—it depends what event it is. Most of the time, people come to an event knowing—knowing—that I am a member of the Liberal Party. There is a brand attached to me as a member attached to the Liberal Party, so it is quite obvious that coming to my event is attending an event that is associated with the Liberal Party.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Assistant Minister to the Premier regarding multicultural affairs. Assistant minister, what data, harvested using public resources and in your capacity as Assistant Minister to the Premier, was used to invite attendees to the dinner that you have claimed is a Liberal Party fundraiser?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:25): There is no data harvesting.

SINGLE TOUCH PAYROLL

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:25): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer update the chamber on the latest Single Touch Payroll figures?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Treasurer has the call and doesn't need any assistance from his frontbench colleagues.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:25): Mr President, I am sure all members hang out for the fact of the fortnightly release of the Single Touch Payroll figures to see how we are faring, in terms of the pace of economic recovery in South Australia compared to the other states and territories in the nation. I am pleased to be able to report on the latest fortnightly figures released today, which indicate that, again, comparing the most recent figures for the fortnight up to 8 May, so as recent as—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Conversations on my left are not helping.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: They have indicated that, when compared to the low point, which was mid-April 2020 in the COVID pandemic, in terms of impacts on the economy, there has been a 13.8 per cent increase in jobs growth in South Australia, compared to the national figure of 12 per cent. South Australia this time only just trails behind the leading state, which is Western Australia, which had a 14 per cent growth in jobs since mid-April of last year.

South Australia's record, again, is the second largest increase of employee jobs in the state, just behind Western Australia's figure and certainly well ahead of the other states and territories in terms of their measurement. In relation to the second measure of the Single Touch Payroll reports

on a fortnightly basis, South Australia's figures were, again, midranking, in terms of employee wages since the depths of the pandemic in April of last year, with 11.2 per cent growth in employee wages.

The national figure is 10 per cent, so it's significantly higher than the national figure. On this occasion, we again trail Western Australia, which is the leader in the clubhouse with a 13.3 per cent increase in employee wages. The Western Australian economy is certainly chugging along pretty well, given all the GST money they have over there—large chunks of our money, I suspect—and also the benefit of commodity prices, such as iron ore royalties, in terms of the impacts on their budget.

Nevertheless, South Australia's figure is still healthily above the national figure of 10 per cent. They are important indicators, as I reported yesterday on the NAB business conditions and business confidence figures. It is important, in terms of monitoring the relative health of the South Australian economic recovery compared to the other states and territories. There are many measures and I am pleased to be able to report again the most recent fortnightly figures.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:28): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Attorney-General as minister for consumer and business affairs in the other place, a question about the AUSTRAC investigation into SkyCity Adelaide Casino.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: As part of its probe, it has been revealed that AUSTRAC's main concerns centre around 'management of customers identified as high risk and politically exposed persons'. This is a significant term used by financial regulators. AUSTRAC's definition of a 'politically exposed person' or PEP is:

A PEP is an individual who holds a prominent public position or role in a government body or international organisation, either in Australia or overseas. Immediate family members and/or close associates of these individuals are also considered PEPs.

PEPs often have power over government spending and budgets, procurement processes, development approvals and grants. Examples of PEPs include government ministers or equivalent politicians, senior government executives, high ranking judges, high-ranking military officers, or board members or executives of an international organisation. This is not a complete list of PEPs.

Because PEPs hold positions of power and influence they can be a target for corruption and bribery attempts, and ultimately for money laundering or terrorism financing activities. This is why it's important to use AML/CTF measures to identify and manage any such potential risks.

My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Since the AUSTRAC revelation, has the government sought information or clarification from AUSTRAC on who the Casino's politically exposed persons might be? If not, why not, given the serious nature of the allegations?

2. Do you or any other government minister know who those politically exposed persons might be?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:31): I am pretty sure the answer to the second question is, for obvious reasons, no. In relation to the first questions, my understanding is that there is no further information that I can place on the public record or indeed the Attorney-General can place on the public record at this stage that would add any more information other than what's publicly available or I have conveyed yesterday to the chamber. If that's not correct, then I will bring back a further reply, but I suspect the answer is there is no further information that I can usefully provide to answer the honourable member's question.

I repeat again, AUSTRAC is an independent regulatory authority. It is conducting inquiries still. The very broad definition that the honourable member has outlined to the house includes not only state and national but also international organisations and people who might be associated with members of international organisations, so it clearly covers a very broad number of potential people within that particular definition.

As I said, I am sure the answer to the second question is no. My view is that there's nothing more that I can usefully provide to the house, but I will ask the Attorney-General. If she has a different view, that there is something further she could usefully provide to the house, I will bring back that response, but I suspect the answer will probably be no.

It is an independent agency; it would allow them to do what they have to do. I am sure they are highly unlikely as an independent regulatory authority to be saying, 'Hey, we're looking at this person, that person. Nothing's been proved yet, but you can tell Hon. Mr Pangallo the names of all these particular individuals because we are sure he won't share that with anyone other than he and his Facebook friends or Instagram followers or whatever it might happen to be.' That's not generally the way independent regulatory authorities operate but, as I said, I will refer the member's question to the Attorney-General. If I am wrong in my assumptions, I will bring back a further response.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:33): I thank you for the flippant response. Are you confident or can you perhaps come back to the chamber, through the Attorney-General, to at least tell the chamber whether or not the politically exposed persons are government ministers or public sector employees in South Australia?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:33): I can indicate that I haven't been money laundering through the Casino. I don't have sufficient money, I suspect, to be money laundering. I can't add anything further to the comprehensive response I have given to the further question, and that is, as I said, I suspect the answer from AUSTRAC and from the Attorney-General will be that they are not in a position to indicate at this stage, whilst they are still conducting investigations, that we are looking at Mr X or Ms X, or whatever it might happen to be, and to publicly identify them at this particular stage, and that AUSTRAC is happy to share that information with the Hon. Mr Pangallo, as interested as he might be in their identity.

Indeed, all of us would be interested to know the identity of people who might ultimately be charged with offences, and one would imagine that will become part of the public record. But in terms of any investigation, there will be an investigation of people who might ultimately be charged with offences and it is then up to them to prove their innocence or have their guilt proven, or there may well be people investigated who are completely innocent and there should be no requirement, in that case, to have their particular details publicly exposed by AUSTRAC, unless for whatever reason AUSTRAC decide they want to go down that path.

We have no control over AUSTRAC. It is ultimately a decision for them, as an independent, national regulatory authority with the power to do what they are required to do. We are quite happy to wait for them to conclude their investigations and, if there are people to be charged, to charge those people at the appropriate time.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:35): Given that SkyCity is only able to operate in South Australia by virtue of the Casino Act and its agreement with the state government, has the government been approached by AUSTRAC or has the government made approaches to AUSTRAC in relation to this investigation?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:36): As a member of the government I have certainly not been approached, and I haven't approached AUSTRAC. Again, I can refer that question to the Attorney-General, but I suspect the answer to both those questions is no. If it is different to that I will bring back a response.

ADELAIDE CONVENTION CENTRE GALA DINNER

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:36): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Assistant Minister to the Premier a question regarding the 29 May dinner.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: I have spoken to a number of people who attended that dinner on 29 May, and none of them were aware that it was a fundraising event—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: When you read the flyer you can understand how nobody would understand that. It might be a joke, but I imagine it breaches the law, this whole event.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: My question to the assistant minister is: exactly how many invitations to the 29 May dinner were issued to organisations that had applied for or received multicultural grant funding, and what guarantee can the assistant minister provide that no official government data, resources or personnel were used in organising the event?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:37): I invite the honourable member to name those individuals—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, on both sides! The Minister for Human Services is out of order. The assistant minister has the call.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Thank you, Mr President. It is ridiculous, absolutely ridiculous, to assume that I would send invitations to leaders just because they have benefited from a grant from the government. That is ridiculous. These are things that maybe the opposition would actually harness and do. We don't do that.

If I had done that the event wouldn't have been 923 people, I can guarantee you. It would be more than that. I had to put a stop on it, I had to close the bookings early, because they had reached capacity. I only invited people who were well known to me and then it was up to them, the leaders, to invite their friends. There is nothing wrong with those leaders wanting to invite their friends. So tell me and name those people who the member actually projected in his questions to me, that there were a few individuals who went to the opposition to release that information. I just invite the member to name them.

ASK WEBSITE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding services for families that need support. Will the minister please update the council on the Marshall Liberal government's new one-stop-shop ASK website?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for her question and for her interest in this important area. Indeed, on 31 May we did launch a new website known as ASK, an acronym for Adults Supporting Kids. This particular website is something that our department—indeed a range of departments, including the Department for Child Protection—is very excited about in terms of providing early support to families who may need it. We are also grateful for the endorsement and advice of Belinda Valentine and Steve Harvey, who have worked as senior community consultants for the ASK website.

Belinda and Steve provided advice on the navigated model and drew on research that they themselves have undertaken. They also undertook a desktop review of other Australian jurisdiction websites, such as The Orange Door in Victoria, had the role of co-chair of a working group alongside the Department of Human Services, and have been consulted on content and website development and functionality.

The purpose of the website is to provide what is known in government circles as a new front door. What that means is that it is to assist people to receive support at the point at which they need it. We know from a lot of discussions we have had with people with lived experience, and a range of other people, that if people view the Child Abuse Report Line as the front door to accessing services, there is stigma associated with that, and they may not seek help through that means.

The ASK website has a range of functionalities. Obviously, it is accessible to anybody who wants to use it, so it provides a lot of information for people in a range of areas, whether it be mental

health or a range of other supports that people might need, but it also is able to connect people into services, particularly in their local areas.

It has a range of modalities. Also, in case somebody feels that they may be at risk by accessing it, it has a quick exit for safe searching, language translations and tiles that can help people with resources such as access to parent information and links to parenting programs, 1800RESPECT, Lifeline, Kids Helpline and similar functionalities. I do not have the data in terms of the number of clicks and the like, but early advice we have received is that it has been quite highly utilised for a brand-new website, and we look forward to people receiving support if they need it, and if they need additional formal supports they can also access those.

ASK WEBSITE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Is the minister able to outline how many different languages this information can be accessed in, and how many of those are Aboriginal languages?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for his question. I do not have that information at hand. Clearly, there are a range of services specifically targeted to Aboriginal and Torres Islander people.

The Hon. K.J. Maher: There's 12 languages.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I will take on notice the number of languages that the website has and bring back a response for the honourable member.

HOMELESSNESS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:43): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Minister for Human Services on the topic of regional homelessness.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I refer to reports yesterday that a homeless support service in Port Lincoln is being forced to ask locals to donate tents, sleeping bags and old swags following an increase in people seeking support in the region and a chronic shortage of housing. This comes following reports in March that rental shortages in both regional SA and Adelaide have made short-term accommodation hard to find, with regional towns often not having enough homes to accommodate prospective workers who are looking to move.

My question to the minister is: will the government commit to building crisis shelters for people experiencing homelessness in the regions to ensure that services are not required to beg for tents and sleeping bags?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for his question. Clearly, in South Australia we are in the midst of a lot of movement of people—in some instances people coming back to South Australia or people relocating from interstate—and that is having an impact, a flowthrough to a range of parts of the housing system. That has an impact on people who may otherwise have access to private rental markets, including in regional areas.

I do note in particular in relation to Port Lincoln that quite recently there was some commentary—under other circumstances—in terms of people who are homeless are able to access other supports through informal processes. Port Lincoln is a bit like other areas which are quite popular in terms of holidays as well, such as places like Victor Harbor, where there can often be shortages of housing because they are very popular places and it's hard for people to get there.

We also see in regional areas—for instance in Port Pirie when there has been a lot of contractors—that it is hard for the emergency services personnel to access hotel accommodation. So there are seasonal changes at times. Overlaying that we have this particular issue in South Australia of lots of people returning home.

Obviously, those sorts of calls and those forms of accommodation we would see as a last resort. The homelessness services do operate throughout South Australia. In terms of the—I think you asked about crisis. In terms of modernising our approach to homelessness, shelters and

congregate living aren't necessarily the most modern approach to these questions and into the future we are looking more at people going into, if you like, mainstream forms rather than being in shelters.

There can be particular problems with having people in a congregate setting. If somebody is being disruptive, that impacts on everybody else, and the only place they have to go to is their own room. We have seen that from time to time in those forms of accommodation. In terms of particularly youth homelessness we announced quite recently Kids Under Cover, which is specifically for young people who may otherwise experience homelessness, as one of a suite of measures.

It's probably not the direction we would look at going forward. We are much more interested in what we call the rapid rehousing model so that people can find a property to live in, with supports if they need them. I am aware that there are other parts of the West Coast where there may actually be some housing vacancies, if people were interested in relocating into those. But our emergency services are very much at the frontline of this, and we always take their advice.

HOMELESSNESS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:47): Noting the minister's remarks regarding crisis accommodation, does the minister regard people sleeping in tents as a modern solution?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:48): No, I certainly don't, and that is always as a last resort. But I'm not convinced that building shelters is the solution to housing people. We obviously have a strategic housing plan, which is looking at the whole suite, and we are very keen to make sure that there are more dwellings built in South Australia, which is part of our solution.

DISABILITY SERVICES

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Human Services regarding government-run disability accommodation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON: The disability royal commission has heard damning and disturbing evidence about government-run disability accommodation and services. In fact, a senior DHS executive at the royal commission, who has since been quoted in the media, spoke about disability accommodation as having, and I quote, 'an air of neglect'. My question to the minister is: after more than three years in government, what kind of culture has the minister created and is overseeing when our own senior executives admit to neglect of those with disabilities?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question. I think he is actually quoting someone slightly out of context in that the quote was from one of our managers who was referring to a particular group home which we have actually since shut down.

I should also say that, since we came to government in March 2018, we have discovered many aspects of our supported accommodation services that needed reform. We have implemented some of the strongest safeguards for people with disability ever enacted in South Australia and there is now more accountability across the board and a new zero tolerance to abuse and neglect policy, among other new safeguarding measures.

We are committed to continuing improvement, which is why we are implementing new initiatives for people with disability, such as the disability app. I may have outlined these before. While they may read as dot points on a piece of paper, what sits behind them is a lot of training and development which goes on behind the scenes to ensure that these practices are adopted across our services.

We have a zero tolerance to abuse and neglect strategy, which is part of our new practice quality and safeguarding framework. I as minister of course receive critical client incident notifications. My understanding is that that did not take place under the former government. We have also lowered the threshold and broadened those criteria. We have improved education and training for staff on how to recognise and report suspected abuse or neglect. We have restructured the

services to increase supervision in group homes to better manage and mentor frontline support workers. We have:

- undertaken robust internal and external auditing;
- recruited a team of quality and safeguarding officers to monitor and improve practice;
- implemented a more robust system and expanded the scope of checklists for internal audit site visits;
- improved reporting through a new anonymous complaints option for staff, clients and families;
- begun a pilot of CCTV in disability homes; and
- established a customer group to self-advocate for a greater voice in support and access to community.

In relation to some of the matters that have been raised, there will be some clarification, which I am not at liberty to go into. I have also spoken to the Chief Executive of the Department of Human Services in relation to these matters.

ADULT SAFEGUARDING UNIT

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:52): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding adult safeguarding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS: The disability royal commission is again highlighting the issue of the vulnerability of people with a disability and older Australians. Will the minister update the council on government efforts to stop elder abuse?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): I thank the honourable member for his question. In March 2018, the Marshall Liberal team was elected to government with a strong mandate to stop elder abuse and safeguard the rights of older South Australians and other vulnerable members of our community. We received that clear mandate in the shadow of Oakden and the former government's underinvestment in, and lack of focus on, vulnerable people.

From day one, the Marshall Liberal government has worked to strengthen and expand protections and services for vulnerable South Australians. That's why in our first 100 days in government we introduced the nation-first legislation to protect vulnerable adults in South Australia and we committed \$2.6 million in our first budget to establish the Adult Safeguarding Unit and give it the people and resources it needs to respond to reports of abuse, neglect and mistreatment.

The Adult Safeguarding Unit commenced operations in October 2019 with an initial focus on responding to concerns and allegations of neglect or abuse of adults 65 years of age or older, or Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders 50 years of age or older. Last year, in response to the tragic death of Ann Marie Smith, the Marshall government again took swift action, expanding the unit's legal authority to include adults living with a disability and providing an additional \$3.5 million over four years to support that additional work.

Since the Adult Safeguarding Unit commenced operations on 1 October 2019, it has taken more than 2,400 calls from people concerned enough to pick up the phone and seek advice or assistance, either for themselves or for somebody they know. Strengthening the ability of every South Australian to recognise the signs and symptoms of possible elder abuse is crucial. People need to have the confidence to recognise elder abuse, to call it out when they see it and to pick up the phone and call the South Australian Abuse Prevention Phone Line, the confidential statewide service operated by the Adult Safeguarding Unit.

Each year, to complement its ongoing education advocacy work, the Office for Ageing Well runs a Stop Elder Abuse community awareness campaign to remind every South Australian that older people have rights, that those rights need to be safeguarded and protected and what to do if they experience or observe abuse. This year's campaign started on 10 May and runs through to

20 June. During the six-week campaign, information and messages about elder abuse are being widely distributed through social and digital media, local radio spots and regional newspapers.

Past experience confirms that campaigns such as this work. Every year, when the campaign is running, the number of calls to the Abuse Prevention Phone Line increases. Over the last year and a half, every South Australian has had to focus a great deal of their time and energy on dealing with COVID. As a state, we have done well, but those efforts and that success cannot be at the expense of our other responsibilities and challenges, like confronting elder abuse.

We need to be realistic in these uncertain times. We need to remember that 80 per cent of elder abuse is committed by a family member, with 50 per cent of that abuse being financial abuse. In the wake of the impacts of COVID, it is not hard to imagine someone putting pressure on an elderly family member or an acquaintance for support, financial support that they may not want or be in a position to give but which they feel pressured to provide.

If someone you know is experiencing that type of elder abuse, or any type of elder abuse, I would encourage South Australians to pick up the phone and call the Abuse Prevention Phone Line, or consider calling the phone line yourself and finding out what options might be available, what steps you might be able to take to protect the person involved.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo has a supplementary.

AGED-CARE CCTV TRIAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:57): In regard to elder abuse and what the government is doing, will the minister update the Legislative Council on the CCTV trial in supported accommodation and whether or not the government intends to expand the use of CCTV cameras?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:57): I thank the honourable member for his question, because it is yet another example of action by the Marshall Liberal government to protect vulnerable people. The pilot commenced at Mount Pleasant on 22 March and at Northgate House on 29 March.

As I have previously advised this council, not only is this an Australian first but I am not aware of any other Australian governments undertaking a CCTV trial. I know that my honourable colleague the Minister for Human Services is looking at CCTV in the human services context, but this project, which is jointly funded by the commonwealth government and the state government, is, as I understand it, a unique government pilot.

The pilot uses artificial intelligence technology to complement the surveillance of the rooms. Contrary to comments that the honourable member made on radio this morning, the devices are not limited to common areas. I am surprised that he hadn't appreciated that from previous comments I have made in this house. Just to clarify, the surveillance is linked to an independent monitoring centre.

In terms of progress thus far, obviously with both sites having been activated in March, it is very early to get any meaningful data from the pilot so far. I did take the opportunity to visit the Mount Pleasant aged-care services in the early weeks of the pilot and did have a chance to discuss with staff some of the early teething problems. For example, one of the staff members told me that the flicking of a garbage bag, in terms of the cleaning process, was enough to activate the alarms.

As with any technology that needs to be applied in a real-world environment, the teams at the two facilities are working with a technology partner to iron out those problems. This is an important partnership with residents, families and staff because the residents' participation in the pilot is voluntary. A number of families were initially reluctant to participate but, having had briefings from the health team, chose to be involved, and the pilot will be independently evaluated because we want to make sure that we take every lesson possible so that we can provide the best possible protection to older South Australians who are living in aged care.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo.

AGED-CARE CCTV TRIAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:00): My reference this morning was to the el-cheapo system being used by Human Services—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: We're using the same one.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: You're using the same one?

The PRESIDENT: Question.

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: Well, same company.

The PRESIDENT: A question, please.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Okay, well, that's interesting.

The PRESIDENT: This is a supplementary question?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: That's for another day, Mr President, but I do have a supplementary: can the minister indicate how they are being independently monitored; and those that are monitoring these cameras, do they have any qualifications in aged care or health care; and who is monitoring them?

The PRESIDENT: We are getting further away from the original answer, but the minister may have some information.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for a clarification of his comments this morning, and I apologise if I have misinterpreted them. In terms of the monitoring, the recording devices in the residents' bedrooms and common areas are programmed to detect predetermined trigger movements and sounds, which then signal a need for a rapid response to the resident.

Falls, calls for help or unusual movements trigger an alert which is automatically sent to an independent monitoring centre who then immediately alert nursing staff at the site to respond to the incident. Footage of the incident, including the minutes before and afterwards, is retained and securely stored on site for review by authorised personnel as required.

The PRESIDENT: A final supplementary.

AGED-CARE CCTV TRIAL

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:02): Well, my question wasn't answered. I asked who was actually monitoring, and do they have qualifications in health or aged care?

The PRESIDENT: As I say, this is getting a long way distant from the minister's original answer. I think the minister will briefly respond.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:02): Yes, and I would just refer the honourable member to previous answers that I have given, which is that monitoring is arranged through our technology partner, Sturdie Trade Services, and it is not a requirement that the person at the independent monitoring centre has qualifications such as health qualifications.

COPPER COAST COUNCIL

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (15:03): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Treasurer, representing the Minister for Local Government, questions concerning two initiatives that have been raised by the Copper Coast Council requiring government action or consideration.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: The entrance road to Wallaroo is in a poor state of repair and needs landscaping to enhance its appearance. It is the entrance to the tourist destination of Wallaroo and onto the ferry—an important gateway to Eyre Peninsula. This is a state road. The council has put forward a sensible proposal to exchange the state road with a heavy vehicle Wallaroo bypass road, which is a council responsibility. Apparently, the government is reluctant to agree to the

exchange due to a cost difference and an impact on the consolidated account. My questions to the minister are:

1. When is the government going to undertake works to upgrade the state of repair and landscaping of the Wallaroo entrance road?
2. What is the status in exchanging the responsibilities of the council heavy vehicle Wallaroo bypass road for the state Wallaroo entrance road?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:04): I am happy to refer the honourable member's question to the appropriate minister and bring back a reply.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER, MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:04): My question is to the Assistant Minister to the Premier regarding multicultural affairs. Exactly what additional resources, in terms of staff, officers or budget lines, does the assistant minister receive in relation to her role as assistant minister?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:05): I thank the honourable member for her question. No other taxpayer-funded resources or my parliamentary resources were allocated to assist in the organising of the big gala dinner on 29 May. It is organised by the Liberal Party of South Australia. This particular event is well supported by the business sector and multicultural communities because it supports jobs.

It supports jobs for the Adelaide Convention Centre. It supports small businesses with food and beverage supplies in organising an event like that. It supports live music and bands that perform on the night. It supports the South Australian economy and it supports the confidence of the community—that's what this is about. If members opposite do not have the confidence to organise events, that is their problem. It is nothing to do with the event I organised. I think this parliament is a place—

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: There is a point of order. Please resume your seat. There is a point of order.

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: I wasn't asking about the 29 May event. I ask the assistant minister to respond to my question: what additional resources do you receive as an assistant minister in terms of staff, in terms of offices and in terms of budget?

The Hon. J.S. LEE: As the Assistant Minister to the Premier, my resources are based on what is allocated by the Premier, which is a part of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I do not have an additional budget because I am not a minister of the Crown.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER, MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): Supplementary: when the minister outlined in her original answer that there are additional resources available, exactly what are they?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:07): I'm sorry, but I did not say there are additional resources allocated to me.

ASSISTANT MINISTER TO THE PREMIER, MULTICULTURAL AFFAIRS

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:07): Supplementary in response to the original answer: what additional jobs were created?

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:07): I think that would be a question for the Adelaide Convention Centre—how many people did they put on that night?

HOMESTART

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:08): I seek leave to make a brief explanation—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ridgway needs to be heard in silence.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Treasurer.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY: Yesterday, during question time, I asked the Treasurer a question around any intentions that the former Labor government or the current government had around the privatisation of HomeStart. He went on to say that this government has had no such discussions but the former Labor government had a whole range of discussions and ran an EOI (expression of interest) process, especially around the privatisation of the loan book, and I expect other aspects of privatisation of HomeStart. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Given that the former government went to the private sector, would the private sector participants in that EOI process expect their participation to be kept confidential?
2. If that has been released, has there been any breach of legislation or any breach of any codes of conduct during the release of that information?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for his excellent question yesterday and his follow-up question today. I guess in general terms what I would say, because—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hanson will remain silent and so will the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Treasurer will be heard in silence.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I want to hear my own answer.

The PRESIDENT: That would be nice.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: As I said, to be frank, as I indicated yesterday, I am not aware of all of the detail of the confidential discussions or otherwise that the former Treasurer had in relation to privatisation of very many assets, and it wasn't just HomeStart. Certainly, the way I have approached being Treasurer this time around and the same approach I adopted a hundred years ago when I was Treasurer last time round is that the inevitable nature of being a minister of the Crown and particularly being a Treasurer—and those who have been ministers will respect this—is you inevitably have a series of what are confidential discussions with individuals. They might not just be business people; they may well be representatives of NGOs or others who may want to express interest in various proposals.

I think a judgement of the quality of the person as a minister is whether or not they are prepared to respect those particular confidences. I think it is sad if someone breaches those particular confidences that they were entrusted with when they were actually a minister of the Crown. Inevitably, it is clear, by the nature of the questions that were asked in another public forum earlier this week, that questions, I am sure, have been raised in relation to the nature of confidential discussions that were held previously. That's ultimately a judgement call for that individual or those ministers or the former Treasurer to respond to in relation to the way they treat confidences.

All I can say is I will continue to respect any confidences in terms of confidential discussions that I have with either members of parliament—and I have had many of those from the opposition and the crossbench—or indeed other representatives of the non-government sector.

As I said, whilst I don't understand all of the details of the processes the former government went through in relation to at least HomeStart, I do want to say my understanding at the moment is they never got to the stage of an expression of interest process in relation to HomeStart. They

conducted confidential discussions and investigations, which may or may not have involved discussions with private sector parties—I don't know that—but they certainly had an expensive scoping study or feasibility study or investigation conducted by Treasury and others in relation to the potential privatisation of HomeStart.

Clearly, either related to that, during that or on separate occasions there were confidential discussions about the future of HomeStart. I hasten to say I don't know all of the detail of the particular discussions the former Treasurer had. What I can repeat is that clearly the former government was in it up to their armpits in terms of further consideration of the privatisation of almost anything that was not nailed down or bolted down. They were prepared to have a look at privatising whatever was moving.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:13): I seek leave to ask the Treasurer a question about SkyCity Adelaide Casino.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: As I asked earlier, given that SkyCity is only able to operate by virtue of the Casino Act and its agreement with the government, and given also your comments today that AUSTRAC is the appropriate agency to look at allegations of money laundering, does that mean that the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services, the regulator, doesn't have the same powers to investigate issues involving money laundering or other illegal activity?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:14): All I can repeat is the advice I received via, I think, the Attorney-General's office from the commissioner yesterday or the day before, which indicated it was the commissioner's view that AUSTRAC had both the expertise and responsibility for investigating allegations of money laundering and whatever the other aspect of their act was. I forget the precise legal definition or term that was used, but the *Hansard* record will show what I quoted from yesterday. I can only share the commissioner's advice that was shared with the government that that was his judgement in relation to it.

Given the definition the honourable member's colleague highlighted today, that the definition of, whatever it was, 'politically exposed person' involves not just state but also national and international organisations and associates of state, national and international organisations, if we think about the capacity of a state-based regulator as opposed to the capacity of a national regulator with all the resources available to a national regulator, on behalf of the national government, it is fairly self-evident that the advice of the commissioner is soundly based, that AUSTRAC is the appropriate agency to do it.

That is why, as I indicated yesterday, the commissioner's advice was that he was consulting with AUSTRAC and he had placed his review on hold pending the results of the AUSTRAC investigations.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:16): Supplementary: can the Treasurer outline to the chamber what powers the regulator does have in South Australia?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:16): The honourable member, as a lawyer, as a member of parliament, can have a look at the act. I don't have a copy of the act with me. It is pretty clear in the legislation what the powers are and aren't in relation to the regulatory arrangements, but I don't have that act or those provisions in front of me.

The responsible minister is the Attorney-General, and the commissioner reports to the Attorney-General. I would refer the honourable member to the appropriate legislative authorities and if, having read those in her comprehensive way, she has further detailed questions, I am happy to have them referred on to the Attorney-General via a question in this council.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:17): A further supplementary: can the Treasurer also confirm whether he or anyone else knows whether the review that had been instigated by the regulator was looking into issues of money laundering and illegal activities at the Casino?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:17): I don't know; that is an issue ultimately for the commissioner. The commissioner has indicated that he has had discussions with AUSTRAC. I don't know whether they occurred prior to the announcements in the last two or three days or whether they occurred subsequent to those. I will leave those issues for the commissioner in relation to what he was looking at and how he progressed them.

I think there has been a statement from the commissioner indicating that their normal regulatory functions continue. They have daily and weekly responsibilities in terms of managing the operations of the Casino, and they continue—as you would expect them to. I can only repeat the advice I received from the commissioner, via the Attorney-General's office I think it was, that the appropriate agency to monitor or investigate issues in relation to money laundering and that other issue that AUSTRAC monitors is AUSTRAC. He is awaiting the results of their investigations.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:18): Final supplementary: given the overarching responsibility of the state government in this area, and its own assets, does the regulator have a responsibility to report back to the Attorney, or indeed the government, in relation to investigations?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:19): The overarching responsibility, in many respects, will be the parliament's, in terms of the legislative authority. In relation to the work the commissioner undertakes, my understanding is that he would report at the appropriate time via or to the Attorney-General. I would need to check what the regulatory arrangements were as to whether he reports to the Attorney-General or whether he just reports via the Attorney-General publicly or to the parliament.

Again, that is probably made clear in the legislative authorities of the commissioner. Not being the minister with responsibility for the commissioner in relation to these issues, it is not a matter of detail that I can respond to the honourable member on. I don't know that I can offer anything further by way of clarifying the honourable member's questions.

*Parliamentary Committees***JOINT COMMITTEE ON RECOMMENDATIONS ARISING FROM THE EQUAL OPPORTUNITY COMMISSIONER'S REPORT INTO HARASSMENT IN THE PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE**

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:20): I move:

That the standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move an instruction without notice to the Joint Committee on Recommendations arising from the Equal Opportunity Commissioner's Report into Harassment in the Parliament Workplace.

Motion carried.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

1. That it be an instruction to the Joint Committee on Recommendations arising from the Equal Opportunity Commissioner's Report into Harassment in the Parliament Workplace that members of the committee may participate in the proceedings by way of telephone or videoconference or other electronic means, and shall be deemed to be present and counted for the purposes of a quorum, subject to such means of participation remaining effective and not disadvantaging any member; and
2. That a message be sent to the House of Assembly transmitting the instruction requesting its concurrence thereto.

This is a standard procedure. The committee asked at its last meeting for this motion to be passed, and I am happy on the committee's behalf, as always, to expedite the important work of this particular committee.

Motion carried.

Matters of Interest

NEXUS ARTS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:22): Today, I have the privilege to rise to speak about Nexus Arts and the launch of its culturally diverse audience toolkit and the intercultural arts exhibition called HOME. It was a great honour to represent the Premier of South Australia, the Hon. Steven Marshall, and wonderful to join His Excellency, the very popular and well-respected Governor of South Australia, the Hon. Hieu Van Le, Her Worship Mayor of Campbelltown Jill Whittaker, Uncle Mick O'Brien, the proud Kurna Elder, and many special guests at the launch of the Nexus Arts' research report and accompanying industry toolkit, called 'You're Welcome: A Guide for Arts Organisations to increase Cultural Diversity in Our Audiences', on Sunday 6 June 2021.

Nexus Arts was established in 1984 as an artists' collective and has played a significant role in the social and cultural development of arts in South Australia since day one. As a leading contemporary arts organisation in South Australia, Nexus Arts has a special focus on fostering culturally diverse and intercultural artistic practice, and developing artists from culturally diverse backgrounds. Nexus Arts is committed to presenting, promoting and supporting high-quality contemporary music and visual arts by many culturally diverse artists. It aims to inspire, stimulate and cultivate broad audiences and engage with diverse partners who work collaboratively in these efforts.

As honourable members are very much aware, interculturalism is very close to my heart and I am very pleased to highlight the wonderful work that Nexus Arts is doing to engage with and explore the participation of multicultural audiences for arts events across South Australia. I take this opportunity to acknowledge and congratulate executive director of Nexus Arts, Dr Blythe Chandler, the chair and board members of the Nexus Arts board, the energetic project coordinator Mrs Marwa Abouzeid, and the whole team for their significant contributions to increasing diversity in our state and for presenting the most welcoming and successful launch event.

The report and industry toolkit is an accumulation of a two-year project, supported by the government of South Australia via the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, through a Multicultural Affairs Stronger Together grant. The research gathered data on the experiences of Adelaide residents born in 24 different countries, who reported speaking 22 languages in addition to English, all of whom engage with the arts.

Taking into consideration an informed global review of literature in the field, Nexus Arts explored the barriers, drivers and trends that impact the participation of culturally diverse audiences in arts events. The result is a rich report and a digestible toolkit designed to support arts organisations across the country to develop more inclusive practices and better engage with audiences from diverse backgrounds.

This toolkit will be shared nationally across the sector, providing a road map to support organisations to provide a more welcoming and inclusive environment for all members of our audiences. The celebration of this exciting research outcome was set against the backdrop of an intercultural visual arts exhibition with the theme 'Home', which brings together community artists from diverse cultural backgrounds to build connections and collaborate on cultural and intercultural understanding.

To many migrants residing in South Australia, home is where our heart is. It is where you hear that familiar language, that music or song being played in the background, that wonderful aroma of food that your grandmother or mother used to cook or is still cooking. It is the sense of belonging that gives us that feeling of home and being comforted living in a multicultural state like South Australia.

This magnificent arts exhibition is hosted by Campbelltown ArtHouse and is proudly presented by the network of arts leaders that was established to support the two-year research project. I would like to acknowledge the members of the Hispanic Women's Association of South Australia, the Chinese Welfare Services of SA, the Arabic Language and Culture Association of

South Australia and the Campbelltown ArtHouse for this very strong partnership working with Nexus Arts. Congratulations, all, for your wonderful efforts in presenting the exhibition.

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL, 60TH ANNIVERSARY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:26): I rise to acknowledge the 60th anniversary of Amnesty International. For six decades, Amnesty has worked to expose human rights abuses, change laws and improve the human condition around the world.

Today, Amnesty International is a global human rights movement of over 10 million people from more than 150 countries and territories. It is a movement based on voluntary members, with a worldwide network of national branches and affiliated groups. True to its values, despite its size, Amnesty keeps democracy at its core. Decision-making occurs at its international global assembly, and its Australian arm is governed by a member-elected national board.

We see Amnesty in full flight today, but its beginnings are humble and remind us that relatively small, yet not insignificant, events can create a groundswell and generate movements. Amnesty began with a toast to freedom by two Portuguese students in 1961. They were gaoled for raising that toast.

Amnesty began with British lawyer Peter Benenson writing the newspaper article, 'The forgotten prisoners', discussing a global trend and citing seven million people suffering imprisonment, torture or execution because their political or religious views challenged those of their government. Benenson then launched the 'Appeal for Amnesty, 1961', disseminating information about prisoners of conscience around the world. By July 1961, the first international meeting occurred and delegates established a permanent international movement in defence of freedom of opinion and religion.

Locally, Amnesty International is now a movement of over half a million supporters, with offices in almost all Australian capital cities. This is everyday people uniting and challenging injustice and defending human rights. At this significant historic marker of 60 years, Amnesty is also setting a path for coming years.

In launching its vision until 2025, Amnesty are determined to pursue systemic change on human rights issues and take purposeful action to further advance human rights. This includes standing against racism and working to become a nation where everyone can feel safe and like they belong regardless of race, ethnicity, culture or religion. I lend my heartfelt support to this ambition and hope to also work to realise Amnesty's plans for a national antiracism strategy.

Amnesty aim to increase refugee and humanitarian intakes, community resettlement and improve human rights in Asia-Pacific communities. It gives me great hope that asylum seekers who flee to Australia have Amnesty advocating for them and raising awareness of their challenges and plights.

Amnesty is also focused on working with Indigenous communities, especially to target and prevent Australia's Indigenous children from becoming incarcerated and trapped within the prison system. We have work to do to correct mistakes of the past, and working with Australia's First Nations communities to help them create positive change is crucial.

The organisation is also driving a women's safety agenda, which we know is critically important to all corners of the globe from highly developed to developing nations. Amnesty shares its vision for Australia to become a nation where women and girls live free from gender-based violence and discrimination. This is not an exhaustive summary of Amnesty's 2025 vision, but it shows there is much work to do even on home soil.

In closing, I give support to Amnesty's work in speaking out against the injustices occurring in Myanmar and its members' vigils to bring awareness to the conflict. I spoke in this chamber recently about the atrocities suffered by the people of Myanmar and urged action or intervention, preferably peaceful, bringing an end to the military junta's control.

Lastly, I wish to recognise the commitment of the volunteers who drive Amnesty International and its work, especially the local SA/NT Activism Leadership Committee members, chaired by Tim Green. Thanks also to Amnesty's national board SA/NT-based directors, Vicki Jacobs and Saras Suresh Kumar.

Time expired.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:32): It is a proven fact that criminals throughout the world use casinos for their criminal gain. Transnational organised crime networks are known to use casinos to convert their illicit profits into legitimate funds. Casinos are particularly attractive because they are cash-intensive and high-volume businesses.

TOCs target operations in jurisdictions where political oversight is lax and where there is a failure to carry out due diligence on casino operations. Do not for a minute think it is not happening right under our noses. Royal commissions are underway in Victoria and in Western Australia on the back of damning revelations made against Crown, the company that operates the two casinos in both of those states, by the Bergin inquiry into Crown's fitness to hold a licence in New South Wales.

Up until this week, we had rarely seen controversy about Adelaide's quaint Railway Station Casino that has been around since 1985. New Zealand-owned SkyCity rocked the stock exchange with a statement that it was being investigated by AUSTRAC after the financial crimes watchdog identified potential serious noncompliance and money laundering issues between 2015 and 2019. The company said AUSTRAC's concerns were raised as part of a compliance assessment commenced in September 2019 focusing on the Casino's 'management of customers identified as high risk and politically exposed persons'.

So serious are these allegations they have the potential to undermine the security of the state. Far-fetched? Far from it. Here is what AUSTRAC defines a politically exposed person as:

...an individual who holds a prominent public position or role in a government body or international organisation, either in Australia or overseas. Immediate family members and/or close associates of these individuals are also considered PEPs.

PEPs often have power over government spending and budgets, procurement processes, development approvals and grants. Examples of PEPs include government ministers or equivalent politicians, senior government executives, high ranking judges, high-ranking military officers, or board members or executives of an international organisation...

Because PEPs hold positions of power and influence they can be a target for corruption and bribery attempts, and ultimately for money laundering or terrorism financing activities.

I do not think anyone will doubt the gravity or seriousness of such an explanation. That is why SA-Best is asking questions of the Treasurer and the government about whether the government has sought clarification from the federal agency on just who these politically exposed persons or customers are and whether the government was concerned that the PEPs could be someone of note who could pose a security threat to the state.

All this is occurring in an environment where the ICAC commissioner, the Hon. Ann Vanstone QC, recently published a report to remind South Australia's public officers of their obligation to appropriately deal with and manage conflicts of interest. Perhaps, in light of SkyCity's revelations this week, the commissioner might want to turn her attention to it. Every South Australian should be alarmed by AUSTRAC's bombshell, and we believe a royal commission may well be needed here.

When SA-Best questioned the government about an independent inquiry into the Adelaide Casino in March, we were typically fobbed off and told that our local regulator, the Commissioner for Consumer and Business Services, had it all in hand. Really? AUSTRAC seems to have found differently. The Bergin report, which sparked the current royal commission, uncovered major flaws in corporate governance, which facilitated money laundering and links to criminal gangs.

The report recommended junket operators be banned from dealing with casino operators, that legislation be tightened to put the onus on casinos to prevent money laundering, and said criminal elements, probably including transnational criminal organisations, had run hundreds of millions of dollars through Crown's accounts. Shortly after the release of that report, SkyCity banned working with junket operators.

SkyCity happens to be the centre of a civil Supreme Court action involving shady Chinese junket operators, launched by a mysterious wealthy Chinese national, Mr Linong Ma. The action relates to gambling sessions at the Casino in May 2019, where Mr Ma allegedly won more than

\$5 million but alleges the junket operator failed to pay the entire amount. As Lord Acton once said, power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely.

DISTILLED SPIRITS INDUSTRY

The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (15:37): I rise today to speak about an important industry, the distilled spirits industry. Last sitting week, I had the great privilege, pleasure and honour to be at a dinner hosted by the Hon. Josh Teague, Speaker of the House of Assembly, and the Hon. David Basham, the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, in the Speaker's dining room, where they hosted a number of prominent members of the South Australian Spirit Producers Association (SASPA).

It made me cast my mind back some five years, almost to the day, when I was the shadow minister. We had a very small industry back then. We had, I think, about six distilleries employing about 30 people. It made me cast my mind back to a forum that I hosted, a distilled industries forum, here in Parliament House during the winter break, when the Premier and other ministers from the Labor Party had travelled overseas. I think most of them had gone to China for a big trade mission. We wanted to look at developing new industries in South Australia.

This particular forum received some favourable comment from *The Advertiser*, from Cameron England and also from Sheridan Holderhead. It also received comment from Tom Richardson, and I spoke to Tom this morning. I will not read out his contribution, but he took a satirical view of the forum that I might be holding, and his description of it was just a commentary of now Premier Marshall and I opening a bottle of whisky, which is one barrier to the industry, and the other barrier to fill was the supply gap and drinking it would fill the supply gap. Nonetheless, that satirical view, I think a somewhat tongue-in-cheek view, taken by Mr Tom Richardson was a little disappointing, given where the industry is today.

We released a findings paper, which discussed a number of areas, including approvals and planning, liquor licensing, excise and tax arrangements, appellation and branding, product standards and supply chains. We listed a key bunch of actions to be followed. It is quite interesting that from those actions a lot of work was done. Clearly, we could all tell there was a tremendous amount of potential for an industry that was only employing about 30 people. One of the whisky producers said to me that the greatest value-adding you can do is turn a tonne of barley that is, say, valued at \$400 into whisky, and there is some \$22,000 of tax that comes to various levels of government from that. So there were some good opportunities to grow that sector.

I am really pleased to see that from those small beginnings and those findings—and we wrote to a number of government officials both here and in Canberra—I was very pleased to see back in January this year the Minister for Primary Industry and Regions, the Hon. David Basham, funded the formation of an industry blueprint, which the South Australian Spirit Producers Association is now working on, which will be a wonderful foundation for that industry to grow forward. Also, we saw in the recent federal budget the wonderful news that, and I quote:

A new federal government package aims to turbocharge the nation's craft beer brewers and boutique spirit distillers by freeing up cash to employ new workers, expand on cellar door facilities or explore new export markets.

So I really appreciate the recognition that the federal government has given this particularly important industry because that was one of the concerns around the industry back at the forum, that we were not able to get that growth because of the high levels of taxation.

Of course, we had our members of academia at that forum. They were from the University of Adelaide and Waite, and I know that they have developed their national collaboration hub for agriculture, food and wine innovation—a project that they have been pursuing, something that the current member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, supports, and I know the new candidate for Boothby, Dr Rachel Swift, supports.

This collaboration centre for agriculture, food and wine will include a research distillery. It is important that as this industry continues to grow we look to support it with the academic rigour, the research and the testing and the standards. As I said, one of the areas we were concerned about in the findings was product testing and product standards, so by having the university behind this industry I am sure we will see it continue to grow.

It is interesting that the industry has gone from six producers and 30 employees five years ago to now some 60 producers and over 1,000 employees—a truly remarkable growth. I urge everybody to play their role and continue to consume South Australia's fine spirits.

WHITE ROCK QUARRY

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:42): I rise to raise some serious health concerns about the expansion of White Rock Quarry in Adelaide's eastern suburbs. In January this year, the state government commenced a detailed assessment of the submission by Hanson construction materials to expand White Rock Quarry in the Adelaide Hills, just 10 kilometres east of the Adelaide CBD. In response to this proposed expansion, local residents have formed the group Residents Against White Rock Quarry over their concerns—and their rightful concerns—about the environmental and health risks of this proposed expansion.

One of the primary concerns to these residents is what is called respirable crystalline silica (RCS) dust. That has the potential to blow over the residents in that local eastern area, including Horsnell Gully, Magill, Skye and Norton Summit. The Cancer Council has found that exposure to silica dust can lead to the development of lung cancer, silicosis—which is an irreversible scarring and stiffening of the lungs—kidney disease and chronic obstructive pulmonary disease and, quite rightly, these suburban residents are very fearful that they will be vulnerable to these health risks.

As a result of current laws, private mines can actually mine right up to the boundary of private homes in suburban areas, spewing this dangerous and unhealthy dust into these people's very backyards and homes. Residents have a right to be concerned, indeed, while there is a nationally agreed workplace exposure limit on this dust. Those limits only apply in the workplace and they only apply for an eight-hour period of exposure each day, yet what protection is offered to individuals who are exposed to silica dust in the very homes they live in, where they spend far more than eight hours each day?

The average size of a particle of silica ranges from 0.1 to 100 microns. For comparison, the average size of a fine grain of sand is 125 microns and the average size of an asbestos particle ranges from 0.7 to 90 microns. Similar to asbestos particles, which I assume everyone in our community is now well aware of the dangers of, silica dust particles are invisible to the human eye. They cannot be tasted or felt. This means that you can be exposed to silica particles for an extended period of time without your knowledge.

The dangers associated with this exposure include bronchitis, emphysema, silicosis, lung cancer and, as I said before, obstructive pulmonary disease, as well as kidney damage. The Cancer Council has estimated that approximately 230 people develop lung cancer every single year as a result of long-term exposure to silica particles at work, where I say again that the allowed standard is for an eight-hour period only.

There is currently very little data available that focuses on the health impacts outside the workplace and indeed very little that focuses on exposure to particles from living near a quarry. What is happening here in our foothills to our east is that this quarry is going to expand right into the very backyards of this community and they are rightfully fearful that their health is being put at risk.

My colleague the Hon. David Shoebridge in New South Wales and I have long called for a ban on the dry cutting of materials that contain silica in the development of a plan to phase out those products. Many would be familiar with the kitchen benches that have become very fashionable, but indeed that fashion is quite lethal to those workers who handle this material.

We are totally aware of the error of our ways now with asbestos and we need to be exercising the same caution with silica dust. I stand and the Greens stand with the residents opposed to the expansion of White Rock Quarry. We in this council should be putting their health first, and I hope this parliament will do everything it can to ensure that the safety, security and health of those suburban residents are not impacted by the expansion of this quarry.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:47): I rise to speak about the Marshall Liberal government's recently released Regional Development Strategy. In continuing to deliver on our

commitments, the government has released the strategy to enable deeper collaboration and cooperation between itself, industry and regional communities to maximise the benefits of decision-making.

Alignment of multiple factors, sourced from local knowledge of key stakeholders in these communities, allows for effective decision-making processes to deliver the best result for our regions. Regions are the backbone of our state and their diverse and rich environment helps define its character. They are the economic powerhouse that drives our prosperity, contributing around \$29 billion yearly to the state's economy.

The Regional Development Strategy marks the first time that a South Australian government has developed a comprehensive plan to work with communities in the country. It is us saying that the one-size-fits-all approach does not work for regional areas as diverse and as distinct as the Limestone Coast; my home, the Riverland; the Barossa; and Eyre, Yorke and Fleurieu Peninsulas.

As the consultation and discussion process for the strategy was underway, we faced significant challenges: drought, bushfires and the pandemic. However, these challenges provided an opportunity to adapt and change for the better. As businesses faced the new norm of working from home and people returned to our state, digital connectivity mattered more than ever, but it did not just show how vital it was for our regions to be sufficiently supported by digital infrastructure, it showed the rest of the South Australian community, and Australia broadly, the flexibility on offer in working arrangements.

This is a chance to bring people back to the country. A mode of working previously inhibited by market conditions can now be a boon for those outside the metropolitan area. The hard-won safety of this state compared to the rest of the world is also a chance for all Australians to explore what we have to offer here at home. There is also a very real possibility that the pandemic could see a return to manufacturing in this state, as stresses to supply lines show the importance of domestic manufacturing. Now is the perfect opportunity for renewal and growth, and the Regional Development Strategy will capitalise on this to deliver the best for all of our communities.

The Regional Development Strategy provides direction and focus for industry and community leaders alike. It is an approach which will strengthen our economic recovery and go towards reaching the government's goal of 3 per cent growth yearly for our state's economy. With effective communication between stakeholders and government, decision-making will be guided by the following priorities:

- Regional voice—in engaging regional stakeholders, businesses and communities, we are facilitating the sharing of values and local solutions when implementing development and growth in South Australia. The government wants those in the regions to seek clear opportunities to shape the future of their community.
- Regional connectivity—engagement of transport network and telecommunication solutions, with local knowledge in development and design, assuring such deliveries meet the needs of our diverse regional communities.
- Regional leadership and skills—we need to ensure our emerging regional leaders have the opportunity for personal and professional development, which is necessary to effectively serve their communities.
- Regional services—we are ensuring the safety and livability of communities in our country by filling in service gaps and establishing solutions for those services which are critical as such.
- Regional investment—outside and inside investment, which continues to increase trade, productivity and exports, which our state is renowned for.

We have achievements to date in these areas. We have actively engaged our Indigenous nations in projects and policy. The Department for Education's 10-year Aboriginal Education Strategy will continue to support our students to ensure they thrive throughout their learning.

We continue to work with industry and regions in the implementation of the Mobile Phone Black Spot Program, along with the 20-year Infrastructure SA strategy, which was developed with a

clear regional focus. Regional connectivity has always been on the agenda with the facilitation of GigCity development at Whyalla and Mount Gambier. Improved telecommunications and digital connectivity in regional South Australian communities will deliver the economic and social benefits needed to take advantage of a post-COVID future.

The Marshall Liberal government wants to grow our state, and our regions are key. In reaching that goal, we are involving regional communities in a meaningful way so that in the growth of our state the benefits to these areas are maximised. That is what the Regional Development Strategy is to achieve.

COVID-19 INDIA

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:52): The recent COVID outbreak and subsequent lockdown in Victoria should serve as a reminder of what people overseas have been dealing with on a massively larger scale on a daily basis for more than a year, often with tragic, unimaginable outcomes. South Australia's strong Indian community, with which I have developed a genuine bond over recent years, is doing it particularly tough, as they look on helplessly at what is happening to their loved ones on the subcontinent.

When we get a few cases of COVID, we are rightly alarmed and have the processes in place to deal with it. I am on record as saying that Australia, in a bipartisan approach, has done a great job in taking measures to shut down the virus when it raises its ugly head. Now we are in a position to help other countries. India is one of those countries that is not so fortunate. Their outbreaks are many times worse than anything we have experienced and their resources are pushed to the limit and beyond.

This is where the more fortunate, affluent countries like Australia can and should help. COVID has shown us like never before that the world is a global community. Beyond just being the right thing to do, it is in our best interests to help our brothers and sisters overseas. I call on the governments of Australia, federal and state, to help. We need to put measures in place to assist countries like India, which are working against great odds to deal with victims of COVID.

India is in dire need of a vast range of medical supplies and we are in a position to provide many of them. They need ventilators, oxygen concentrators, antigen kits, thermal guns, hand sanitiser, surgical masks, gloves, gowns, pulse oximeters, safety goggles, the list goes on. Vaccines are needed and so are ICU beds.

As I went down the list of items they were lacking, the need for what was listed as 'dead body wrapping bags' was a sobering reminder of how desperate the situation is over there. While Australian governments contemplate what they can do to help, the local Indian community is doing all it can to raise awareness and much-needed funds for their relatives and friends back home while trying to remain positive.

The Aalap Indian Association held a charity gala night on 5 June to raise funds, and when you look at the list of those groups that worked together on the night it really drives home the strength and spirit of our Indian community, and how much they are a part of the greater South Australian community. I would like to name these associations as follows: the United Indians of South Australia, the Hindu Council of Australia, the Guru Nanak Sewa Mission, the South Australian Indian Australian Medical Association and the Adelaide Tamil Association.

There were also the Telangana Association, the Adelaide Metropolitan Malayalee Association, Desi Australia, Gurjari South Australia, the Uttarakhand Association of South Australia, Adelaide Brahm Samaj, Adelaide Dawoodi Bohra Jamaat, Adelaide Marathi Mandal, Adelaide Kannada Sangh, Arjun Entertainment, Art of Living, the Bharatiya Hindu International Malayalee Association, Dindori Pranit Shree Swami Samartha Seva Marg and Divya Jyoti Jagrati Sansthan.

Further, there were FICSA, Haryanvi Kunba South Australia, IACF Adelaide, the Indian and Australian Art Cultural Association, Indian Professionals in Australia, the Indian Association for Human Values, Jai Durga Sanskar Mandal South Australia, Jat Mahasabha South Australia, Kalalaya, the Nair Service Society of Adelaide and Patidar Samaj of South Australia.

Finally, there was the SA Indian Medical Association, the Sargam Musical Forum, the Shirdi Sai Baba Community and Cultural Association of South Australia, the Shree Sanatan Dharam Society of South Australia, the Talaash Indian Bollywood Band, the We Breathe Cricket Club and the Adelaide Warriors Cricket Club. The last of those groups mentioned shows how much we have in common with our Indian friends, after years of great respect and rivalry on the oval playing cricket.

The world is affected by COVID but the subcontinent is doing it particularly hard at the moment. The South Australian Nepalese community also got together on 5 June to hold the COVID-19 Nepal Aid Fundraiser. This was a commitment between the AussieMed Foundation, the Honorary Consulate of Nepal and several South Australian community groups in support of the Australasian Nepalese Medical and Dental Association-led medical aid projects to mitigate the COVID second wave being experienced over there.

I read out all the names because the groups involved tried hard to convey how much the Indian community has assimilated into South Australia. That is a lot of people and a lot of organisations coming together to aid a country in need. If they can do it, so can we at an official level. I call upon Australia as a nation and on South Australia as a state that has, through good—

Time expired.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: TEACHERS REGISTRATION BOARD PETITION

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (15:57): I move:

That the report of the committee, on the House of Assembly's petition No. 13 of 2020: Maintenance of the Current Composition of the Teachers Registration Board, be noted.

The Australian Education Union and the Independent Education Union commenced this petition to maintain the current composition of the Teachers Registration Board and to retain their ability to nominate members to the board. On 22 July 2020, Dr Susan Close MP, then shadow minister for education, tabled the petition in the House of Assembly.

The petition was signed by 11,606 residents of South Australia and requested that the House of Assembly urge the government to ensure political independence of the Teachers Registration Board and maintain its current composition and nomination process. On presentation to the parliament, the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991 refers eligible petitions to the Legislative Review Committee. Once referred, the committee is required to inquire into, consider and report to parliament on eligible petitions.

The petition was commenced in response to the Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020, which was presented in the House of Assembly on 4 March 2020 by the Hon. John Gardner MP, Minister for Education. The bill proposed amendments to the Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004, including alterations to the composition of the Teachers Registration Board.

The minister advised the Legislative Review Committee that those amendments were intended to improve the flexibility of the board's size and ensure that members would be appointed based on the knowledge, skills and experience the board needs to carry out its functions effectively.

The bill sought to alter the composition of the Teachers Registration Board in three ways. The first was to reduce the number of members on the board from 16 to between 10 and 14 members. The chair of the board, Ms Jane Lomax-Smith, had raised concerns that the size of the board made it difficult to manage. Both houses of parliament supported the government's desire to make the board more modern, flexible and agile by reducing the number of members.

The second proposed amendment required that three practising teachers be nominated to the board, one from each of the areas of early childhood, primary and secondary education. The petitioners objected to this proposal, as it would reduce the minimum number of teachers on the board from seven to three.

The petitioners argued that the current composition of the board has ensured that high standards for professional practice and development are required for teachers to maintain

registration. It has also ensured that decisions regarding competence are made by those who have an understanding of current teaching practice and the professional context in which teachers work.

The Minister for Education emphasised in the other place that teacher representation on the board is critically important. He explained that he expected that, in practice, there would be more than three teachers on the board. The third proposed amendment to the composition of the board was to remove the power of teacher and education organisations to nominate board members. The power would instead be vested in the Minister for Education.

The minister explained that this amendment aimed to ensure that members were appointed based on knowledge, skill and experience, rather than on the basis of nominations from particular stakeholders. The petitioners argued that it is essential that the majority of board members are nominated by teacher and education organisations, not handpicked by the minister of the day.

The committee heard evidence from Mr Blair Boyer MP, shadow minister for education, and received written evidence from the Hon. John Gardner MP, Minister for Education. The committee determined, based on this evidence, not to proceed with a call for public submissions in relation to the petition. Both the minister and Mr Boyer MP advised the committee that, through genuine collaboration and negotiation, they had agreed on a number of amendments to the bill that achieved the outcomes sought by all participants in the parliamentary debate.

The bill as amended passed both houses of parliament on 15 October 2020. The resulting Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2020 will commence on 1 July 2021. Consistent with the petitioners' requests, the amendment act provides that at least six members of the board will be practising teachers and at least half the members will be registered teachers. The Australian Education Union will nominate four practising teachers and the Independent Education Union will nominate two.

Although the number of members nominated by the unions will be reduced from seven to six, this number is proportionate to the reduction in the overall number of board members. Contrary to the petitioners' request, the amendments to the act will remove the power of teacher employees and universities to directly nominate members to the board. However, the amendments will require the minister to call for expressions of interest for nominations. Representative bodies for employers of teachers and teacher educators will have an opportunity to put forward nominations for members, and to make submissions in respect of nominations.

The minister will also be required to ensure that the members of the board collectively have knowledge, skills and experience in the areas of teacher education and matters affecting employers of practising teachers. Both Mr Blair Boyer MP and the Hon. John Gardner MP, Minister for Education, advised the committee that, in their opinions, the amendment act adequately addresses the petitioners' concern about the composition of the Teachers Registration Board. Mr Blair Boyer MP advised in his evidence before the committee:

The chair's and the registrar's main reasons for wanting to make change was that they felt the board was too big and unwieldy. I think what we have found here, in the end, is a capacity for the chair and the registrar to have smaller meetings but still maintain the representation from registered teachers on that board.

The minister commented in his correspondence to the committee:

The provisions in the Amendment Act that will modify the composition of the Board represent a sound compromise between the Government's position set out in the Bill introduced into parliament and the petitioners' request that the current composition and nomination process for the Board is maintained.

In the committee's view the petitioners' concerns were satisfactorily resolved by the amendments made to the bill and the subsequent enactment of the Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2020. While the amendment act does not alter the composition and nomination process of the Teachers Registration Board, the committee is satisfied that the political independence of the board remains intact. The committee made the following findings:

1. The Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004 as amended by the Teachers Registration and Standards (Miscellaneous) Amendment Act 2020 will ensure that at least half of the members on the Teachers Registration Board will be practising teachers.

2. The amendments to the act will maintain the political independence of the Teachers Registration Board. The Australian Education Union and the Independent Education Union will continue to have power to nominate members to the board.

3. Under the amendments to the act, teacher and education organisations will be entitled to provide submissions to the Minister for Education, who must consider those submissions when nominating members to the Teachers Registration Board.

As noted by the member for Florey in her speech on 20 March 2019 in support of her successful efforts to have the Legislative Review Committee inquire into, consider and report on eligible petitions, a petition is the oldest and most direct way citizens can draw attention to a problem and ask the parliament to act. The petition has enabled the voices of concerned citizens to be heard by both the parliament and the government. As a result, the parties came together to negotiate a compromise position and amend the bill.

In their evidence before the committee both Mr Boyer MP and the Minister for Education expressed their gratitude for the genuine and effective discussions and cooperation in coming to this agreement. I would like to thank the current members of the Legislative Review Committee, Mr Nick McBride MP, Mr Peter Treloar MP, the Hon. Zoe Bettison MP, the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC and the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos MLC. I would also like to thank former members of the committee who were involved in the work on this petition: Mr Josh Teague MP, Speaker of the House of Assembly; Mr Dan Cregan MP; and Mr Fraser Ellis MP.

In addition, I would like to thank the committee secretary, Mr Matt Balfour, and the research officer, Ms Maureen Affleck, for their assistance. I would also like to express the committee's gratitude to Mr Blair Boyer MP and the Hon. John Gardner MP, Minister for Education, for their contributions to the committee's inquiry into this petition.

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

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE: URBAN GREEN SPACES

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (16:08): I move:

That the seventh report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Urban Green Spaces, be noted.

On 5 March 2020, and pursuant to section 16(1)(c) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Natural Resources Committee resolved:

1. To inquire into urban green spaces, and in particular the benefits, opportunities, challenges associated with urban strategic planning, biodiversity, water management, primary production, climate change impact projections;

2. To investigate as to what extent of resources are allocated to urban green spaces in comparison to similar projects being undertaken interstate and internationally, in relation to coastal management, water resources and wetlands, green streets and flourishing parklands, biodiversity sensitive and water sensitive urban design, controlling pest plants and animals, nature education and fauna, flora and ecosystem health in the urban environment; and

3. Any other matter.

The committee received 40 written submissions and conducted six public hearings between September 2020 and March 2021. During these hearings the committee heard from witnesses from the South Australian government Department for Environment and Water, the South Australian Chapter of the Australian Institute of Landscape Architects, Resilient East, Urban Development Institute of Australia (South Australian branch), AdaptWest, Dr Sheryn Pitman and members of the Green Adelaide board.

The committee's inquiry into urban green spaces occurred within the context of significant reform in landscape management and planning, presenting opportunities and challenges from the perspectives of stakeholders. The committee received a range of comprehensive and detailed submissions and oral evidence, which together conveyed that urban green spaces are highly valued resources in the community and can be broadly interpreted across different stakeholders.

Throughout its inquiry the committee examined the benefits, opportunities and challenges as expressed by stakeholders relating to urban green spaces. Specifically, the committee heard that

urban green spaces support communities and livability, have an important role in mitigating urban heat in Adelaide suburbs, support biodiversity outcomes and are complemented through strategically planned and designed open space.

Green spaces and green infrastructure are of vital importance to the health, wellbeing, resilience and productivity of urban areas. The committee heard that most green spaces in Adelaide are located on private land, such as front and back yards and gardens. The importance of green space on private land was a clear concern from written and oral evidence, particularly given the observed loss of green space on private land.

Throughout the inquiry the committee heard that one of the main factors contributing to the loss of green space on private land is patterns of development, including individual ad hoc subdivisions within existing suburbs. The committee heard of the complexities in balancing urban infill requirements, providing housing, housing affordability and mitigating the risks of increased urban heat for communities.

Overall, submissions and oral evidence to the committee's inquiry suggested that the issue of supporting urban green spaces for improved livability involves many sectors and disciplines and many stakeholders. The committee considered how some of the opportunities and challenges associated with urban green spaces could be supported through actions undertaken by the state government.

As such, the committee has proposed 11 recommendations for the consideration of the state government that can support greater coordination and collaboration across sectors, enabling a more integrated approach to supporting urban green spaces within the context of planning and development.

I thank all those who gave their time to assist the committee with this inquiry. I commend the members of the committee—the Hon. David Basham MP, Dr Susan Close MP, the Hon. John Darley MLC, Mr Nick McBride MP, Mr Adrian Pederick MP, the Hon. Josh Teague MP and the Hon. Russell Wortley MLC—for their contributions to this report. I also thank the committee staff, Mr Shannon Riggs and Ms Kate Bryson, for their assistance throughout.

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

Motions

GREEN NEW DEAL

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:13): I move:

That this council—

1. Supports a Green New Deal for South Australia.
2. Notes that 2020 was an incredibly difficult time for South Australians, starting with drought and bushfires, and followed by the COVID-19 pandemic.
3. Further notes that increasing unemployment due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, as well as climate change and rising economic inequality, are key challenges facing South Australians into the future.
4. Calls on the Marshall Government to adopt an innovative jobs growth plan through investing in:
 - (a) publicly owned renewable energy and storage projects to address climate change;
 - (b) social housing to help end homelessness;
 - (c) employing more educators, healthcare workers, nurses and social support workers to ensure all South Australians have access to the care they need;
 - (d) the expansion of the public transport network to reduce congestion and decrease emissions;
 - (e) reviving our CBD precinct to support local businesses;
 - (f) creative industries and the arts; and
 - (g) care for country and culture.

This motion is calling on this council to support a Green New Deal for South Australia and calling on the Marshall government to adopt an innovative jobs growth plan through investing in a range of measures that would help fight the climate crisis and rising inequality in our state. South Australia should be leading the way with a Green New Deal to change our state for the better. People are angry and anxious because the government has no plan for the big problems that are facing our state. We need to see ambitious and innovative ideas from our leaders and the Green New Deal will do just that.

Many in this place will be familiar with the term 'a Green New Deal'. It was first coined by US Democrat congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (AOC) and essentially creates a bold agenda calling for government action on climate change along with the other social aims of job creation and reducing economic inequality.

What would a Green New Deal mean for South Australia? What would it look like? Many different groups have started to consider how we could harness a green recovery to address some of the biggest issues facing our state and our nation. To put it simply, a Green New Deal is a plan of investment and action to build a clean green economy.

The last 18 months have seen South Australia's economy take a significant hit. From the devastating bushfires that have ravaged parts of our state and the continued impact of the global pandemic to the highest unemployment levels in the country and the ever-present threat posed by the climate crisis, it is clear that now is the time for bold innovative new plans for our great state.

With the state budget just weeks away, and the last one before the 2022 election, I am calling on the government and this parliament to seize the opportunity to rethink our economy and to spend big on new projects and programs that would create green jobs and address the important challenges of our age.

I talked about the fact that this motion is calling on the Marshall government to adopt an innovative jobs growth plan for investing in a range of different measures. One of those, of course, must be publicly owned renewables in South Australia. South Australia's abundant wind and solar resources mean that we are ideally suited to lead the nation and the world with 100 per cent renewable energy, and we should do that by 2025. A renewable-led recovery will create the jobs we need, it will tackle climate change and reduce energy prices.

The Greens' vision for South Australia is one that will make the most of our state's skills in manufacturing and create new jobs for the future, and we know that as we transition away from coal and carbon we can create new jobs in green innovation and renewable energy. We should harness the skills of our state's manufacturing industry for the development of new technologies, things like cutting-edge renewables, light rail and electric cars, and we should be making those things in South Australia.

It is regrettable, of course, that we saw the previous federal Liberal government, led by Tony Abbott, totally deprioritise the support for the automotive industry in South Australia, and really we should be trying to kickstart that industry with new investment so that it can start manufacturing electric cars in a significant way.

We also need a Green New Deal so that we can tackle homelessness and the housing crisis. One of the most pressing issues in this state at the moment is homelessness and housing affordability. We need a housing system that is about people, not profit. Homelessness is not inevitable. We can solve it. Everybody has a right to a roof over their head and a place to call home. It is not acceptable to simply say it is inevitable for people to sleep on the street or that people are going to be sleeping in tents. We need to see leadership from government to ensure that we invest in the housing that we need.

We have seen some wonderful strategies recommended by the Adelaide Zero Project, but we need more of an investment from the government. This is not a quick fix, but we need a long-term housing strategy that will end homelessness in our state. Housing, after all, is a human right. To end homelessness, we need to provide homes for tens of thousands of people on the waiting list, and we can do this by building housing, creating jobs and ensuring that nobody is discharged into homelessness.

As part of a Green New Deal, we need to also consider what we can do to make our society a caring society. The implementation of a Green New Deal is not just about green jobs and the green economy. It is also about investing in other types of work, particularly those types of industries that are traditionally female dominated.

Through the pandemic, we have seen just how essential our caring professions are for our communities, from our healthcare professionals who continue to work on the frontline, to our educators who adapted with flexible teaching arrangements to the pandemic, to our community service workers who continue to support the most vulnerable people in our society. We need to ensure that they are remunerated properly, and we need to ensure that they are supported with more funding so that they can employ more workers.

We also need as part of a Green New Deal to deal with expanding our public transport network. Bigger roads are not the answer to traffic congestion. We in the Greens have a different vision. We need a well-funded and well-functioning public transport system that gets people where they need to go quickly, reliably, safely and cheaply. We need greater investment in bikes and walking infrastructure that will give South Australians the freedom to choose riding or walking as a safe, easy option and to leave their cars at home.

A few weeks ago, I introduced a bill to establish a walking and cycling commissioner to encourage walking and cycling as modes of transport in our state, to promote the health, environmental, social and economic benefits of this, and to prepare and to promote strategies to make walking and cycling inclusive for everybody in South Australia. It is really regrettable, I think, that we have not seen the investment in cycling infrastructure that we need in South Australia, in particular, in the City of Adelaide.

Sadly, the City of Adelaide has spent over \$400,000 on planning the east-west bikeway only to knock it on the head under the leadership of Alex Hyde from the conservative wing of the Liberal Party that dominates town hall. I think that is really regrettable because South Australians, in particular people in the City of Adelaide, are desperate for cycling infrastructure to be rolled out. A Green New Deal would not only fund more bike lanes in the CBD area, it would also encourage greater use of public transport through free or subsidised tickets. This would not only help reduce congestion in the city, it would also encourage more people to come back into our CBD, which would be a positive knock-on effect for local businesses that are currently struggling.

We know that our CBD has been hard hit by this pandemic. Many businesses have been forced to close their doors, and many city-based employees are still working from home. A Green New Deal would ensure that we prioritise a plan that continues to enliven the city, extending the free wi-fi network, supporting entrepreneurs, growing small bars and live music, and setting some clear renewable energy targets for the city.

I know that a number of small businesses in the CBD are struggling and will be very alarmed by the Marshall government's plans to deregulate shop trading hours. They will be very alarmed that they are not going to be able to compete with Coles and Woolies and the big players, and that that is going to punish them and damage their business. The Greens certainly stand with them in that struggle.

As part of a Green New Deal, we need to look at creative industries. Creative industries are the engine room of our economy, and yet they were the first industry directly hit by the impacts of the pandemic. In the last 18 months, we have seen our cultural and creative sectors suffer enormous damage due to restrictions on public gatherings and performances and exhibitions that were cancelled in the interests of public health. Of course, I make no criticism of the government for doing that—it was necessary in terms of a public health response—but we do need to ensure that our arts sector is now supported in the days ahead because that has had a significant impact.

The knock-on effect of this has been substantial for our broader South Australian community, and for our economy, not least the many thousands of people who are employed in related industries that are driven so strongly by the arts here in our state. Those industries include tourism, hospitality, regional affairs and community businesses—all these things rely on a thriving, creative industry.

While South Australia has fared fairly well, and we can consider the success of things like the Adelaide Fringe Festival earlier this year, we must not lose sight of the fact that the disappearance of the Australian creative sector will have a major social, economic and cultural impact on our state both in the short and the long term. We know that the arts community have not been eligible for federal government support through JobKeeper, so that means they have been really hard hit by this pandemic.

Finally, a Green New Deal would also look at how we can care for country and culture. When I talk about caring for country, I am talking about First Nations people's approaches to land and water management. For First Nations people, it is increasingly documented that caring for country is linked to maintaining cultural life, identity, autonomy and health. The diverse environmental activities to which First Nations people contribute have positive outcomes for climate mitigation, biodiversity monitoring, the protection of endangered species, landscape health and more. It is for exactly that reason that a Green New Deal is really important because it would ensure that this knowledge and experience is at the forefront of policy and decision-making.

This is our chance to start thinking about how we can reshape our state, how we can create a fairer and more sustainable South Australia, how we can become a productive leader and how we can be a state that actually tackles the climate crisis and ensures that everybody has what they need to live a happy and healthy life.

We need to think differently. That has been one of the lessons of the pandemic and the ensuing economic crisis. We need to think differently and now is the time for us to do that. Now is the time for us to commit to a Green New Deal. South Australia can create a cleaner, fairer future for all of us, and I urge all members of this council to support the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

Bills

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (GAS INFRASTRUCTURE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:25): 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. R.A. SIMMS (16:26): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Gas Infrastructure) Amendment Bill 2021 aims to deal with a problem that South Australian consumers face with respect to gas connections. Despite all the recent innovations in energy efficiency, renewable energy and energy storage, there are many South Australian families who are being locked into higher energy bills, and they are being locked into a lack of choice thanks to the conduct of certain property developers in South Australia.

These developers want to stop South Australian families from being able to choose what kind of energy they use in their homes and they do this by locking them into legally binding arrangements that force them to use fossil fuels in their homes forever. This may sound like a familiar statement, and I can assure you it is. In 2018, my friend and former MLC the Hon. Mark Parnell introduced this exact bill into this place. He hoped then that common sense would prevail. Sadly, three years later we are back here with a second attempt to deal with this issue.

While there are currently no laws in place in South Australia that mandate gas connection to newly developed properties, these connections are mandated by property developers in new developments. This bill seeks to do one simple thing: to legislate to void requirements for mandatory gas connections in new residential developments.

We know that for new houses, all-electric households are cheaper to run, compared to households with gas and electricity, in the medium to long term. Mandated gas connections for newly built properties are expensive, burdensome, unsustainable and environmentally harmful. With more

environmentally friendly, cost-effective alternatives available, it is imperative that we move away from this harmful practice. When allowing these clauses of mandatory gas installation to exist, we take away people's autonomy and we condemn our state's future to the continued use of fossil fuels.

I want to make it very clear that I am not saying that people cannot use gas. That is not what this bill is seeking to do. It is about giving consumers, new home owners and those who are purchasing a new property choice. This is a bill about choice. It is not an ideological position. It is about respecting the rights of consumers to determine where they would like to source their energy.

The way that South Australian developers are mandating the use of gas is through these legally binding covenants that are registered on the certificates of title for new houses and land packages in new housing estates. To give you a concrete example, the Lightsview property development is one worthy of consideration. This property development by Peet Limited has been undertaken in partnership with Renewal SA. This is a government agency, and I quote from their mission statement:

...to initiate, undertake, promote, and support urban development activity to help deliver key strategic priorities of the Government of South Australia, particularly the new urban development directions outlined in the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide.

More than 85 per cent of this development has been sold as at June 2021.

Upon further investigation, my office has been advised that these developers are mandating a gas connection to all newly built dwellings. A simple read of section 10.7 of their vacant land contract states that gas connections are mandated alongside the installation of either a gas-boosted split solar system or a six-star instantaneous gas hot water service. It says at section 10.7 of that agreement:

You must install a gas-boosted split solar hot water system or a six star instantaneous gas hot water service on the dwelling to be erected on the allotment in accordance with the requirements of the Lightsview Design Guidelines. A six star instantaneous gas hot water service can be erected on the dwelling as an alternative only when a photo Voltaic system of 1.5 kw or greater is installed also.

The deal is, if you want to buy into the Lightsview estate, you have to agree to connect to gas, and you have to agree to use gas at the very least for heating your home and for heating your water. What this contract means is that you are legally prevented from becoming more energy efficient and from using electricity as an alternative.

This bill is very simple: it outlaws this practice. It declares null and void any attempts to force householders to use fossil fuels in their homes if they do not want to. It puts energy choice back into the hands of South Australian families and takes that power away from the developers. It also frees up the opportunity for South Australian families to save money and to contribute to reducing carbon emissions and reducing our pressure on the climate.

There are significant savings to be made here. According to the Grattan Institute, running a new Adelaide house on all-electric energy would save up to \$2,183 over 10 years and up to \$5,556 over 10 years. That is if they switched from gas cooking, hot water and space heating. The practice of property developers mandating gas connection and gas use in these homes is locking South Australians into higher energy bills and higher emissions. I know that this will be an issue at the forefront of many South Australians' minds as they consider the harsh winter conditions that we are facing.

I also want to draw this council's attention to the new research that has come out looking at the health impacts of gas cookers in homes. In particular, I refer to a report in the *Sydney Morning Herald* dated 6 May this year, where it was noted that gas cookers in homes and gas heaters used in thousands of New South Wales classrooms pose serious health risks for children with asthma or allergies. The Climate Council research highlights the danger of gas use domestically, as gas cooking can have the same impact as passive smoking on children with asthma. The fuel should be consigned to the past like coal, wood and kerosene. This is a health risk we can no longer afford, the report says.

I agree. Why on earth are South Australian families, South Australian home owners being denied that choice when they buy a new property off the plan? It seems absurd that in modern South

Australia families are being shackled with gas against their will and forced into a situation where they are going to face spiralling energy prices as a result and where they are going to be contributing to carbon emissions. This is a straightforward bill. It is about choice, and I hope that all South Australians will be supportive. I think most South Australians will be supportive—I have positive feedback—but I hope that parties in this place will get behind this simple reform.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

Motions

PETERBOROUGH MEDICAL CENTRE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:35): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes the closure of the medical centre in Peterborough on 30 June 2021 due to a shortage of physicians;
2. Recognises that this is part of a concerning trend of the loss of permanent GPs in rural South Australia that has a harmful impact on local rural communities more broadly; and
3. Calls on the Marshall government to ensure there is suitable and targeted funding to fully and urgently implement the measures recommended by the Rural Health Workforce Strategy to sustain and grow South Australia's future rural medical workforce.

Today, I rise to address the very concerning issue of the medical centre in Peterborough, which at this stage is set to close its doors on 30 June—the very end of the month we are in now—due to a shortage of physicians. The Mid North and many parts of rural South Australia have suffered from a shortage of doctors and health services for some time now, and the closure of this clinic will make an already dire situation much worse.

Peterborough is a small rural town some 250 kilometres north of Adelaide. It is home to approximately 1,400 people. When the clinic closes those people will have to travel to either Orroroo or Jamestown for medical services, both of which involve approximately an hour round trip. In fact, many are already doing this due to long waiting periods.

However, this travel is not feasible for quite a few of them. If they do not drive or if they cannot afford a taxi fare, in some cases their only option might be to catch one of the three weekly bus services to Port Pirie, some 100 kilometres away. Locals have already stated they will simply have to stop going to the doctor. That is not a position anyone in this very wealthy state of ours should find themselves in.

The proposed short-term solution is to rely on temporary locums to fill the gap until a more permanent solution is reached; however, there is already a shortage of locums in the area, and it has been acknowledged by the Rural Doctors Workforce Agency that there will be difficulty in maintaining this service consistently. I am informed there is also an issue regarding continuity of care, because when you do not have a permanent doctor and notes and files are passed from doctor to doctor and you see a different person each time, there is an increased chance of important facts and observations being missed. Patients are already taking it upon themselves to bring their own notes to appointments to ensure that does not happen, but that is not best practice for quality of care.

The clinic in Peterborough is currently the only one along the Barrier Highway in the 350 kilometres between Burra and Broken Hill. Not only will the closure of this medical centre make it much harder for locals to access necessary health and medical services, it will have an impact on those in the surrounding communities. It will put pressure on other medical services and centres in the Mid North that are already struggling with being understaffed and that have a large backlog of appointments, with some patients already having to wait months.

Across Jamestown, Orroroo, Peterborough and Booleroo there are only three full-time GPs. That is approximately one GP per 3,000 people. Broadly, in rural South Australia the number is around one GP per 1,200 people. For comparison, the federal government's aim is to have one GP per 900 people. Indeed, GPs in rural areas commonly work not only in the medical centre but also in the local hospital to attend to inpatient facilities and provide obstetric services or anaesthetics. There

is a lot of responsibility and commitment those doctors may not be ready to undertake, especially if there is only one GP in the clinic.

This will have economic impacts. If people are already having to make the effort to travel to another town for medical services, they are likely to then do their grocery shopping and complete their other errands while they are in that other town to make it worth their while. That, of course, will have a negative effect on local businesses in Peterborough.

The state government has—and it is very welcome—established the Rural Health Workforce Strategy. That has launched various plans and programs, such as the Rural Generalist Program announced on 28 May this year. Funding has been allocated to various projects since 2018, with the goal of recruiting, training and developing professionals and volunteers and improving systems and equipment.

The Rural Doctors Association of South Australia has voiced various concerns with the Rural Health Workforce Strategy, however, including that it 'does not display a strong commitment to the pathway', only suggesting 'preparation for the rural generalist pathway'. It has pointed to inadequate funding to implement the multiple strategies and the consultation process 'leading to the collection of inaccurate data'. These are all quite concerning.

A study of medical professions that was published in May 2021 from Monash University found that the more students spent time in rural areas on their placements the more likely they were to accept a job in a rural area once they graduate. Perhaps including more rural placements and better supporting students undertaking them will entice those students to work in rural areas. Another option is to provide funding to regional universities and TAFEs so that they are an accessible local option and students are not forced to move into the metro areas to study in the first place.

A key hurdle once students are qualified, of course, is making a permanent GP an attractive option. Currently, locums are often paid at a higher rate than permanent doctors, so the financial incentive for doctors in rural areas is to be a locum who travels around to the different areas, rather than a permanent GP remaining in one town. The federal government's recent bulk billing incentive has been welcomed by GPs across Australia. Having greater incentives such as this one for doctors, especially young doctors, to become permanent GPs in rural areas and ensuring they have the support they need within the clinic is essential.

The closure of this clinic at Peterborough will have real tangible and negative impacts on the locals in that town and the surrounding communities. That is why I draw the attention of the council to this looming event. Unfortunately, Peterborough is far from the only rural community in South Australia facing this issue. Further north in Quorn the only GP has been unable to find a replacement as that GP prepares to retire. Locals in Hawker and Leigh Creek have their clinics open only a couple of days a week already; others are waiting up to three months for appointments in nearby Port Augusta.

This is a crisis, and it is not just a crisis in South Australia, it is a crisis right across our nation, and we need strong commitments and real action and increased funding to fix it. All South Australians have a right to accessible, adequate and affordable health care, and Peterborough needs a lifeline.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES ACT MISCELLANEOUS REGULATIONS

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 8: Hon. N.J. Centofanti to move:

That the miscellaneous regulations under the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005, made on 11 February 2021 and laid on the table of this council on 16 February 2021, be disallowed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (16:42): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES ACT GENERAL REGULATIONS

Orders of the Day, Private Business, No. 9: Hon. N.J. Centofanti to move:

That the general regulations under the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005, made on 18 February 2021 and laid on the table of this council on 2 March 2021, be disallowed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (16:43): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

WALKER, MR M.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. F. Pangallo:

That this council—

1. Acknowledges the passing of Mr Murray Walker, OBE;
2. Acknowledges his achievements in the broadcasting of motorsport worldwide;
3. Acknowledges his enthusiastic support and promotion of South Australia, in particular motorsport events, including the Australian Formula One Grand Prix between 1985-95 and as a roving ambassador for the V8 Supercars; and
4. Conveys its sincerest condolences to his wife, Elizabeth, and family in the UK on his passing.

(Continued from 26 May 2021.)

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:43): I rise to speak to the motion that the Hon. Mr Pangallo introduced to the chamber. Can I take a moment before I go to the formal part of my speech to acknowledge his cooperation in moving this matter to today; in fact, I think it was moved twice, for which the government and I am sure the chamber is grateful.

It is an honour to speak to the Hon. Mr Pangallo's motion on the life of Graeme Murray Walker OBE, who sadly passed on 13 March this year. On behalf of the Marshall Liberal government I wish to express our sincerest condolences to his family. As members are aware, Murray had an extensive career in broadcasting, with many decades spent in commentating an array of sporting events full time, most notably for South Australians, of course, those involving motor sports. Well known for his voice from his commentaries on the Grand Prix globally, I fondly remember listening to Murray whilst watching these spectacular races. I even stood next to him once, when we had the privilege of hosting the Grand Prix in Adelaide. It is my small claim to fame.

Murray always loved coming to Adelaide for the Grand Prix. He loved the track, and he loved the people, placing Adelaide on the motorsport map, so to speak. He was a unique and talented communicator. He was creative and critical, and he was renowned for his mannerisms and unique commentating style. He is even credited for naming the car brand Vauxhall Ventora, as the original name, Ventura, was rejected by General Motors.

As was described by the Hon. Mr Pangallo during his contribution introducing this matter, Murray was famous for certain quotes—his self-professed Murrayisms—that reflected his emotive and spontaneous speaking style, with which all of us would no doubt be familiar. Certainly, he was always describing the atmosphere of a race perfectly, seeking to captivate the audience in a kind of alternate reality where even the most cynical spectator became attentive.

He did this in a way, as Clive James said, sounding 'like a man whose trousers are on fire'. Yet, in the case of a collision or accident he was able to capture true gravitas and sombreness when it was required, where the audience became tense in their seats, awaiting the appropriate outcome. It was indeed the manner in which he approached his craft that made him a significant figure and contributor not only to Adelaide and the state of South Australia, but his voice is renowned around the world.

Murray was also a man of empathy and passion. When Britain's Damon Hill sped across the finish line and became world champion in October 1996 he stopped mid commentary, a teary Murray Walker saying, 'I've got to stop because I've got a lump in my throat.' Concerning many of his coined phrases, David Letterman explained them well, saying they meant 'everything and also absolutely nothing'.

With flashes of the obvious, kind eyes and a cheery smile, he would allow the rush of the moment to drive him. His flabbergasted statements reflected his excitement, his spontaneity and, I may say, his presence. He was either completely oblivious or not caring of the thousands and maybe more who were listening, explaining that, 'Sometimes the words just come out in the wrong order.' He was indeed unique.

His charismatic commentary style was important in developing the next generation of motorsport. Many now famous race car drivers have nostalgically recalled and credited how their love for races began through watching the Grand Prix as a child with Murray's voice. On a Sunday afternoon they listened to the animated and ardent exclamations of Murray Walker. World champion Lewis Hamilton recently paid tribute to Murray, stating how he remembered growing up hearing his voice over the races that made them 'so much more exciting and captivating'. He referred to Murray as being the 'iconic voice' of his sport, and who would disagree with that?

It has been said of Murray that in the high-pressure tension of the moment he was often reluctant to share the single microphone in the booth with fellow commentator James Hunt. Murray once referred to him and his sparring partner as being like oil and water. Apparently, due to the level of friction in the commentary box between the duo, they had to share one microphone between them in order to avoid having them talking over one another. It was this character foil between him and the former race car driver, however, that appeared to electrify every race, no matter how seemingly uneventful.

There are few people who can maintain a passion and zest for something like Murray did, and even if you never watched motorsport or had no interest in it, you could certainly appreciate the way that he loved it. In the words of Sir Jackie Stewart, it was never work to Murray, it was never just commentating, it was simply telling the world about something he loved. He allowed himself not to be the know-it-all commentator, but the fan who, at times, got over excited.

He was certainly known to be genuine and unafraid to make mistakes, often lightheartedly revelling in his errors and making jokes of them himself. Throughout the many years of his professional career, at the mercy of a million opinions, he was unapologetically, unashamedly himself. This made Murray approachable and endearing, traits that magnetically attracted people towards himself and his commentary. He was also, most importantly, regarded by those in the industry as being supportive and kind, and I believe that these qualities alone are noteworthy traits to be remembered for—as well as his outstanding career.

In fond reflection of the life of Murray Walker OBE, I close on this quote from Murray, which I think perfectly epitomises his distinctive style of commentary, 'There's nothing wrong with the car, except it's on fire.'

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:49): I wish to thank the Hon. Dennis Hood for the words expressed today and all the other members of the Legislative Council who have contributed their words of condolence for Murray Walker, who died in March this year at the age of 97. The voice of Formula One, as he was known, was regarded as one of the finest sports broadcasters anywhere in the world.

He was much loved around the world and testimony to that was the huge outpouring of tributes, from the royal family to sports royalty to motorsport fans across the globe, not the least in Australia, which he tended to regard as a home away from home when he covered major events here, such as the Formula One and the unique V8 events at Mount Panorama, and from the streets of Adelaide to Phillip Island's MotoGPs. As I mentioned in my speech, motorcycling was also one of Murray's great loves and passions. He was involved with it at a young age.

When he was here, Murray would always be mobbed by people who recognised him wherever he ventured. Murray always took the time to engage with them. On the trips I made overseas and when I was covering Formula One, I caught up with Murray. The same thing would happen there. He would be mobbed by fans and respected by teams and drivers right throughout.

He was the type who never took himself seriously, self-deprecating to the point where he would often send himself up for his gaffs or, as the Hon. Mr Hood mentioned, his Murrayisms. Here

is one of them, 'I don't make mistakes. I make prophecies which immediately turn out to be wrong.' There is also the title of his last book *Unless I'm Very Much Mistaken...I am Very Much Mistaken!*

As I have said, Murray truly loved his experiences in South Australia and of course Adelaide, which he considered the best street racing circuit anywhere in the world. One of his last hurrahs, while he was in his nursing home, was to admonish Premier Steven Marshall for his illogical decision to dump our world-famous V8 street race. He more than did his bit to promote our state, our lifestyle and our love of motorsport to a worldwide audience of hundreds of millions. The value of that cannot be measured or underestimated. I hope his contributions are one day appreciated and honoured by this government, or perhaps the next, in some way in the city he loved so much.

I shall write a formal letter to Murray's family expressing the condolences from the Legislative Council. I thank you all for your contributions.

Motion carried.

Bills

DANGEROUS SUBSTANCES (LPG CYLINDER LABELLING) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of message No. 109 from the House of Assembly.

(Continued from 31 March 2021.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendments be agreed to.

As members would know, in the other place there were some amendments that really are of a technical nature, which addressed a couple of the issues in this bill. They were passed by the other place. I acknowledge that they actually improved the bill overall in relation to the labelling issue. Under these new laws that we have now passed, the warning signs will generally be at least 10 centimetres in length, except in the case of smaller gas bottles where the minimum size of the warning on the bottle will be two centimetres in length.

Those amendments that were successful in the lower house were of a technical nature in relation to the issues around those minimum standards when it comes to the warning signs on those bottles. Generally, we have been very supportive of those and I thank the honourable Mr Blair Boyer for picking up those issues.

An honourable member: He's not honourable.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Sorry, he is not honourable, I am told. I am sure he is an honourable man. I thank Mr Blair Boyer MP, or the member for Wright—I should refer to him correctly—in the other place for picking up those issues and addressing them and also managing, obviously, to get a majority of the other place to support them. That is all I have to say.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I would like to thank the Hon. Connie Bonaros for her efforts in bringing this bill to the chamber and securing its passage now through both houses. It is not an easy thing to do sometimes, and this one certainly was not an easy thing to do. It is no mean feat. I would also like to thank the honourable—the member for Wright—Blair Boyer, who will not be honourable until possibly after the March election next year.

I visited Paddy Ryan's dad in Port Lincoln with the member for Wright, the member for Cheltenham and the member for Mawson in the middle of last year, and it certainly created a pretty lasting impression on me of the need for this. I pay tribute to Adrian Ryan for his advocacy and for turning what was a tragedy into something that hopefully can prevent future tragedies. I again thank the honourable member for her work on this. I am very happy to support where we have landed.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The Greens supported this bill when it passed the Legislative Council, and we support it today as it finally comes back to the Legislative Council in amended form. I would have thought such a small change, a cautionary approach to ensure that no other young people lose their lives as a result of a lack of education, would have been something that we could

have got through this parliament with the minimum of fuss and with more respect for Paddy's Law, as it will become, but we are here now and we will support it.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I am not on the list to speak, but I wish to add my congratulations to my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros and to Mr Boyer for his efforts in the other place. This is quite a significant piece of legislation that will actually save lives. I want to congratulate the Hon. Connie Bonaros for the way she approached this very sensitive area and dealt with the family that was involved in this and has been able to achieve a result that is an Australian first. I am really hopeful that other jurisdictions will now follow suit and do a similar thing.

Again, thank you to all the members who have supported it in this place and also the other place. I think it is important when there are issues like this where lives are at stake that members are able to get together, there is a consensus and legislation can be passed, regardless of who proposed it at the time. I congratulate Connie Bonaros again on being able to pull this one off. It is very hard for crossbenchers, as we all know, to get bills passed, but I am glad that this one has gone through because it will make many people very appreciative of the work done in this place.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: The government acknowledges that the majority of members in the House of Assembly supported the bill with the amendments that were moved, and the government acknowledges that a majority of members in this chamber are likely to support the suggested amendments, so we accept the reality of the numbers in both chambers.

The concerns that the government has about the impact of the legislation remain. I have placed those on the public record on at least one or two previous occasions, so I do not propose to delay the discussion this afternoon by repeating those. The concerns that we expressed continue to be expressed by the government and by some stakeholders in the industry, and we fervently hope that the wishes of the movers of the legislation, the family and other interested parties are achieved by the passage of the legislation.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In closing the debate, I thank all honourable members for their contributions and for their support. As the Hon. Tammy Franks has pointed out, this is one of those issues that was a no-brainer and should have had the unanimous support of this parliament, but I acknowledge that we have accepted this is where we are. The law is passing, and that is a wonderful outcome. I have already thanked the member from the other place for their support, who did an incredible amount of work on this bill as well with me.

Above everything, I would really like to thank Paddy's parents, Adrian and Josie. I cannot tell you how relieved they were because they are the people who have been pushing for this reform harder than anybody. We saw it through the press. I spoke to Adrian after that happened and said, 'We would like to help you see this become a reality.' Of course, if it was not for their advocacy and their belief in what they were trying to do, none of this would have been possible.

Their community has rallied behind them. They have had amazing support, and I think that they can find some comfort in knowing that while this will never bring Paddy back it could potentially save another person, another child, another young person like Paddy from the same devastating outcome that fell upon Paddy and his family, who are living with the consequences of that every day.

I said in my second reading that Paddy was a good kid and he just made a silly mistake, and that happens every day of the week. I do not think it is too much, and I am glad it has not been too much of us in here to ask that we move these measures which are directly aimed at preventing other kids and other people from making that precise same mistake. So I am extremely grateful for the support, but I am particularly extremely grateful to Josie and Adrian and their entire family, and everyone who has supported them, for entrusting us with this and seeing it through to its end.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (BUSHFIRES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (17:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Criminal Law Consolidation (Bushfires) Amendment Bill 2021 has been passed in the other place. This bill seeks to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, section 85B—Special provision for causing a bushfire. This amendment seeks to raise the penalty for bushfire arson to at least be aligned with the general arson provisions.

During the second reading debate in the other place, the sentiments of the bill were supported, but the argument was put that the bill unnecessarily duplicated provisions that already existed in the general arson provisions. The argument revolved around two sections: section 85B, which created a specific offence for causing a bushfire, and section 85 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, which already makes it an offence for a person to either intentionally or recklessly damage property—for example, a building or motor vehicle—by fire or explosives without lawful excuse.

The maximum penalty is life imprisonment for the latter; however, once the argument of creating a specific offence of arson causing a bushfire was made some years ago, matching the penalties to those of general arson is compelling.

Arson-lit bushfires cause a devastating impact on the communities affected. Additional to the risk to life, the loss of homes, property and stock and the damage to agriculture and the impact on remnant vegetation and native animal habitat, the intended trauma produced makes wildfires among the worst disasters to afflict our communities. There are the physical scars to our land, the vast environmental devastation, the economic cost to communities and businesses, the mental exhaustion and post-traumatic stress on our emergency responders and, at times, the tragic loss of life.

The areas affected in our state are vast, covering much of the settled regions from Eyre Peninsula through to Yorke Peninsula, the Adelaide Hills to Kangaroo Island, and the South-East. To know that bushfires can be started deliberately by arson adds to the bewilderment and trauma. With separate section 85B relating to arson causing bushfires, it makes sense that the penalties align with general arson to property. This bill seeks to raise the penalty for bushfire arson of 20 years to match the maximum penalty of life imprisonment for general arson.

In the 2019-20 bushfire season, 10 people were reported or arrested for intentionally or recklessly causing a bushfire. The cost of bushfires to our community is far too great for us not to act to try to reduce the number and further condemn this behaviour. Our community's resources are used to extinguish these fires: the water, the fuel, the volunteer first responders, the paid first responders and the cost of emergency responders, air support, the clean-up and the associated social costs.

The economic impact of Australia's 2019-20 bushfire season was reported to exceed \$4.4 billion across the nation. This is why the bill contains provisions that, if an arsonist is found guilty of the bushfire arson offence and has the means to pay for the costs of recovery and repair, the court should require the defendant to pay compensation for the injury, loss or damage that results from that fire. Through this amendment, hopefully some of the costs can be recouped that are worn by us all.

I recognise that this bill is only one small measure in the wider social threat that firebugs pose to us all. It is a relief to know of the work of SA Police checking people who have been identified as a risk under Operation Nomad, as well as the SES volunteers who patrol our fire-prone areas on catastrophic bushfire days. I ask you, elected members: what else can we do to further extend this program and prevent these fires? How can we seek to further understand and address the psychological triggers and signs that lead to arson and work with individuals to help individuals who have, at times, this predisposition to ensure that they are not a danger not only to the community but to themselves?

Along with the deterrents of penalties, monitoring by police and SES patrols, the police minister has been asked to investigate the installing of CCTV cameras along main roads throughout bushfire-prone areas to increase still further the certainty of detection and to assist SAPOL to gather evidence against perpetrators so discovered.

I know that the efforts and risks that CFS and SES volunteers across the state undertake on our behalf are truly valued and appreciated by our community and parliament. I hope by submitting

this bill to the council today that it may add to all the measures necessary to prevent unnecessary bushfires. I commend the bill to the council.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. D.G.E. Hood.

LAND TAX (DISCRETIONARY TRUSTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the House of Assembly desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

Page 2, after line 8, insert new Clause No.3 as follows:

3—Amendment of section 13A—Land tax for discretionary trust if beneficiary notified to Commissioner

(1) Section 13A(1)—delete '30 June 2021' and substitute '31 December 2021'

(2) Section 13A(3)—after 'or for the' insert 'previous or'

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendment be agreed to.

This is a procedural issue. Because this is a money bill, when this chamber agrees to an amendment to it, it takes the form of a suggested amendment. So we suggested the amendment, and the House of Assembly has agreed to our suggested amendment. Now that they have amended the bill, it comes back to us and we have to agree to their real amendment, as opposed to us suggesting an amendment. It is a procedural issue and it is the final stage in what we initiated whenever we last discussed the bill. It is as simple as that.

Motion carried.

At 17:14 the council adjourned until Thursday 10 June 2020 at 14:15.