

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 12 October 2021**

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins)** took the chair at 14:15 and read prayers.

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

*Bills***CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (OVERSIGHT AND ADVOCACY BODIES) (COMMISSIONER FOR ABORIGINAL CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

LEGISLATION INTERPRETATION BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INTERVENTION ORDERS AND PENALTIES) BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (CPIPC RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Report of the Auditor-General—Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2021, Report No. 12 of 2021

Report of the Auditor-General—COVID-Safe Check-In review, Report No. 13 of 2021 Reports, 2020-21—

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption and Office of Public Integrity
[Ordered to be published]

Judicial Conduct Commissioner
[Ordered to be published]

By the Treasurer (Hon. R.I. Lucas)—

Reports, 2020-21—

Adelaide Festival Centre Trust
Adelaide Festival Corporation
Adelaide Venue Management
Art Gallery of South Australia

Assumed Identities and Witness Identity Protection
Attorney-General's Department
Auditor-General's Department
Carrick Hill Trust
Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board
Country Arts SA
Defence SA
Department for Energy and Mining
Department for Infrastructure and Transport
Department for Trade and Investment
Department of Primary Industries and Regions
Department of the Premier and Cabinet
Department of Treasury and Finance
Essential Services Commission of South Australia
Forestry SA
HomeStart Finance
Infrastructure SA
Libraries Board of South Australia
Local Government Finance Authority
Lotteries Commission of South Australia
Motor Accident Commission
National Heavy Vehicle Regulator
Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing
Office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity
Office of the Industry Advocate
Office of the National Rail Safety Regulator
Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission
Professional Standards Councils
Retail and Commercial Leases Act 1995
Return to Work SA
South Australian Employment Tribunal
South Australian Government Financing Authority
South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission
South Australian Museum
South Australian Tourism Commission
State Opera South Australia
State Procurement Board
State Theatre Company of South Australia
StudyAdelaide
Surveillance Devices Act 2016
Tandanya National Aboriginal Cultural Institute
Terrorism (Preventative Detention) Act 2005
Urban Renewal Authority (trading as Renewal SA)

Corporation By-laws—
City of Tea Tree Gully—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Roads
 No. 3—Local Government Land
 No. 4—Dogs
 No. 5—Moveable Signs
 No. 6—Waste Management

District Council By-laws—
Barossa—
 No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 No. 2—Moveable Signs
 No. 3—Roads
 No. 4—Local Government Land

- No. 6—Cats
- No. 7—Waste Management
- Town of Gawler—
 - No. 6—Cats
- Regulations under Acts—
 - Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006—Savings and Transitional.
 - Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009—Covert Operations—Savings and Transitional
 - Independent Commission Against Corruption Act 2012—Commission
 - Judicial Conduct Commissioner Act 2015—Savings and Transitional
 - Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Motor Bike Driver Licensing
 - Ombudsman Act 1972—Savings and Transitional
 - Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016—General—Temporary Accommodation
 - Police Complaints and Discipline Act 2016—Savings and Transitional
 - Summary Offences Act 1953—Savings and Transitional
 - Surveillance Act 2016—Savings and Transitional
 - Telecommunications (Interception) Act 2012—Savings and Transitional
- Accommodation Expense Reimbursement and Allowance for Country Members of Parliament—Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal—No. 6 of 2021
- Accommodation Expense Reimbursement and Allowance for Country Members of Parliament—Report of the Remuneration Tribunal—No. 6 of 2021
- 2021 Review of the Common Allowance for Members of the Parliament of South Australia—Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 7 of 2021
- 2021 Review of the Common Allowance for Members of the Parliament of South Australia—Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 7 of 2021
- 2021 Review of Electorate Allowances for Members of the Parliament of South Australia—Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 8 of 2021
- 2021 Review of Electorate Allowances for Members of the Parliament of South Australia—Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 8 of 2021
- 2021 Review of Accommodation and Meal Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition—Determination of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 9 of 2021
- 2021 Review of Accommodation and Meal Allowances for Ministers of the Crown and the Leader and Deputy Leader of the Opposition—Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 9 of 2021
- Reimbursement of Expenses Applicable to the Electorate of Mawson—Travel to and from Kangaroo Island by Ferry and Aircraft—Report of the Remuneration Tribunal No. 10 of 2021
- Review of amendments to the Criminal Assets Confiscation Act 2005 enacted by the Criminal Assets Confiscation (Prescribed Drug Offenders) Amendment Act 2016

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. J.M.A. Lensink)—
Reports, 2020-21—

- Animal Welfare Advisory Committee
- Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium
- Department of Human Services
- Department for Child Protection Annual Report
- Department for Environment and Water
- Dhilba Guuranda-Innes National Park Co-Management Board
- Dog and Cat Management Board
- Environment Protection Authority
- Green Industries SA
- Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park Co-Management Board
- Koala Life Board
- Lake Gairdner National Park Co-Management Board

Mamungari Conservation Park Co-Management Board
 Ngaut Ngaut Conservation Park Co-Management Board
 Parks and Wilderness Council
 Safe and Well: Supporting Families, Protecting Children
 South Australian Heritage Council
 South Australian Housing Trust
 South Australian Water Corporation
 South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board
 Stormwater Management Authority
 Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Co-Management Board
 Witjira National Park Co-Management Board
 Yumberra Conservation Park Co-Management Board
 Fees Notice under Acts—
 Radiation Protection and Control Act 1982 (No. 2)
 Regulation under Act—
 Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017—Safety—Exemption from
 Psychological Assessment (No. 3)

By the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon. S.G. Wade)—

Reports, 2020-21—
 Adelaide Film Festival
 Community Road Safety Fund
 Construction Industry Training Board
 Department for Health and Wellbeing
 Department for Innovation and Skills
 JamFactory Contemporary Craft and Design Inc
 South Australian Film Corporation
 South Australian Police
 State Bushfire Coordination Committee
 Regulations under Acts—
 South Australian Public Health Act 2011—Notifiable and Controlled Notifiable
 Conditions
 Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997—E-Cigarette Liquid

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (14:20): I bring up the report of the committee on its inquiry into the Coast Protection Board and coastal legislation.

Report received.

Ministerial Statement

GOVERNOR APPOINTMENT

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:28): I table a copy of a ministerial statement made in another place today by the Premier on the subject of the swearing in of South Australia's 36th Governor.

RETURN TO WORK CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (14:28): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement on the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia 2020-21 annual report.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I rise to give a statement about the tabling of the 2020-21 annual report of the Return to Work Corporation of South Australia (ReturnToWorkSA). The Return to Work scheme is a critical contributor to South Australia's economy, protecting approximately 550,000 workers and 54,000 employers from the costs of work injury.

The scheme was transformed with the Return to Work Act 2014, which was introduced with bipartisan support and which provided more certainty for employers and workers. The design of the scheme, thanks to the Return To Work Act, has delivered historically low premium rates, while providing arguably one of the most generous injured worker benefit packages in the country. This provides improved certainty of benefits for workers and increased stability in premium rates for employers, ensuring a scheme that is fair, balanced and financially sustainable.

With the commencement of the Return to Work scheme, the majority of injured workers are better off, whether that is through early intervention and treatment to return injured workers back to work or the removal of two step-downs in the first 12 months of income support. Injured workers now have a scheme that supports a full year of income support of 100 per cent weekly earnings and up to three years of medical costs are covered. This scheme also introduced economic loss lump sum payments, previously unavailable, the removal of work capacity reviews and, for seriously injured workers, support rather than an obligation to return to work.

Since the scheme's commencement, approximately \$1.7 billion less in premiums has been collected by ReturnToWorkSA than if the old scheme had continued. That money, which would have otherwise come to ReturnToWorkSA, is in the hands of employers and circulating in the South Australian economy, helping to create more jobs. However, a recent Supreme Court interpretation of a key provision of the act in the matter of Summerfield now threatens the sustainability of the scheme and stands to undo some of the achievements to date.

In our modern and safer workplaces, ReturnToWorkSA forecasts approximately 80 workers reaching the serious injury category per year. In simple terms, the interpretation provided by the courts paves the way for approximately 70 more injured workers to reach the seriously injured threshold per year and approximately 180 injured workers each year to receive higher lump sum payments. For each injured worker that reaches the seriously injured threshold, ReturnToWorkSA expects to spend \$2 million providing income support until retirement age and covering medical expenses for life.

To protect the objectives of the scheme in the interests of all participants, and for the competitiveness of the state, ReturnToWorkSA is taking all possible steps as the scheme's administrator to challenge this decision in the courts. We believe the Summerfield decision is an unforeseen interpretation of the act's wording and at odds with parliament's intent. ReturnToWorkSA has set aside \$584 million as part of its 2020-21 financial results due to the current decision. A further \$500 million in liability is likely should the appeal to the High Court of Australia be unsuccessful.

All told, should ReturnToWorkSA be unsuccessful in their appeal, the scheme will need to carry almost \$1.1 billion in additional liabilities and its ongoing costs will be significantly increased. The financial impact of the Summerfield matter is reflected in the \$418.9 million loss, as at 30 June 2021. But for this unforeseen circumstance, ReturnToWorkSA would have been able to post a profit of \$165.1 million.

The provisioning for Summerfield has also moved the funding ratio to 91.9 per cent. If the decision stands, the scheme funding ratio would decrease to approximately 80 per cent, meaning it will not be fully funded. Should the appeal be unsuccessful, future unanticipated additional lump sum and serious injury payments will place significant upward pressure on the average premium rate. It would not be unrealistic to expect the average premium rate to be above 2 per cent.

If not corrected, ReturnToWorkSA will need to collect more than \$100 million in additional premiums annually ongoing. These additional costs to employers, not taxpayers, would likely cost the South Australian economy 20,000 jobs over the next five years.

ReturnToWorkSA has been advised that the High Court of Australia will hear oral arguments for their application for special leave to appeal on 5 November 2021. I anticipate providing members with a further update in the sitting week of November 2021.

*Question Time***CLEVE DISTRICT HOSPITAL AND AGED CARE**

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:38): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Health and Wellbeing a question regarding health care.

Leave granted.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: *The Advertiser* reported yesterday on the sad death of Mr Jeffrey Beaton, a former resident at the Cleve District Hospital and Aged Care facility. It has been reported that he was reported missing from Cleve District Hospital and Aged Care at around 9.30pm on 2 October and discovered severely dehydrated eight days later on a property several kilometres east of the town. Sadly, a day later Mr Beaton passed away.

A Cleve local has been reported as saying, 'Residents are free to come and go as they please,' and, 'The facilities are unsecured and not designed to manage dementia patients,' and, 'The next closest facilities are in Elliston, some 200 kilometres away, which residents, as you can imagine, are upset by.' My questions to the minister are:

1. What briefings has the minister sought and obtained regarding the disappearance and now death of Mr Beaton?
2. What precautions are in place at Cleve District Hospital and Aged Care to prevent residents going missing?
3. Has the minister received any briefings previously about concerns regarding staffing or clinical care at the Cleve service?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his question and certainly my thoughts are with the family of the deceased person. The resident absconded from Crestview Hostel on Saturday 2 October, I am advised, at 22:30. The staff immediately searched the area surrounding the hostel and then reported the incident to SA Police.

An extensive search was conducted by SAPOL, the SES and the CFS and occurred across 3 and 4 October, which included the use of a SAPOL helicopter. The search was scaled back by SAPOL on 5 October. The resident was located on 10 October by a local landowner and transported to Cleve hospital for treatment, which included MedSTAR review and advice.

Crestview Hostel is not a secure facility and the resident was not under a SACAT section 32 restrictive practices and special powers order, but I am advised that all external doors are locked or have number coded keypads for resident and staff safety. Residents are provided with the key if they have been risk assessed, but I am advised that the resident in this case did not have the code.

There is one external door to the secured back garden that is left unlocked throughout the day to enable the residents to freely wander into the garden. The garden is fenced and has three gates that are locked by way of number coded keypads.

CLEVE DISTRICT HOSPITAL AND AGED CARE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Supplementary: has an independent investigation been ordered into the circumstances and the services at the Cleve District Hospital and Aged Care facility?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:41): Certainly, SA Health has well-established processes for reviewing adverse events and I'm sure they will be followed in this case.

The PRESIDENT: Further supplementary, the leader.

CLEVE DISTRICT HOSPITAL AND AGED CARE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): Has the minister made an inquiry as to whether an independent review outside of his own department will take place in relation to these events?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:41): The SA Health procedures include a number of processes for escalation of incident reviews, both internal and external. If it's appropriate for this to be referred to an external authority I'm sure it will be.

CLEVE DISTRICT HOSPITAL AND AGED CARE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Final supplementary: will all of these reviews and results of the reviews be made public?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:42): As I said, I expect SA Health will comply with normal practice.

CLEVE DISTRICT HOSPITAL AND AGED CARE

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:42): Supplementary: did the minister receive any briefings prior to this incident about concerns regarding staffing or clinical care at the Cleve service?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:42): I don't recall any such briefings.

CLEVE DISTRICT HOSPITAL AND AGED CARE

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:42): Supplementary: has the minister contacted the hospital—

The PRESIDENT: This is the fifth supplementary on one question, so I will go to the Hon. Ms Bourke and then we will move on.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Thank you, Mr President. Has the minister contacted the hospital directly to investigate what happened?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): I certainly do not think it is appropriate for a minister to take on the role of an investigator.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, I understand you had a supplementary on this one. I will allow that. I didn't see you earlier.

CLEVE DISTRICT HOSPITAL AND AGED CARE

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:43): Sometimes it's hard to see me, Mr President. Supplementary question to the minister: was this the first time Mr Beaton had left the premises unaided or have there been other incidents involving Mr Beaton or other residents?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): I am advised that on Friday 1 October the resident absconded and was found in the town. He again went missing on Saturday afternoon of 2 October but once again was easily located. I am advised that the behaviour was unusual for the resident.

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing regarding hospitals. After the minister's chief executive revealed this week that only around 100 extra beds could immediately be brought on line to deal with a COVID surge but we would likely need to triple that number, can the minister explain exactly why the government has cancelled the leases on the Wakefield and College Grove hospitals, and why would the government pay for extra hospital capacity when we thankfully did not need it but then cancel the extra capacity right before COVID-19 is expected to come into South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:44): Could I ask the honourable member to repeat the last part of the question?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The second part was why would the government pay for extra hospital capacity when we thankfully did not need it but then cancel the extra capacity right before COVID-19 is expected to come back into South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I don't know what the honourable member is referring to.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: Opening the borders.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: If I could be given the courtesy of an answer, because I gave her the courtesy of a question. The leases that she is referring to lapsed months ago, and it was in public documents. The last budget papers reported the fact that these leases had lapsed. If the honourable members would like to come here making accusations on the government, they might like to get their facts right.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hunter and the deputy leader will be silent.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Nonetheless, I would like to thank the honourable member for her question because it gives me an opportunity to remind the house of work that is being done by this government to make sure this state is COVID ready. A key element of our plan for opening—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Excuse me. A key part of our plan to open up is to increase inpatient capacity. We have already announced an extra 60 beds, 16 additional beds at the Gawler Health Service to support the north, 30 additional transition to home beds at the Repat, 15 hospital-level geriatric care beds in the community. This is on top of adding progressively around 140 treatment spaces to our emergency departments, and we will continue to make more and more announcements detailing elements—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —of the bed capacity.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, you have concluded your answer?

HOSPITAL BEDS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (14:46): Supplementary arising directly from the minister's answer: is he therefore confident that there will be 300 extra beds, if we are expected to need that number, as was revealed by the chief executive earlier this week?

The PRESIDENT: I am not quite sure where that came from from the minister's answer.

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:46): I am very happy to say that I am confident that we will deliver the capacity that the South Australian health system needs to respond to whatever COVID brings.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding public housing. The minister announced an allegedly tough new approach to antisocial behaviour in public housing more than 2½ years ago, so why did the full-time carer of a woman with cancer need to contact the media yesterday before any action was taken about serious allegations at public housing in Kent Town, and what does the minister have to say to the tenant who spoke to the ABC yesterday and described the fear that many residents live in?

The PRESIDENT: Once again, I remind the honourable member that she is getting close to asking the minister for an opinion in the second part of that question, but I will call the minister.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:47): It gives me great delight to talk about antisocial behaviour policy. The Labor Party do like to have a bit both ways on this.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bourke has asked a question. Give the minister the courtesy of answering your question.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Indeed, the Labor Party like to have it both ways in terms of the antisocial behaviour policy. I think when we first brought it out—

The Hon. E.S. Bourke interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —they were accusing us of being overly tough, and now they are—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Haven't you got any answers for these residents?

The PRESIDENT: There is an answer, if you would like to listen to it.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Mr President, it is extremely hard to give a response when members of the Labor Party just constantly interject.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We have seen under our policy the number of evictions rise from the period under Labor. In terms of in 2017 there were 143—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Why are you dodging it, Michelle? It's a simple question.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter is out of order.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —in the 2019-20 year there were 299 evictions

The Hon. I.K. Hunter interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter will remain silent.

The Hon. C.M. Scriven: What about this tenant? That's what the question was about.

The PRESIDENT: And so will the deputy leader.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We have a much lower tolerance of poor behaviour in our Housing Trust properties.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Why won't you answer the question about this resident who had to go on the radio to get a response?

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, continue.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We have had some evictions, which relate to one place having 122 cannabis plants on the property, one place being used to store rifles and stolen property, threats to harm and kill neighbours, and verbal abuse.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What's this got to do with a resident who had to go on the radio to get a response? Why are you avoiding that question?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: My understanding of the case that has been highlighted in the media is that the Housing Authority has been aware of the case and has been working behind the scenes. I understand that, as far as the other tenants are concerned, it may sometimes seem to them that action isn't being taken when in fact there is activity taken behind the scenes.

Of course, we can't just immediately break someone's lease. That is a process that has to go through the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal and evidence needs to be collected

in relation to people who do make complaints about their neighbours. They need to ensure that they are collecting that evidence and that we are able to use that against tenants who are behaving poorly. We take antisocial behaviour very seriously, indeed, a lot more seriously than the Labor Party did, and the data has proven itself.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (14:50): I have a supplementary: when was the minister's office first contacted about the serious allegations of antisocial behaviour in Kent Town?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:51): I think someone tweeted at me about this particular matter and we then made sure that the authority knew that somebody had raised those particular concerns. I can't remember exactly what day that was.

INTERNATIONAL DAY OF OLDER PERSONS

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding older South Australians. Can the minister please inform the council about her attendance at the recent COTA Owing Our Age event celebrating International Day of Older Persons?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for her question. Indeed, 1 October is the United Nations' International Day of Older Persons. As time goes on, there are more and more of us who are fitting that particular description. It was a great pleasure to join the Council on the Ageing South Australia in their program for the day. The President of COTA SA is Emeritus Professor Anne Edwards AO. It is public knowledge, so I'm sure she won't mind me sharing, that she recently turned 80. She said:

I have decided, in the interests of challenging ageism, to own my age. I am happy to tell people I am 80.

The reason she has been able to get away with that for so long is because she certainly does not look her age. There was a panel of speakers who presented on this, including Major Moogy Sumner AM; Jodeen Carney, who is the Equal Opportunity Commissioner; Amanda Vanstone AO, the former senator; Jane Doyle, who is well known through her work in the media; and others.

The panel spoke about their particular experiences. We know that South Australia has the highest proportion of older people on mainland Australia—37 per cent are aged over 50. It has been predicted that this proportion will continue to increase at a time when South Australians can now expect to live longer, healthier lives than any previous generation in history.

I am pleased that the government has a Plan for Ageing Well 2020-2025, which outlines our vision and priorities for ageing well for all South Australians. This government is committed to including older people in decisions that affect them. Two rounds of consultation were held, which helped to shape that future direction—one in 2018, with 1,500 people participating in workshops, and over 100 stakeholders in the second round.

This plan helps to shift the thinking on ageing. Most older people live at home independently and make positive contributions to their community, civic society, business, families and workplace. The plan recognises the value of older people as an asset and recalibrates retirement at a time of possibility and opportunity. The plan has three strategic priorities: home and community, meaningful connections and navigating change. I thank the Council on the Ageing for putting on that event and for the privilege of participating in it.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:54): Supplementary just in regard to the original question regarding ageing: why is the only action in the minister's strategic plan regarding older people at point 3.3, which is them living in share houses, if it is so important?

The PRESIDENT: Your supplementary questions must be much more concise.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:54): In the government's plan, one of the priorities is actually housing. I think he is referring to the South Australian Housing Authority, which is—

An honourable member interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We certainly do have a lot of work which goes into ensuring that we are looking after older people who are living—are you talking about the Housing Authority?

The Hon. J.E. Hanson: It's your plan—your strategic plan.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: If the honourable member doesn't want to identify whether he is talking about the plan that I referred to in my response or a separate plan then I don't really have an answer for him.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Darley has the call.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Darley will be heard in silence.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding housing:

1. Can the minister advise how many new South Australian Housing Authority homes are planned to be built this financial year?
2. How many privately owned rental houses exist in South Australia at the present time, and are these increasing or declining?
3. How many privately owned rental houses are leased by SA Housing Authority?
4. How many privately owned rental homes does the government expect from the build to rent scheme proposed in this year's budget?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:56): The answer to the first question is probably between 150 to 200. The answer to the second question about the number of properties in the private rental market I don't know but I will need to see whether we have that data or whether that actually sits within the CBS within the Attorney-General's portfolio. Sorry, what were your last two questions?

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: How many privately owned rental houses exist in South Australia at the present time, and are these increasing or declining?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I don't know the answer to that one.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY: The third one: how many privately owned rental houses are leased by the South Australian Housing Authority?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The answer to that one I think is zero, but I will get a response from the agency just to double-check.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding housing:

1. Exactly what assistance did Housing SA provide to Billie, whose story was published in the *Sunday Mail* this week, after her housemate and landlord were killed in an alleged arson attack and then Billie spent a week in hospital with burns before being discharged into homelessness?
2. Why do none of the 33 actions in the minister's 10-year housing strategy refer to people exiting prison, hospital or other institutions into homelessness?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for her question. In relation to this particular case, we think we have internally been able to identify that particular client. The advice from the agency is that there has been support and assistance provided.

In relation to those who exit other institutions, we certainly—I have been asked about hospitals potentially exiting people into homelessness in the past and I have responded previously that the health system is updated to ensure that they know how to contact the relevant services. As far as Corrections is concerned, we do operate within the Housing Authority. I think it might actually be contracted by Corrections, but there are programs under OARS that are contracted to look after people who have been in contact with the correctional system.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary, the Hon. Ms Pnevmatikos.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (14:59): What sort of support and assistance? What was the nature of the support and assistance provided?

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink: For the correctional facility?

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS: No, that you referred to for this particular individual.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (14:59): Look, I am not going to go into those details. The opposition may like to go into people's personal details—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Hanson, the Opposition Whip and the deputy leader are all out of order.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That's not—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You won't tell us what you're doing for these people.

The PRESIDENT: Well, you won't listen.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am not going to go into people's particular details.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: What about the services? That's what's being asked: the services you provide.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Those details should remain confidential, and the Labor Party ought to respect it.

PUBLIC HOUSING

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:00): The assistance that the minister refers to, was that provided prior to Billie telling her story to the media or since?

The PRESIDENT: It doesn't really come out of the original answer. If the minister wants to answer, I will let her.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:00): I have been briefed about this particular case and I am not going to go into the details on behalf of the Labor Party, because they do want to get into the nitty-gritty details and that just isn't appropriate.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

NURSES AND MIDWIVES

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Minister, how is the government planning on boosting the nursing and midwifery workforce in preparation for living with COVID-19 outbreaks once we open interstate borders?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his question. The Marshall Liberal government's strong COVID-19 response has protected local jobs and kept South Australians safe. As we safely transition to the next phase of our COVID-19 plan we are massively expanding the capacity of our health system by adding hundreds of extra beds and recruiting hundreds of extra nurses.

Our COVID-ready plan will ensure the state is ready to reopen once our vaccination rates mean that we can do so safely. Positive cases in the community will gradually increase, but a lower proportion of cases will need hospitalisation because the majority of South Australians will be vaccinated. Being vaccinated means the impact of COVID is likely to be much less.

We are making sure that our health system will be ready to cope. One priority initiative in the Marshall Liberal government's COVID-ready plan is boosting the SA Health workforce by an additional 1,200 nurses and midwives in an unprecedented health staff expansion. That means every graduate from this year's nursing and midwifery classes in South Australian universities who has applied and is eligible to work for SA Health will be offered employment.

We usually recruit around 600 nurses and midwives to SA Health each year. This year, we will be recruiting around double that. The Marshall Liberal government is acting to secure an appropriately skilled and experienced nursing and midwifery workforce to meet the anticipated demand for COVID-19 cases when we reopen our borders. South Australians can rest assured that we are determined that they will be able to get the care they need when they need it.

The graduate nurses and midwives will be upskilled under a specially developed education and training program which will see their qualifications fast-tracked and new staff entering the COVID-19 frontline gradually from mid December. The first intake in December will support our hardworking nurses and midwives during the Christmas-New Year period, particularly helping existing staff to take a well-earned break. I would like to reiterate the thanks of the government for the existing workers, who have taken a significant burden in the last 18 months.

The \$7 million investment in the SA Health nursing and midwifery skills and training strategy will ensure that each graduate nurse and midwife recruited receives the necessary training and clinical supervision. That is a \$7 million investment in our health workforce.

The huge boost comes on top of the recruiting drive for 370 nursing positions that the Marshall Liberal government has already announced. These positions will target priority roles in emergency departments, intensive care units and mental health while also supporting the rollout of the COVID-19 vaccine.

There are more frontline health staff in South Australia than ever before. The health workforce has grown every year under the Marshall Liberal government. We want to grow that number even further to support the state's COVID-19 response.

Crucially, as we pass the peak of the vaccination program, we will be in a position to transfer health workers from the vaccine effort and dedicate more healthcare staff to hospitals and other COVID response roles. The Marshall Liberal government continues to deliver a COVID response to keep South Australia safe and strong.

NURSES AND MIDWIVES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:04): Supplementary: of the 370 new recruits, how many will be adequately skilled to step straight into an ICU role?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:04): The 370 is in relation to three particular metropolitan local health network roles. That is, I think, the third wave of recruitment that we have done since the COVID pandemic started. They will be in a range of roles and if a person needs further training to be able to take up a role that obviously would be made available by SA Health, but I do not have details.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: I am told it takes two years of additional training, so how many will actually be able to step into those roles?

The PRESIDENT: Order! I will allow the member another supplementary, if she wishes. Minister, have you concluded?

The Hon. S.G. WADE: I would just like to make the point that the 370 is not a graduate nurse focus program. It is an open program so we would be seeking experienced nurses whether they are from South Australia, whether they are from the public sector, whether they are from the private sector, whether they are from interstate or overseas.

COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:06): Supplementary in relation to the answer given about the reopening of borders: minister, when your chief executive said in a public forum yesterday, 'It's not our expectation there would be no quarantine, even for double vaccinated people at this stage, in relation to borders opening', which completely contradicted what your Premier said the week before—

The PRESIDENT: Order! Supplementary question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —was the Premier being deliberately misleading or just grossly incompetent the week before?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: If the minister chooses not to answer.

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

The PRESIDENT: No.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The answer was in relation to the reopening of borders and that is what the question was directly about.

The PRESIDENT: That's right, and the minister has chosen not to answer and I can't make him.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ngo has a supplementary.

NURSES AND MIDWIVES

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:06): Supplementary question—

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: No, leader! You have a member of your backbench on his feet.

The Hon. T.T. NGO: How many of these new nurses will be given a permanent position?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:07): My understanding is these are ongoing positions. I will check that. It may be normal practice to have graduate nurses doing a first-year contract, but I will certainly clarify that for the honourable member.

COVID-19 TRAVEL RESTRICTIONS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): Final supplementary in relation to the answer given about the reopening of borders: minister, for people who have been double vaccinated by Christmas will there be any restrictions on coming to South Australia?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:07): The honourable member yesterday used a scurrilous selective quotation to try to foster misunderstandings in the South Australian community.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: This government has been completely consistent.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! If the opposition want to be frivolous we will move on to the next question.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: Once we reach 80 per cent of our eligible population fully vaccinated we will no longer rely on statewide lockdowns in South Australia or statewide lockouts of other states and territories. That's the position today and has been our position for months. We may still need testing requirements—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. S.G. WADE: —and/or quarantine requirements but those requirements will be focused on hotspots and exposure sites.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Bonaros has the call.

SKYCITY ADELAIDE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:08): 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 SkyCity Adelaide Casino.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: During the last sitting week I asked the Treasurer a number of questions about the Adelaide Casino following the disturbing revelations which we have canvassed in this place that AUSTRAC was investigating the Casino after it identified potential serious noncompliance with the Australian Anti-Money Laundering and Counter-Terrorism Financing Act. The Treasurer has kindly referred those questions to the Attorney-General for her response; however, I'm still waiting for that response.

My concerns about the way the casinos, including SkyCity Adelaide Casino, operate in Australia have been further heightened by revelations yesterday about the Star Entertainment Group, which operates a casino in Sydney and two in Queensland, with a third on the way. Claims have been made that the group has been enabling suspected money laundering, organised crime, large-scale fraud and foreign interference with its Australian casinos for years.

The allegations mirror those made against Crown Resorts, which resulted in the Bergin inquiry—again, which has been canvassed in this place—and two subsequent royal commissions. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. What assurances can the state government give that SkyCity Adelaide isn't enabling suspected money laundering, organised crime, large-scale fraud and foreign interference?
2. What checks and balances does the state government have in place to ensure that the SkyCity Adelaide Casino is operating within its legal framework?
3. Can the Treasurer provide the advice given to the government by the commissioner for business services, the state's regulator, since the AUSTRAC investigation started, noting that the commissioner suspended the review pending the outcome of the AUSTRAC investigation?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:10): I'm happy to refer the honourable member's question to the Attorney and bring back a reply.

HOMELESSNESS

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding homelessness. After announcing a \$20 million Homelessness Prevention Fund almost two years ago, can the minister explain why barely 10 per cent of this has been committed; how much has actually been spent and not just committed; and why is the minister sitting on dedicated funds for preventing homelessness when people are sleeping on the streets and in the Parklands?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for recycling one of Labor's previous questions but it gives me the opportunity to respond again in relation to homelessness and our reforms to the homelessness system.

Indeed, there is record funding being spent in South Australia on homelessness, over \$72 million, both through the new Homelessness Alliance, which is about \$50 million, plus some other existing contracts of some \$20 million on an annual basis. In relation to the number of clients, we have some 20,000 every year, and the service works out to be quite an expensive spend per client in terms of the services, which is why we decided to reform the services.

The Homelessness Prevention Fund is something we had in our housing strategy, so it is \$20 million over 10 years, so \$2 million a year. We put some \$6 million out to the sector to seek projects which would be considered to be innovative and work in that prevention space, so that was the criteria. We received some tenders and shortlisted but in the end we were only able to award funding for Kids Under Cover, which provides relocatable studios, so that program is working through the homelessness specialist service providers. Some young people find it intolerable to remain in the family home, or they might be living with grandparents or the like, so this can help with those overcrowding situations.

That funding was awarded. There were a number of submissions which didn't fit the criteria and therefore they weren't able to be funded. The existing homelessness services which receive significant funds we believe will operate in a much more effective manner to prevent people from cycling in and out of homelessness services, as they have for a long period of time—or a certain cohort have—and we need to be working better in that prevention end to stop people from falling into homelessness in the first place. And, memo to the Labor Party: homelessness has not increased in South Australia, the trend is actually going down.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hood has the call.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: I had called the Hon. Mr Hood before you had risen so I will—

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I was on my feet first, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: I will give you the credit, but you need to get up more quickly. I will give a supplementary to the deputy leader.

HOMELESSNESS

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (15:14): Can the minister say how much has been spent out of this fund?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:14): The contract was awarded, as I said, to Kids Under Cover. How much they have spent to date, I am not sure. They were awarded \$2.3 million. How much of that they have spent, I'm—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: I gave the Labor Party the courtesy of having this supplementary when I had already called someone else, so perhaps we will listen to the answer in silence.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: How much they have spent, I am not sure, but I would also point out that we on this side of the house do not subscribe to the Labor Party policy of spray and pray, which is how they would allocate money: throw money at a problem and expect that you resolve it. We have undertaken significant systems reform—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We have undertaken significant systems reform—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Order, the Hon. Ms Bourke!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We have undertaken significant systems reform—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Hunter, order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —and we are spending record funding on homelessness services, over \$72 million—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the deputy leader!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —a huge amount of money compared to what the Labor Party ever did.

SINGLE TOUCH PAYROLL

The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:16): My question is to the Treasurer. Will the Treasurer update the chamber on the latest Single Touch Payroll figures as they relate to South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I didn't really hear a great deal of that. The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:16): I am very excited to get this particular question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am sure all members will be very excited when they hear the response again. Given the house was up for two weeks, we missed the instant update of the release last week of the Single Touch Payroll figures for the most recent fortnight. I am delighted to be able to indicate that, again, when measured against the low point of the pandemic, the middle of April 2020, South Australia has seen 15.4 per cent growth in total jobs in South Australia.

The comparative figure for Australia as a nation is 8.6 per cent, so almost double the national job growth rate. Again, Western Australia led the pack, as it has for a number of months now, at 17.1 per cent. Importantly, Northern Territory had an impressive performance in the most recent figures at 16.7 per cent. South Australia's job growth rate, again, is almost double the national job growth rate.

The more important, in my view, measure, which has now been resumed again after a bit of an interruption by the ABS, is the change in employee wages, because that measures the total amount of income going into a household as opposed to whether or not they are in a job or not—the total employee wages.

Again, South Australia, since the low point of the pandemic, has seen a 16.2 per cent increase in employee wages compared to the national figure of 12.0 per cent. It is still a good figure nationally in terms of growth in employee wages, but South Australia's figure there, again, is the second highest. Western Australia leads the pack, as it has for many months, but South Australia's figure, at 16.2 per cent, is the second highest.

In looking at the breakdown in which particular industry sectors, we have seen the greatest jobs growth in education and training, health care and social assistance, and in financial and insurance services. Unsurprisingly, the industry sectors where we have seen the greatest challenges in terms of declines have been in, for example, accommodation and food services. Again, in summary, it is a further indication of an impressive performance for the state's economy as we emerge from the ramifications of the COVID-19 pandemic.

CONCESSIONS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Treasurer on the topic of concessions.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: SACOSS has just published a major review of the concession system in our state, highlighting how a complex patchwork of policies and practice has created poverty premiums and barriers to accessing concessions. This patchwork approach, particularly with varying eligibility criteria, makes it difficult for people to navigate these systems and access the support they need. Further, the current regime for concessions gives rise to poverty premiums, which is where those on lower incomes, such as working-age Centrelink payments, are denied concessions available to people on higher incomes, such as the age pension.

The SACOSS report also identifies troubling inconsistencies, for example, where renters receive lower payments under the Cost of Living Concession compared with home owners on similar incomes. By further example, people living in share housing may be excluded from energy and Cost of Living Concessions, and asylum seekers and those not on the Centrelink system miss out on most concessions entirely.

SACOSS is calling for three major initiatives to address the systemic flaws in our concession system: a broad review of the concession system as a whole, extension of all concessions available to age pension recipients to other Centrelink recipients, and the introduction for all concessions of an additional low income eligibility criteria that is not based on any Centrelink benefits. My questions to the Treasurer are:

1. Has he read the review?
2. Will he commit to a broad concessions review on reform, as recommended and called for by SACOSS?
3. Why are people with less income in our state receiving less support than those with greater income?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:20): Yes, I have read the report. I always look forward to the contributions to public policy debate of SACOSS. Ross and his team there actively engage not only with me but with my ministerial colleagues—I know Minister Lensink, I am sure Minister Wade and others. We always look forward to their contributions. We don't always agree, but we always have respectful discussions.

On this particular occasion, as I have indicated publicly, I don't agree with a number of the major propositions that Ross and the SACOSS team have put forward. I think there is an important element, which I have discussed with them before and which they continue not to highlight in their reports, and that is that the approach this government has adopted is to try to drive down the costs of households in South Australia, the important costs that every household has to pay, rather than just concentrating on the nature and shape of the actual concessions that you adopt.

The former government adopted an approach: electricity prices went through the roof, they jacked up water prices by artificially jacking up the asset value of SA Water, and that had enormous implications for households that are struggling to pay their utility bills, their water and their electricity bills. So the approach we have adopted—and I have discussed this with Ross and his team on a number of occasions—is that we need to address as a government and a society driving down the costs for low income households and all households.

I am proud to say that we have reported, and will proudly be reporting this over the coming months, that for an average household in the metropolitan area, with a couple of cars and a couple of children, a reduction in their costs of about \$900 a household per year. But for a low income household, which might not have the benefit of running two cars—might only have a single car or be on public transport—the driving down of water costs by an average \$200 a year is a critical issue for some of those households. The electricity cost is a critical issue for low income households, and the average cost we have driven down, since the terrible travails imposed upon the South Australian community by the former government, by about \$300 for many households.

The average cost for low income households and high income households has been driven down, in terms of electricity costs, water costs and the costs of running a car (if they are fortunate enough to have a car) and ESL bills (if they are fortunate enough to be in a position of paying ESL bills). This government has been driving down the costs being imposed on households. I think the SACOSS analysis, the implications of costs and the paying of bills, important as it is, misses an important issue, and that is that we can benefit everybody by driving down the costs of households right across the board.

In relation to some of their other issues, we always treat with respect the suggestions that SACOSS put forward. The government will continue to consider them, but we are not in a position for some of the wholesale increases in costs of concessions that SACOSS is recommending by way of that particular report.

ABORIGINAL HOUSING STRATEGY

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Human Services about housing. Why does the new tender for remote housing in the West Coast communities of Yalata and Koonibba only refer to nine 'replacement' homes and not any additional homes in these communities? Across the minister's first term in government, will she deliver even one—just one—extra home in remote Aboriginal communities?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:25): I thank the honourable member for his question. Indeed, our government was the government that put our own hand into our pocket to stump up some funding for remote housing—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —to the tune of—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Does the opposition wish to listen to the answer to the Hon. Mr Ngo's question?

The Hon. K.J. Maher interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, leader!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —some \$37½ million, which I understand is the first time the South Australian government has matched the commonwealth's financial—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: They gave us 293 last time.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That's the first time that the South Australian government has matched—

The Hon. K.J. Maher: How embarrassing!

The PRESIDENT: Order! Minister, continue.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —the commonwealth's commitment to funding. I am not sure whether I will be allowed to speak or not, Mr President. You never really know here. In terms of the funding agreement—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I know. Weeties and red cordial today. A total of 35 remote replacement houses will be delivered.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am trying to listen to the minister and I have great difficulty at the moment. Minister, continue your answer, please.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The time frames on delivering these are subject to community consultation and sign-off. This strategy is based on an assessment that over the next five to 10 years there are 50 remote dwellings that are at the end of their life cycle and need to be replaced. To alleviate the high levels of overcrowding, all replacement houses will be replaced with an increase in bedroom numbers.

We are also very keen as part of the national partnership to ensure that we are supporting local Indigenous employment, with a minimum of some 30 per cent of the workforce—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —from the local communities. For the first time, two apprenticeships—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Wortley!

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: —and one certification in plumbing, electrical and pest control are in place with local Anangu. I think that's a really important arrangement for people who are living on the lands to be able to participate in that level of economic development.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Point of order.

The PRESIDENT: Point of order. I think the minister has concluded her answer.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The point of order is relevance. She was asked about new housing and didn't address that once, only replacement housing.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I have answered the question.

The PRESIDENT: There is no point of order.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The minister has been on her feet for some time, has answered the question—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: That's right. The Hon. Ms Lee has the call.

WOMEN IN HOTELS CONFERENCE

The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:28): My question is to the Minister for Human Services regarding the Women in Hotels Conference 2021. Can the minister please provide an update to the council on the importance of the conference and how it embraces women who are working in the hotel industry?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (Minister for Human Services) (15:28): I thank the honourable member for her question. Indeed, it was a great pleasure to participate in the 2021 Woman in Hotels Conference, which was held quite recently. It has been running, I think, for over 20 years—27 years in fact—and it is a biennial event to bring women from across the sector together to share their knowledge and engage in networking.

It was my pleasure to be able to open the conference. We certainly enjoyed the opportunity to be able to meet in person, which in other jurisdictions doesn't happen as much. I think it needs to be acknowledged that it's very important for women in various industries, regardless of whether that is in feminised industries or ones that traditionally women haven't participated as much in, to be able to get together at an industry level to network and to gain support from one another.

Guest speakers included Chelsea Randall, the captain of the AFLW Adelaide Crows, who obviously is someone who is a great role model for women. There were also presentations from Taryn Brumfitt, who is well known for her work in body awareness and encouraging women to be themselves and to not worry about what people think about their body shape, and also Julie Hancock, who is from Zagame Corporation Victoria, who was talking about team culture, recruitment and the like.

It is a very important event for Women in Hotels to be able to get together and it was a great privilege to be able to share part of their day with them.

PUBLIC HOSPITALS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Health and Wellbeing about age discrimination, language barriers and COVID bed plans in our hospital system.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I have been contacted by a constituent whose grandfather aged 80 has been in the RAH for the past four weeks after a medical episode. The man doesn't speak or understand English, so he has no ability to communicate with clinicians treating him, unless a family member is present to translate. That can be difficult when only one visitor is allowed. The family says that, as a result, he has missed out on some treatments.

The frail octogenarian was also left unattended in a chair by his bed. The family requested he be observed so he didn't fall. He did fall when nobody was present and of course there were communication problems and he was unable to tell staff whether he had been hurt. His family then had to demand X-rays be done when he complained about a sore leg and back.

A RAH doctor has apparently clinically assessed the old man to be discharged. How this could be done without the patient being able to express himself to the doctor is bewildering, yet the family is now being placed under enormous pressure by staff to get him out and into an aged-care provider. Finding one that is suitable and where language isn't a barrier is proving extremely difficult. To compound their distress, the RAH has now flagged it will soon charge the pensioner \$66 a day until he is moved. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why are clinicians putting pressure on elderly patients to be discharged and is this part of SA Health's strategy to free up the number of beds occupied by senior citizens that will be required should there be a wave of COVID cases in coming weeks?
2. Why are patients, particularly elderly pensioners, being threatened with additional charges if they remain in hospital after being there a period of time?
3. Does SA Health provide translation services in the public hospital system?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:33): There were a number of issues raised there and if I could briefly touch on each of them. I certainly would be concerned if visitor limits in a facility meant that a support that a patient needed was not able to be provided to them. There is flexibility in visitor limits. There is a statewide policy or guideline, but local hospitals are able to determine their own local rules in accordance with their own local circumstances. Certainly, the expectation would be that our facilities would be flexible to the particular needs of each person who is in their care.

In relation to the issue of the discharge of a person to a residential aged-care facility, let me make it clear: there has been no recent policy change that I'm aware of in relation to charging for people awaiting placement in a residential aged-care facility. It has been a well-established practice under governments for a number of years—I would be surprised if it's not a number of decades.

One of the issues that our health system has faced is that, whilst we want to support a family to make the next step from hospital care to a residential aged-care facility, and if they don't already have an established place in a residential aged-care facility, it does often take time to find a suitable location.

It has been a consistent view of SA Health that there comes a point where a patient in hospital who is awaiting an aged-care place—and my understanding is it's based on both length of time and the number of residential aged-care placements that have been made available—a charge may be levied. Certainly, SA Health is very keen to work with patients awaiting discharge who need support beyond the hospital and that might be through the National Disability Insurance Scheme or it might be through the commonwealth aged-care arrangements. It is in our mutual interests to facilitate an appropriate discharge. No patient wants to stay in hospital a day longer than they need to and also the hospital itself needs to free up beds for incoming patients. That has always been the case; it is the case today.

In terms of the translation services, in relation to the honourable member's direct question, yes, SA Health does provide access to translation services and, in relation to the particular case, if the honourable member would like to provide me or my office with the details we are happy to look into them. It is certainly SA Health's mission to support people to receive health care and that includes involving them in their own care and their family and where that involves communication issues we certainly provide translation services.

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

PUBLIC HOSPITALS

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:37): Will the pensioner face this levy if he isn't able to find a suitable aged-care facility to take him?

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:37): There are well-established processes here. In the end, we do expect people to take up offers. We certainly appreciate that people need time. Often they need time as a family to work through the options, but in the end SA Health has well-established processes such that there is a modest recoupment of costs when a discharge hasn't been able to be facilitated.

In that context, I mentioned to the house a number of times that we are working closely with the commonwealth to try to facilitate discharges. To be frank, the biggest problems that we are experiencing are in relation to disability placements, rather than aged-care placements, but it is a matter of balance between a family making timely decisions in terms of the next placement and the provision of hospital-based care.

Bills

ELECTORAL (ELECTRONIC DOCUMENTS AND OTHER MATTERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (15:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and the detailed explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Mr President, I am pleased to introduce the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill 2021. This Bill is in response to the Electoral Commissioner's Report on the 2018 State Election and proposes a number of amendments to the *Electoral Act 1985*.

The proposed amendments in this Bill will improve administration, streamline and modernise processes and allow for more flexible pre-poll voting options. The Bill will enable the State to provide voting services that are more consistent with options available in other jurisdictions and meet community expectations. Increased pre poll voting options will also ensure that the election can proceed in a way that minimises risks associated with the COVID-19 pandemic.

Under this Bill, the Electoral Commissioner will be able to establish pre-poll booths anywhere in South Australia up to 12 days before the election. This will replace the existing system, which provides for people to vote at declared institutions such as nursing homes or hospitals and only allows mobile polling booths to be established in regional areas.

The Bill provides that voters who attend a pre-polling booth established for their district will have the convenience of being able to cast an ordinary vote. The counting of ordinary votes made at pre-polling booths will be able to occur before the close of polls in prescribed circumstances. This will help to ensure that the results of the election are known as soon as possible after the close of polls.

These changes are possible because each voter will be marked off on an electronic electoral roll on a computer at each issuing point in every polling place. With technology constantly evolving and improving, the electronic roll mark-off will ensure that there is no risk of any person voting multiple times.

Mr President, the Bill contains amendments so that both voters and candidates will have flexible options for lodging information with the Electoral Commission. The Electoral Commissioner will be able to allow candidates to lodge information for nominations, voting tickets, how to vote cards and descriptive information for ballots online. Regulations can be made allowing voters to apply for postal ballots by phone or online.

Amendments have also been made to the date for the close of rolls and deadline to apply for postal votes. This allows for the earlier issue of voting papers and will maximise opportunities for postal voters to return their postal votes in time to be counted in the election.

The Bill provides both election information and public notices will be published on the internet, rather than a newspaper in the first instance. However, it will remain open to the Electoral Commissioner to publish notices in newspapers as is necessary, such as regional newspapers.

The Act already provides voting options for a class of voters who do not have fixed addresses. However, the Bill includes new protections for these itinerant electors. If itinerant electors fail to vote or are outside of South Australia for more than one month, they will not lose their status, nor will they be fined if they do not vote. This is to avoid creating hardship for people experiencing homelessness and travelling retirees.

The Bill expands the options for assisted voting which are currently available for sight impaired voters. The proposed method to be prescribed is telephone assisted voting. The Bill includes sight impaired voters as prescribed voters and allows other categories to be prescribed by regulations. The categories of voters to be prescribed by regulation may include overseas voters, residents of certain institutions and people in quarantine because of COVID-19.

The misleading advertising provisions contained in section 113 of the Act will be amended. Currently this section allows for the Electoral Commissioner, if satisfied that an electoral advertisement contains a fact that is inaccurate and misleading to a material extent, to request that an advertiser withdraw the advertisement and publish a retraction. The Electoral Commissioner can also make an application to the Supreme Court seeking orders.

The Bill removes this decision making function from the Electoral Commissioner and provides that an application can be made to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal to seek orders for retraction and withdrawal of a misleading advertisement. There are rights of appeal to either the Court of Appeal or a single judge of the Supreme Court under the *South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act* depending on the circumstances. In the 2018 Election Report the Electoral Commissioner set out the significant challenges of regulating misleading advertising. The amendments will mean that Electoral Commissioner will be able to focus on administering the Act in the lead up to an election without having to become involved in potentially partisan disputes.

The Bill also allows for a single authorisation of a poster that comprises multiple how to vote cards. This will make preparing these posters simpler for political parties and easier to read for voters.

A number of the amendments are drafted to allow regulations or the Electoral Commissioner to set out the detail of proposed processes. This will enable further changes to be made in the future as the technology evolves.

Mr President, I commend the Bill to the Council.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Electoral Act 1985*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Certain definitions are amended for the purposes of the measure.

5—Amendment of section 8—Powers and functions of Electoral Commissioner

A function of the Electoral Commissioner to promote and encourage the casting of votes at a polling booth on polling day is deleted.

6—Amendment of section 15—Electoral subdivisions

Subsection (3) relating to remote subdivisions is deleted.

7—Amendment of section 18—Polling places

A requirement to advertise in a newspaper is amended to publication on a website and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

8—Repeal of section 25

Section 25 relating to printing of rolls is repealed.

9—Amendment of section 26—Inspection and provision of rolls

This amendment is consequential.

10—Amendment of section 31A—Itinerant persons

2 grounds on which an itinerant elector ceases to be entitled to be enrolled are deleted.

11—Amendment of section 41—Publication of notice of application

A requirement to publish in a newspaper is amended to publication on a website and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

12—Amendment of section 48—Contents of writ

The date for the close of rolls (currently, 6 days after the issue of the writ) is amended to the day that falls 2 days after the issue of the writ.

The requirement to publish the writ for an election in a newspaper is amended to publication on a website and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

13—Amendment of section 49—Deferral of election

A requirement to publish notice of deferral of an election in a newspaper is amended to publication on a website and in any other manner prescribed by the regulations.

14—Amendment of section 53—Nomination of candidates endorsed by political party

Various references in the section (such as to 'nomination paper') are removed to facilitate electronic nominations.

15—Amendment of section 53A—Nomination of candidate by a person

Similar amendments to those to section 53 are made to this section.

16—Amendment of section 54—Declaration of nominations

This amendment is consequential.

17—Amendment of section 58—Grouping of candidates in Legislative Council election

A requirement relating to a signature is changed to a requirement to endorse in a prescribed manner.

18—Amendment of section 60A—Voting tickets

Various references in the section to written notices and authorisations are changed to facilitate electronic processes.

19—Amendment of section 62—Printing of descriptive information on ballot papers

Various references in the section to written authorisations and signatures are changed to facilitate electronic processes.

20—Amendment of section 65—Properly staffed polling booths to be provided

The reference to 'returning officer for the district' is replaced with 'Electoral Commissioner'. The other amendment requires polling booths to be established at polling places 'for' the district (rather than 'within' the district).

21—Amendment of section 66—Preparation of certain electoral material

The requirement to submit a quantity of how to vote cards is replaced with a requirement to submit them in a manner determined by the Electoral Commissioner (in accordance with any requirements of the Commissioner).

Another amendment is technical.

22—Amendment of section 71—Manner of voting

Voting by attending at a pre-polling booth and voting in the manner prescribed by this Act (not by declaration vote) is authorised. A change is made to section 71(2)(a) that is connected to the amendment to section 65(1)(a). The distance from a polling booth that a voter must be in order to be entitled to make a declaration vote is increased to 20 km. Another amendment relates to residents of a declared institutions.

23—Amendment of section 72—Questions to be put to person claiming to vote

The words 'and the address of the principal place of residence of the claimant' are deleted from the questions to be put to a voter before an authorised officer issues voting papers.

24—Amendment of section 73—Issue of voting papers

A reference to 'written' is deleted. Another amendment proposes relocating certain requirements to the regulations.

25—Amendment of section 74—Issue of declaration voting papers by post or other means

Section 74(1)(b) is amended to remove a reference to 'letter' and to allow certain requirements to be prescribed by regulations. A definition of *designated time* is inserted for the purposes of this amendment. The substitution of subsection (2) is related. A reference to 'mobile polling booth' is substituted with 'pre-polling booth'.

26—Amendment of section 77—Times and places for polling

A reference to determining 'mobile polling booths' as places for voting in remote subdivisions is substituted with 'pre-polling booth' for any places determined by the Electoral Commissioner. Other amendments are consequential.

27—Repeal of section 83

The provision relating to taking declaration votes at a declared institution is deleted.

28—Amendment of heading to Part 9 Division 5A

This amendment is consequential.

29—Amendment of section 84A—Assisted voting for prescribed electors

Currently, the assisted voting scheme relates to sight-impaired electors. The scope of the scheme is broadened to include an elector of a class prescribed by the regulations. Another amendment provides that the regulations may prescribe 1 or more assisted voting methods.

30—Amendment of section 84B—Applying provisions of Act to elector using assisted voting

31—Amendment of section 84C—Electoral Commissioner may determine that assisted voting is not to be used

These amendments are consequential.

32—Amendment of section 85—Compulsory voting

Being an itinerant elector is added to the list of sufficient reasons for failing to vote at an election.

33—Amendment of section 89—Scrutiny

These amendments relate to the commencement of the scrutiny of ordinary votes taken at pre-polling booths before polling day at such times and places and in such manner before the close of poll determined by the Electoral Commissioner.

34—Amendment of section 91—Preliminary scrutiny

Section 91(1)(b)(i)(A) is substituted so that the relevant officer conducting the scrutiny is required to be satisfied of the identity of the elector (which must be verified in a manner prescribed by the regulations).

35—Amendment of section 112A—Special provision relating to how-to-vote cards

New subsection (7a) disapplies section 112A(1)(a) and (b) in relation to a how-to-vote card published as part of other material if that material is an electoral advertisement authorised in accordance with section 112.

36—Amendment of section 113—Misleading advertising

SACAT is authorised to make orders relating to inaccurate and misleading electoral advertisements (currently, this function is conferred on the Electoral Commissioner).

37—Amendment of section 116A—Evidence

This amendment is consequential on the amendment to section 113.

38—Amendment of section 125—Prohibition of canvassing near polling booths

This amendment is consequential on the amendments relating to declared institutions.

39—Insertion of section 129A

New section 129A is inserted:

129A—False or misleading information

An offence is prescribed that a person must not, in giving any information under the Act, make a statement knowing it to be false or misleading or omit any matter from a statement knowing that without that matter the statement is false or misleading.

40—Amendment of section 132—Injunctions

Subsection (2), which prevents an injunction from being granted under section 132 in relation to a contravention of, or non-compliance with, Division 2 of Part 13 of the Act (which sets out offences relating to electoral advertisements, commentaries and other material), is deleted.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET MEASURES 2021) BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 9 September 2021.)

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:40): I rise to speak in support of the government's Statutes Amendment (Budget Measures 2021) Bill, inclusive of the amendments I filed on 8 October. As we all know, there is considerable pressure on rental housing stock throughout South Australia. We are constantly hearing that it is well nigh impossible to find affordable rental accommodation in Adelaide and the regions. Competition and demand for rentals is high and rents are rising as a result of lack of supply.

The government's existing affordable home owner initiatives have not met the needs of lower income earners and welfare recipients. I was disturbed to see media reports this week that there are over 2,000 Housing Trust homes vacant. I am hopeful that the 50 per cent land tax discount for eligible new build to rent residential construction projects in this bill will act as an incentive for developers and investors to build more rental housing.

My amendments, [Pangallo-1], aim to provide additional certainty for build to rent residential construction projects by ensuring the guidelines referred to in the bill are substituted with regulations. This means the regulations are subject to the usual parliamentary scrutiny and accountability. Guidelines, on the other hand, can be changed and approved by the Treasurer at any time. I do not believe guidelines give the necessary confidence or certainty that the industry requires to significantly invest over the long term. I hope that members support my simple but sensible amendments.

I have some concerns about abolishing the legislated payroll tax exemption applicable to wages paid and ex gratia payments payable in connection to a feature film produced in South Australia and will be looking for some assurances from the government that this will in no way disadvantage our film industry. Abolishing the film production payroll tax exemption and ex gratia scheme and redirecting the average annual costs of those schemes to the South Australian Film Corporation's Screen Production Fund seems reasonable on the face of it, although I note that the two amounts—\$1.6 million—are identical, meaning there is no net increase in the government's contribution to the Screen Production Fund.

I was especially pleased to see an ABC media report this week that the South Australian film industry has survived COVID-19 remarkably well and is expected to grow and expand even more, given our highly skilled and talented workforce. Chief Executive Officer of Mercury CX, Karena Slaninka, said it was actually lockdowns that had given South Australia a competitive edge with a variety of television and film projects getting produced in South Australia that would otherwise be filmed interstate. She said this included projects like the feature film *A Sunburnt Christmas*, the television series *The Tourist*, and at least two Netflix productions, all of which followed the pre-pandemic production of *Mortal Kombat*, the highest budgeted feature in South Australian history.

If we have learnt one thing from COVID-19, it is that South Australia has to develop its own people in our distinctive competencies and build our economic self-reliance. Whilst we must not become insular—indeed, it is vitally important that we have a global outlook—we must foster strong and independent creative industries here to broaden our focus from more traditional manufacturing jobs into new and previously unimagined fields such as in visual effects like those produced by Rising Sun Pictures and MR. X in South Australia. I am hopeful that this is not the only incentive the government will be offering the film industry in South Australia and look forward to pre-election announcements about this exciting sector.

I understand the bill also allows for the introduction of high definition mobile phone detection cameras, as prefaced in the 2020-21 budget. It will be interesting to see if the new mobile phone cameras manage to avoid the evidentiary problems we continue to encounter with speed detection cameras. I also support the minor Mining Act amendment to close a loophole that allowed tenement holders to pay lower royalties by contracting at less than market value.

I commend the bill to the chamber and look forward to receiving more information about the payroll tax changes and the film production fund during the debate.

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

ELECTORAL (REGULATION OF CORFLUTES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 23 September 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (15:46): I rise to speak on this bill. This chamber has sat for 188 days since the last state election, and after today there are only eight more due, possibly, before the next election. We are seeing major changes to the way an election is conducted and campaigned for at the very last second. If this was a football match, we would be well into time-on in the final quarter, with the umpire then deciding, 'I'm going to change the rules. I'm going to change how the game is played and how you're allowed to play the football game.'

This is an outrage. These provisions have been considered by this chamber and rejected by this chamber previously, and we are back here again, at one minute to midnight, trying to change the rules for how the election is conducted. It is a shameful example of the Liberal government again acting at the very last minute to try to change the rules because they think there is some sort of benefit for themselves.

Not only is this government seeking to pass this electoral bill at one minute to midnight, but in the lower house when it was being considered they guillotined debate. They stopped the debate continuing so that members could consider the nature and effect of the changes that are happening. It is happening at one minute to midnight, and they stopped the democratic process in the lower house when this was being considered.

Members in the House of Assembly were given five minutes to debate each clause through the committee stage. That even led to a situation where the member for Florey, Frances Bedford, was prevented from speaking in relation to her own amendments because 'time has expired'. These are anti-democratic measures being conducted in an anti-democratic way. This is an outrage.

It was another concerning development that we have seen further changes to this not just at one minute to midnight, not in time-on in the last quarter, but as the whistle is about to blow. We have had amendments to consider on this bill filed at 11.49am this very morning. Before these amendments were filed it was almost certainly the case—even though the Attorney herself could not answer these questions in the lower house—and quite likely possibly even after these amendments were filed, that this bill would curtail significantly freedom of political speech.

The bill, as it was introduced in this place, would have absolutely meant that a person protesting, for example, climate change—if they were protesting that and it could have had an influence on the outcome of the election it would have been banned. That is what this government wanted to do. It is an outrage. It is anti-democratic.

The amendments that we have seen filed at one second to midnight, at 11.49 this morning, refer to the Public Assemblies Act. I am not certain that they allow lawful protests to happen. For example, if someone is wearing a T-shirt, is that an election sign that is not banned under this? I am not sure a protestor would be allowed to wear a T-shirt even with these amendments. It is an outrage and it is anti-democratic.

In relation to a question from the member for Kaurana, when the member for Kaurana asked, 'If somebody is doing a protest on a public street and they want to have a sign, is that prohibited under this legislation?' the Attorney answered, 'I am advised that depends entirely in relation to what it says and also the display of those and whether they contravene the proposed definition.' Further to that, the Attorney was asked about the possibility of constitutional issues in relation to regulating the freedom of political speech.

Again, these could not properly be answered and now we are supposed to accept that at 11.49 this morning the Attorney has had a sudden change of heart and suddenly has decided that these are now completely democratic and, 'I have some amendments that refer to the Public Assemblies Act and everything will be fine.' Well, I am not buying that; I am not buying that at all.

The Attorney-General has form in relation to these sorts of things. The Attorney-General has form in relation to taking this chamber for granted. We have seen, every time there has been COVID emergency powers legislation put before this place, that the Attorney has come the day before with legislation—or even on the day—and expected the crossbench and the opposition to support them. It is not good enough. The Attorney has form in taking people for granted here, making changes at the last minute and not giving due notice, and that is what is happening again.

The Attorney has form in overreach, complete and utter overreach in a lot of what she has suggested in her legislative reforms, and we are seeing this again here—the complete and utter banning of corflutes. Overreach in the past, at the start of this parliamentary session. Soon after the election, the Attorney brought changes to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to make it illegal to have gaol time for minors for the possession of cannabis. Except for the Liberal government, every other member of the Legislative Council rejected those changes. It was overreach, and every other member of the Legislative Council saw it as such and rejected them.

Recently, we had changes in an identity theft bill. The Attorney tried to sneak in provisions that merely having information without any intention to do anything wrong with it could lead to serious consequences and gaol time. It was overreach, as it is here. The Attorney has form with this sort of overreach. Once again, the Attorney has come with a bill to ban corflutes that is complete and utter overreach to whatever problem she thinks is there.

It is clear that the Attorney thinks there is some sort of political advantage, perhaps it will be to the detriment of minor or smaller parties who often use corflutes as a cheap and effective way to get their message and their branding out. Maybe the Attorney thinks she can wipe out minor and small parties with this. Well, we are not going to be a party to these anti-democratic measures.

The Attorney has form in a whole lot of other areas, taking this parliament for granted and, in fact, acting against things that this parliament has decided. We saw just this morning in the House of Assembly a select committee voted on by a majority of the House of Assembly looking at potential conflict of interest issues to do with the Attorney's not approving a development application on Kangaroo Island.

We saw early on in this parliamentary term the Attorney investigated by the Anti-Corruption Branch for breaches of her own ICAC Act. That went all the way to referral for prosecution, and independent counsel had to be brought in, and we do not know why it did not proceed. We were not told that there were not breaches of the law from the Attorney herself. We were just told that the prosecution would not proceed.

The Attorney has form for overreach, the Attorney has form for doing things against what the parliament might have said, the Attorney has form for taking us for granted and I am not going to be a party to passing a bill that is clearly designed because the Attorney thinks there is some base political advantage to her or her party.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:54): I rise in support of this bill on behalf of the Greens. In so doing, I recognise that, as is the case with all political parties, there are different views within the Greens on this matter. My predecessor in this parliament, Mark Parnell, organised a forum of Greens members when this issue first came on the agenda. I had the opportunity to talk with many members about this issue at that time, and indeed over the months and years when corflutes have been debated.

It is very clear to me that there is strong support for this change within the SA Greens membership. This has also been a strong campaign for the Greens interstate. In the ACT, for instance, the Greens have been campaigning strongly on this issue. Indeed, the parliamentary inquiry into the ACT election has recommended banning corflutes from roadsides. It is a parliamentary inquiry that has involved representation from the Labor Party, the Greens and others.

More importantly, there is strong support for this reform among the South Australian community. Most voters find these signs to be an eyesore and to be visual pollution, not to mention highly wasteful. There are a few exceptions, of course. I know my mum and dad will miss seeing my face on Stobie poles. I know the member for Kaurana, Mr Chris Picton, will be very disappointed, as he has a growing collection of my corflutes dating back to our days together at Flinders University. I can assure him that these signs will still be available for his personal collection, they just will not be

in the public realm. He can still display my corflute on his private property or post it on his fan wall or whatever else he wants to do. There is no prohibition on that.

It is worth noting that the views of political parties on this issue have changed over the years as well. Back in 2009, the then Attorney-General, Michael Atkinson, first attempted to ban corflutes from public streets. The move at that time was opposed by the Liberals and the crossbench. I am sure Mr Atkinson will be tweeting in delight to see the Greens have changed our position on this.

Both former Labor minister Kate Ellis and former Liberal minister Christopher Pyne have argued for corflutes to be banned. Back in 2019, the Hon. Kate Ellis of the Labor Party told *The Advertiser*, and I quote directly from her statement:

It is a massive amount of resources, the public don't particularly like them and it's a huge distraction for the first week of the campaign.

Your office gets inundated with calls about 'you've got too many posters here, or you don't have enough posters there'.

Wouldn't it be great if we had an election campaign where we were talking about the issues that were going to be determined and how that would impact on our community?

She goes on:

There are too many of these signs, they don't serve much purpose and we have this debate every couple of years; the rest of the country do not do this the way that we do...Get rid of them, I say.

'Get rid of them, I say,' says Kate Ellis, former Labor minister. I could not agree more.

For my part, my views on corflutes have been on the public record for many years. As a city councillor, I advocated for corflutes to be banned for council elections. That move was opposed by the majority in Town Hall, but it did receive strong support from the local community. I welcome the fact that this change was legislated as part of the government's local government reforms.

For me, there are three very important considerations in this debate. The first is the impact that corflutes have on the environment. At a time when our state has taken bold and decisive action on single-use plastics, it seems absurd that the political class would be exempting ourselves from this through producing these costly and wasteful plastic signs, many of which will end up in landfill. Not all political parties recycle their candidates in the same way that I have been recycled, so that can lead to increased waste.

I do concede that you could legislate to use other materials less damaging on the environment, but there are also other issues for us to weigh up here. There is another fundamental consideration, and that is: who owns the public realm? The public realm belongs to all South Australians. Intrusion onto the public realm, onto our public streets, is heavily regulated for this reason. The idea that these streets should be populated with election signage in this way is a form of visual pollution and I think it offends that basic principle. I have heard it said that voters will not realise there is an election on if there are not corflutes on the streets. I do not accept that argument.

There are plenty of other ways that candidates and campaigners can engage with their electors. Signs really do not say anything about the policies or principles of a political party or a candidate. I mean no disrespect to anybody in this room but politics is hardly a beauty contest. A sea of smiling faces does nothing to advance the quality of political debate in our state. Under this bill, party members, supporters and volunteers can still display signs on their private property as is the case in other jurisdictions around our country, so there will still be plenty of opportunities for people to get the message out without dominating our streets in this way.

The final issue I want to touch on is equity. I have heard it argued—indeed the Leader of the Opposition made this point—that somehow banning corflutes will damage smaller parties. I do not accept that argument. The current regime is an arms race. It means that all parties are required to invest huge amounts of money and people power into putting up these signs and finding the volunteers to distribute them. This really favours those candidates or political parties who have deep pockets. At \$7 a pop, corflutes can blow a very big hole in a campaign budget, particularly for a small party or a candidate. This bill just levels the playing field.

I know the Leader of the Opposition has argued that this would be the end of democracy as we know it in the state of South Australia but the reality is, if the Labor Party feel so strongly about this, they can go into the next election and say, 'Vote for the Labor Party and we will reverse this legislation. We are the bring back corflutes political party.' It is their choice to do that. If they want to run as having that as a key part of their platform at the next election, saying to the people of South Australia, 'We will bring back corflutes and reverse these changes,' then they should do so and let the people of South Australia decide. I suspect what they will find is that there is a huge amount of public support for these changes and that people will be very excited to see the parliament take action on this.

In concluding, the Greens have been in negotiation with the government and I understand that some amendments will be moved in the committee stage. These have been alluded to by the Leader of the Opposition and I will talk to those a bit later. What those amendments do, I think, is provide certainty in terms of ensuring that people can have signage at public rallies and events, street corner meetings and the like and the amendments that the government will talk to later will address those points.

I do hope that this will be the last time the parliament is required to debate this issue and I think that the public would overwhelmingly welcome this parliament's action on the matter.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:02): I was not slated to speak but I just wanted to express that SA-Best definitely will be opposing this bill. Just to reiterate the comments made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition—which he did in such an indelible way—it is an attack on democracy, it is an attack on free speech and the fairness of the election process which discriminates against smaller political parties and Independents.

This is all about eliminating those pesky minority voices that try to be heard during an election campaign. Everybody has a right to be heard and the ability to nominate for public office. Elections should not be dominated by those with huge cash reserves or the backing of donors from the big end of town. We could not possibly even contemplate rubbing out or airbrushing under-resourced candidates wishing to contest a state election.

As for the corflutes, if there is an environmental issue—as the Hon. Robert Simms has pointed out—I am sure we can legislate in this place that they are recycled or made out of recyclable materials, or that perhaps there are stiffer penalties if they are not removed in an appropriate period of time. I actually like corflutes because I can put a face to a name, because I am not particularly good at remembering names of people, particularly strangers. In saying that, I point out that we will certainly be opposing this bill strongly.

The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:05): For the record and for the reasons already outlined by the Leader of the Opposition and the Hon. Frank Pangallo, I will oppose this bill.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (16:05): My colleague has outlined what SA-Best's position is, but again—and I said this the last time I spoke on this bill, when it was wrapped up together with all those other changes that relate to the election, which is going to take place, as we know, in March—if the government were serious about this bill, and if the government were serious about its election reforms, then they would not be coming to us three minutes before an election with major changes to the way things are done. If the government were serious about getting rid of corflutes, they have had 3½ years to put that proposal to us, but they have not done that.

What we saw the last time the Attorney introduced the bill into this place was corflutes wrapped in together with OPV and a number of other ECSA recommendations, and we were expected then to deal with them as a package. I think this chamber made it abundantly clear to the Attorney at the time that we would not deal with it as a package, that we expected more from her and from this government in relation to the way we deal with reforms in this place, but especially when they relate to an election that is literally around the corner. This bill is no different from that.

Three minutes before the election the Attorney comes to us again. This time she has unravelled the package a little. She has put her ECSA recommendations in one bill and corflutes in another, but she has done so knowing full well what opposition there was to this bill previously and full well what opposition there is to this bill currently.

I have to say that I appreciate some of the comments the Hon. Robert Simms has made about the concerns around corflutes. We all know what those concerns are, but there is nothing that has prevented the government at any stage since the last election and since today from presenting this bill to this parliament, whether it be alone or as a package. They have not chosen to do that. They have chosen once again, at the last minute, to get us to vote on something that they know is divisive and that they know will undermine the minor parties and Independents of this place more than anyone else. It is for these reasons, in addition to the reasons outlined by my colleague, that we will not be supporting this bill.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:07): I welcome in some cases the restatement of positions members have placed on the record previously in relation to the proposals in this particular piece of legislation. On behalf of the Attorney-General, I thank the Hon. Mr Simms for the work he has done with the Attorney and her officers in crafting amendments for this chamber to consider, should the bill proceed past the second reading of this debate.

The Hon. Mr Simms' contribution was informative in many respects in the contrasting positions of individuals, members and parties over the years. I am sure, although I have not taken the trouble to go back on the public record, I would have expressed views different from the views that my government is expressing at this particular time at times in the past.

In fact, I recall one of the matters that was discussed at length with lawyers lined up for bidders for our electricity assets, and lawyers lined up supporting the government's position and the various merchant bankers and others, and they were, I think, bemused is probably the right word when, amidst all the issues of discussion as to what would go into the leasing arrangements for the poles and wires in South Australia, there was an insistence that ETSA, or the new body that replaced ETSA, continue for the term of its leasing arrangements to allow the erection of election corflutes at no cost to political parties during the duration of the lease.

There was a view that if a provision was not put in there either they might prevent it or, if they did not prevent it, they might want to charge a per poster fee for erecting election corflutes on Stobie poles. As I said, it was met with some bemusement because it was obviously not one of the issues that the lawyers on both sides, the merchant bankers and accountants and others were contemplating ever having to discuss when looking at the complicated leasing contracts that were being entered into at that particular time.

Times have changed, as the Hon. Mr Simms's contribution indicated. I would never have contemplated that I would be sitting down in the Myer food court eating my lunch with a wooden stick instead of the good old single-use plastic that I have been using for I do not know how long—10 or 20 years—but the world has moved on.

I think most observers acknowledge that the South Australian Liberal government has been at the forefront of change in many of these areas, including the banning of single-use plastics. Governments of Labor and Liberal persuasions were involved in relation to container deposit legislation. This government's open embrace of renewables and zero emissions by 2050 has demonstrated across the board that this government has been an enthusiastic embracer of the importance of combating the implications of climate change and tackling environmental issues.

Whilst I am sure there will be the odd issue that the Greens and the Liberal government might disagree on occasionally from time to time, there will of course also be issues where we are in furious agreement. In terms of protecting our environment there is a shared purpose between the Greens in this particular chamber and the Liberal government. It is disappointing to hear the Leader of the Opposition portray himself as one of the troglodytes in terms of wanting to continue to contribute to environmental degradation, with the continued support of thousands and thousands of plastic posters despoiling our environment for decades to come.

The Leader of the Opposition and the opposition are building a very impressive policy array for the next election, as I think the Hon. Mr Simms alluded to in part. They will be going to the election promising to reintroduce plastic corflutes for elections should they be elected, and they will be promising to abolish shopping on Boxing Day after people have enjoyed it for four years. They are putting together an impressive package of policy commitments and promises through the various positions that they continue to adopt in this chamber.

As I said, the positions on this particular issue have been ventilated only relatively recently, so it is not as if this issue is coming from the clouds unseen by anyone. We have had this debate. People's positions are pretty clear and the parliament is again being asked to express a view one way or another in relation to this particular proposal.

I might comment on the hypocrisy of the Australian Labor Party talking about last-minute changes that impact the electoral system, given their last-minute proposal in one of the election periods to abolish the fairness provisions in the electoral legislation is unprecedented in terms of the potential impacts on electoral prospects in the future, certainly compared to the issue of whether or not we should ban corflutes. This is small beer compared to the changes the Australian Labor Party successfully implemented right at the death knell of one particular parliamentary session.

But this is a bill about corflutes, so I do not intend to wax lyrical about other issues. I share a view that the Hon. Mr Simms has put that this chamber should consider the bill and the amendments that are going to be put at the committee stage.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes 10
Noes 11
Majority 1

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, D.G.E.
Lucas, R.I. (teller)
Wade, S.G.

Franks, T.A.
Lee, J.S.
Simms, R.A.

Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Stephens, T.J.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Hanson, J.E.
Ngo, T.T.
Scriven, C.M.

Bourke, E.S.
Hunter, I.K.
Pangallo, F.
Wortley, R.P.

Darley, J.A.
Maher, K.J. (teller)
Pnevmatikos, I.

Second reading thus negated.

MUTUAL RECOGNITION (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (FURTHER ADOPTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 26 August 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:19): I rise to speak on this bill and indicate I will be the lead speaker for the opposition. This bill seeks to implement legislative amendments to support a national scheme for the automatic mutual recognition of licences, consistent with the government's obligations under the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Automatic Mutual Recognition of Occupational Registration.

In June 2021, the commonwealth parliament passed amendments to the Mutual Recognition Amendment Act (the commonwealth act), introducing a uniform scheme of automatic mutual recognition to enable an individual registered for an occupation in their home state to be taken to be registered to carry on in a second state the activities covered by their home state legislation.

The argument for such a scheme is that it will increase the strength and resilience of our economy by reducing time and cost for Australians to take up jobs wherever they may arise around the nation. It will create, the argument says, a more mobile labour force and allow skilled workers a cross-jurisdiction ability to work. Whilst labour force mobility can be positive, there are also some

concerns about whether skilled workers are flown from interstate to South Australia to complete work that could be done by a South Australian.

The Treasurer mentioned in the second reading that this will also allow more businesses to bid for work in other states, which on one side of the coin is positive for our state but also concerning if this means that more interstate companies will be competing for South Australian government contracts. I understand the Australian government, in collaboration with state and territory governments, developed a uniform automatic recognition scheme through consultation and engagement with industry, trade unions and regulators.

Mutual recognition, under the existing national scheme, provides an entitlement for registered workers to be registered for an equivalent occupation in another jurisdiction on the basis of the existing registration without further assessment of their qualifications. This has been operating in South Australia since its introduction in 1992 and is covered by the Mutual Recognition (South Australia) Act 1993.

Safeguards in the national scheme have been included to ensure the community, the environment, animals and workers are protected. Workers who come to South Australia will be required to comply with our laws, with any conditions a person has on their home state registration also applying here unless waived by the local registration authority. We are informed the uniform scheme enables a state minister to exempt a registration in their state from being subject to automatic mutual recognition for a renewable period of up to five years because of a significant risk to consumer protection, the environment, animal welfare or worker or public health and safety.

This scheme commenced, we are told, on 1 July 2021 in Victoria, New South Wales, the ACT and the NT. We will be supporting the passage of this bill, but I inform the government that we will have some questions particularly around the mutual recognition of teachers.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:22): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his indication of support for the second reading.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: This is probably best done at clause 1. As I said in part of my second reading contribution, I will have a couple of questions particularly about mutual recognition in the teaching profession. I am wondering, in the consultation the government undertook on this bill, were any teaching organisations in South Australia supportive of the proposed changes?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: This was an issue that was discussed at a number of levels; in particular, the ministerial council that covers the education ministers discussed this. My understanding and my advice is that they supported the position that we are going to adopt, that is, under the provisions of the bill a five-year exemption before these particular provisions would operate in the teaching profession.

I am advised that the Teachers Registration Board in South Australia, which as the leader would know is a representative body that has union representatives—I think principal representatives and other representatives, departmental representatives—on that board, also supported the view that they believed under the provisions of the bill there should be a five-year exemption period. I am proposing to follow that particular course in relation to the teaching profession.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the Treasurer for the information. I am wondering in particular in relation to not the five-year implementation period but the concept of mutual recognition of teachers what the specific views were of the Teachers Registration Board, the Australian Education Union and the Association of Independent Schools.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I can speak specifically in relation to the ministerial council and the Teachers Registration Board, which does include representation of the teachers union. I do not know directly what the attitude of the teachers union would be, but I would be surprised if it was anything

different. That is, the position of the Teachers Registration Board, I am advised, and the ministerial council was that they supported the notion of mutual recognition for the teaching profession; however, they believed there were issues that needed to be resolved that would require the five-year exemption period.

So they were not opposing the principle that at the end of the five-year period we should be in a position to have mutual recognition, but there were a number of specific issues which needed to be worked through with our Teachers Registration Board and their equivalents in the other jurisdictions, and our ministers for education at the ministerial council meeting adopted that position, so I am advised.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Has the government received any advice or submissions or concerns that teacher standards in SA could drop under the provisions of this bill once it is fully implemented?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: I am advised that, no, we have not. Certainly, the discussions I have had at the Board of Treasurers and at CFFR (Council on Federal Financial Relations), where this was discussed and which involves the federal Treasurer and which has driven this particular mutual recognition process, were that the treasurers from across the nation were not expressing those sorts of views and our advice and understanding was that neither were their ministerial colleagues, the ministers for education. They were essentially accepting that the principle made sense but that there may well be differences between the jurisdictions which needed to be worked through, and they would need to be worked through over this five-year exemption period.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 5) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:29): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

GIROLAMO, HON. H.M.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon R.I. Lucas:

That this council welcomes the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, elected by an Assembly of Members of both houses on 24 August 2021 to replace the Hon. D.W. Ridgway (resigned).

(Continued from 7 September 2021.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:29): This was a motion to allow my colleague the Hon. Ms Girolamo to make her first speech to the chamber. It was an outstanding contribution, the first of very many over very many years, I trust. With those brief words, I close the debate.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon R.I. Lucas:

That the report of the committee be adopted.

(Continued from 9 September 2021.)

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer) (16:30): In speaking to close the debate, I want to thank the members of the Standing Orders Committee. From informal discussion with other members of this chamber, I understand, even though not everyone has spoken, there is support for the

recommendations of the report of the Standing Orders Committee and we look forward, with the passage of this motion, to the next stage in finalising the process of amending our standing orders.

Motion carried.

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

That the amendments be presented to the Governor by the President for approval pursuant to section 55 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Motion carried.

Motions

RIDGWAY, HON. D.W.

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon R.I. Lucas:

That this council notes and thanks the Hon. David Ridgway for his service to the Legislative Council and the community since his election to the Legislative Council in 2002.

(Continued from 9 September 2021.)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Leader of the Opposition) (16:32): I rise to say nice things about Ridgy. I had my whip in my ear behind me saying exactly that and then the Leader of the Government from across the chamber telling me exactly the same thing, so I guess I do not have a choice but to say nice things about Ridgy so I am going to entirely change the nature and tenor of my speech.

David Ridgway was born in Adelaide on 14 November 1960 and studied at Bordertown High School. He grew up in the small South-East community of Wasleys and with the Rural Youth, as he was fond of telling us occasionally, he travelled to the USA and Europe. He took over the family farm, which diversified from growing bulbs for the cut flower industry and I think became the biggest supplier of gladioli in Australia. I note that that is Dame Edna Everage's favourite flower, so the similarities between Dame Edna Everage and David Ridgway continue.

David won a seat in the state's upper house, the Legislative Council, in 2002 and held some very important positions, including Leader of the Opposition, in this chamber. Growing up, David Ridgway always had an interest in leadership but I am told he had a ferocious appetite as a young man and his devotion to the pastime of eating earned him the nickname growing up of 'the Grub'. I am very well informed.

David Ridgway has been passionate about our state. I have not always agreed with the methods or the policies in terms of promoting the state, but there is no doubt that his interest was in seeing South Australia succeed. For his family and for the whole of the state, that was a motivating factor in most of what David Ridgway did.

The PRESIDENT: I remind the leader that he is the Hon. Mr Ridgway.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Hon. David Ridgway—and I am assuming that whatever process needs to happen to retain the honourable title, the Hon. David Ridgway did those things.

The PRESIDENT: I understand that.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The still Hon. Ridgy, sir, as I said, was first elected in 2002 and held many different shadow ministry positions, shadow ministry appointments, over those long 16 years. The full decade when the Hon. Ridgy was a shadow minister spanned many different portfolio areas including the environment, planning, police, resources, assisting multicultural affairs, small business, housing and then in areas such as tourism where he went on to serve as minister when the Liberals won the election in 2018.

The Hon. Ridgy was always good-natured and I think many in this chamber have enjoyed spending time with him regardless of what side of politics they were on. The Hon. David Ridgway always had time for a chat or a catch-up, and I think, as is often the case in this place, everyone appreciated that.

I will note that the Hon. David Ridgway still owes me \$50 and unless he can get up and claim otherwise that will stand as a claim in this chamber. We had a bet about whether he would be a

minister by the time the election rolled around, and (a) because he is now this state's Agent General in London but (b) because he was not a minister before that, he clearly owes me \$50, and I will spend the remainder of my time in this parliament—as the Hon. Robert Lucas does about bets he has made with members of the opposing side—bringing this up very often. The \$50 that the Hon. Ridgy owes me might even be the subject of a motion at some stage in this chamber.

He served his party and his state with distinction. I think that will continue and I think if any of us from this chamber have a need with work to find ourselves in London I am sure he will extend the hospitality for which he has become famous.

The Hon. T.T. NGO (16:36): I stand to support this motion. I, too, have a few nice things to say about the Hon. David Ridgway. I first met the Hon. David Ridgway in 2008 at the first of many Vietnamese community functions that he attended. I got to know him well, along with other honourable members in this place, when I entered parliament after the March 2014 election. Even though the Hon. David Ridgway was from the opposite side, some might say the dark side, I found him to always be friendly and helpful. One thing I found especially pleasant about the Hon. David Ridgway was that he did not take things too personally. Once he became a minister, whenever I needed advice or assistance from his ministerial portfolios, he was always willing to help.

A few years ago, when he held the trade, tourism and investment portfolio, he told me that he was visiting regional councils and visiting Streaky Bay over the weekend. As a fun gesture from me I jokingly asked the Hon. David Ridgway if he could grab me some oysters on the way back. Following that conversation, one Sunday afternoon I got a text from David asking me for my address in Kilburn.

Within an hour he was at the front of my place with five dozen oysters. He said that he had to drop one of his staff off near my place and it was easy to pop these oysters to me so that I could have them for dinner that night. I know my wife was very impressed with what the Hon. David Ridgway did. The Hon. Terry Stephens often jokingly told people, when he introduced me to new people, that I run the government because I got the minister to get me some oysters and drop them off at my place, so I actually run the government and not him.

In April last year, right at the start of the pandemic, everyone thought the world was coming to an end. State and federal governments were announcing financial packages to help Australians out with jobs. One group which contributed so much to the Australian economy over the past few decades was not eligible for this assistance because they were not Australian citizens. This group, the international students who contributed over \$40 billion to the Australian economy and over \$1 billion to the South Australian economy, had been left to fend for themselves. At a time when we had shut our city down as we struggled to deal with the spread of COVID, many of those international students were scared and worried about their life and felt abandoned by Australia for not helping them in a time of need.

I was happy to stand in this place and was one of the first members of parliament in Australia to speak out about the plight of international students, how this country was ignoring their needs, and I called on our state government to help out. With good fortune, the Hon. David Ridgway happened to be in the chamber listening to my speech. Afterwards, in the corridor, he told me that he agreed with what I said. He then said to leave it with him and he would work with his department and the Treasurer to come up with a financial package for our international students.

A couple of weeks later, a financial package worth more than \$14 million was announced by the Hon. David Ridgway. We were the first state in Australia to act and provide financial assistance to our international students. Other states then followed. South Australia's financial package created a sense of goodwill. Our international students appreciated that they were the first to get government help.

When the country opens up and travel can be a part of life once again, I think South Australia's support can become a selling point for enticing international students to our state, because we were the first state to reach out to our international students, showing them that they, too, are members of this state's community. I posted my speech on Facebook, and I had many positive comments. In fact, the post received over 100,000 interactions. Many international students

living in South Australia said they were so proud that they lived in the place that was the first to offer them help.

This is probably something I know the Hon. David Ridgway would be very proud of. He said to me a few weeks later, when all other states were doing the same thing, 'We can often achieve so much when we work together in bipartisanship.' With that kind of positive attitude, I am sure the Hon. David Ridgway will effect positive changes that will benefit our state in his role as Agent General. I wish him all the best in his new role.

The PRESIDENT: I call the Hon. Mr Stephens.

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS: Hear, hear!

The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (16:43): With the Treasurer's enthusiastic approval of my standing to make a small contribution, I want to tell him he is going to be disappointed from the outset because there will be things that we know that I will not be including in my speech. In 100 years, when people are trawling through *Hansard*, there will be things that they do not need to know about the illustrious career of the Hon. David Ridgway and myself.

My first encounter with the Hon. David Ridgway was more than 20 years ago when we were both, as some of the older heads would say, young colts going around for preselection. Both of us were fortunate to have a wonderful, now former, member in the Hon. Caroline Schaefer as one of our mentors. The Hon. Caroline Schaefer organised a meeting between these two young colts, one from the South-East and one basically from Eyre Peninsula.

She told both of us that we would get on fabulously well and, should we be successful, would be good friends within the parliament and outside. We met on The Parade for a coffee one Sunday morning, I think, from memory. I was quite enthusiastic, looking forward to meeting this guy, who had already been acknowledged by some supporters within the Liberal Party that he was going to be higher up the ticket than I was. He had been a vice-president of the party and I was a nobody from Whyalla who had run a couple of times in Giles, so I was very comfortable with that scenario.

However, the Hon. David Ridgway was looking to cover all bases, so he had walked into this meeting and it was like the gunfight at the O.K. Corral. I was waiting for him to draw at 10 paces. He came with a very guarded attitude, but I am pleased to say that did not last too long. I made it quite clear that I was very pleased to support him ahead of me. He had done much more work with regard to positioning himself for the Legislative Council and, to be honest, I was almost an accident. The Hon. Mr Lucas has a bit to answer for my position in this place. So that was my first encounter with the Hon. Mr Ridgway, and we have been pretty solid friends ever since that day. We have shared plenty of good times and really supported each other through the lows of the long, dark 16 years in opposition.

The Hon. Mr Lucas has touched on the Hon. Mr Ridgway's maiden speech. Unfortunately for those of you who were not here at the time, you possibly will never know what we are alluding to, but at one point the Hon. Mr Ridgway was talking about his love of Bordertown, some of the things that happened in Bordertown, including the meatworks, where he was really pleased to be talking about how the meatworks had moved on from traditional lamb cuts to more exotic delicacies, shall we say. It was at that time—and God bless *Hansard*, because they certainly made that speech look not unusual—for those of us here at the time, that the temperature in this place rose quite considerably.

The Hon. Mr Ridgway's work ethic—and some people may not have acknowledged this, or known—was quite incredible. He almost never made himself unavailable to attend any function or event on behalf of the party or one of his colleagues. I am grateful, too, because he would drag me along on many occasions to all sorts of different events that either he had been invited to or he was representing somebody at and I would go as his plus one, but he also many times, if I was in a position where I could take a plus one, came along and attended with me. I am sure people in this place would acknowledge that two MPs working in a room are better than one MP working in a room.

Between us we both spent probably as many nights out with each other as we did with our wives over his parliamentary career. One of the things he always made well known was that, if he

was available and somebody needed somebody to do something, he was never shy in putting up his hand and doing the work that perhaps some people may not have been prepared to do.

I will always remember a couple of little truisms that David gave to me, and one certainly has inspired me. One of his claims to fame was that, at a reasonably young age, he was the president of Rural Youth. I will not go into Rural Youth too much. I am not really sure that I understand Rural Youth, other than that they seem to do a hell of a lot of partying and there is a fair bit of fun and frivolity involved. However, it was a reasonably important position, and he was about 22 years of age at the time.

He was telling me how he told his father, who has sadly passed away, 'Dad, I am a bit concerned. I am not quite sure I am ready for this role. It's an important role. We are proud rural people.' He had quite a bit of respect for the organisation. His wonderful father said to him, 'Son, I had been to war, was back and demobbed. I had been flying missions for the RAAF for four years and by 22 I was back from war, so I think that you can stand up and get on with it,' which is exactly what the Hon. Mr Ridgway did. That is something that I will always remember that he told me, and it is really quite inspiring.

The other one that you may or may not know is that he used to say to me all the time, 'This place is full of rumours and innuendos and all sorts of stories that fly around the place, even outside, in the many things that we attend.' He said, 'Terry, if you haven't seen it or you haven't heard it, it didn't happen. If you just take that approach, you won't get yourself in any trouble.' I have always tried to remember that. I am not sure that he always abided by that himself, but that was his advice to me and I certainly listened at the time.

I have explained that he had an enormous work ethic. He certainly was a fabulous networker, and is still a fabulous networker, and he is obviously quite ideal for the role that he has. With Brexit happening, I am sure that there are opportunities for South Australian exporters, which will certainly mean jobs for South Australians, and that obviously should be our key focus. He is absolutely the right man in the right place at the right time, and I am sure he will do a fantastic job because, as I said, his skill is networking. The people that he has met along the journey, the friendships that he has made, the connections that he has made, and warmly so, I am sure will serve South Australia in great stead.

I want to thank David. I will explain that over the years my Liberal parliamentary colleagues have given it to us a fair bit because we used to share rooms at what were our 'love-ins', which were our conferences. From the time that we came into parliament together, we could not see any sense in paying for a room ourselves when we would probably be up late in the evening, we would probably enjoy a fair bit of social intercourse with those who were around us and by the time we headed to bed all we would want to do was snore.

The only trick was that I always had to have earplugs and make sure that I was asleep before the Hon. Mr Ridgway, who, God bless his lovely wife Meredith, is a fair snorer when he has had a couple of reds. Two country boys, we just never could understand why you would pay full cop for a room when you could share the cost of a room and at the end of the day all you are doing is getting to bed late in the evening and snoring anyhow.

I thank David for all of those trips that we did around South Australia, visiting constituents and various groups and various people. I will say that when we would travel through the countryside together, he would always tell me about the crops: 'Left, right, that's this, this is that, peas, beans.' I would not have any idea, and I am not sure that half the time he had any idea either, but I could not really challenge him on it. I take my small amount of rural knowledge from his agricultural background.

With that, I wish David and Meredith and their families all the very best for the future. I know that he will do a great job for us in the United Kingdom and I look forward to seeing the fruits of his efforts for making South Australia a better place.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (16:53): I rise to very briefly say a few words, because it is very rare that I agree with the Treasurer, but I will get to that in a second.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens: You should do it more.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: It will be rare. I could also agree with the Hon. Terry Stephens in his feedback that the Hon. David Ridgway was an incredible networker, and I am sure he still is. I think the first time I met the Hon. Terry Stephens and the Hon. David Ridgway was at a Tour Down Under event. I thought, 'These guys know how to have a bit of fun.' I have always appreciated going to events from there and always being made to feel welcome and always up for a good laugh.

People do say, outside this building, that politicians never get along but I think that more often than not we do. When the Hon. Rob Lucas was giving his speech earlier in August he was coming out with a few lines and I was thinking, 'This is everything I was writing down, my thoughts.' He is a great networker. He is always able to be friendly and:

...even through his long years in opposition, is that the Hon. David Ridgway is a remarkable networker. He has the capacity to speak with people from all sorts of backgrounds, the capacity to put them at ease...

I was thinking all the time, 'I agree with all these points.' They are really good points to gathering information. It was at that point that I started replaying everything I ever said to the Hon. David Ridgway because maybe he was just using me to gather information, which I am sure he was not. He was a good guy to hang out with and I do appreciate him taking the time to catch up and share his thoughts about his involvement in the party and how he got involved through Young Liberal and everything else in between.

The chamber is not the same without him. We miss his banter and his lines of, 'Chuck him out.' It is just not quite the same without that or having to send messages to try to wake him up when he was falling asleep in the back corner. I do wish him and Meredith all the very best in his new role. He was very proud of his family and always spoke very highly of them and I do think you can judge a good character by that. I do wish David and Meredith all the very best in London.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (16:56): I rise on behalf of SA-Best and my colleague the Hon. Connie Bonaros to speak about the Hon. David Ridgway, or 'rambunctious Ridgy' is I think a definition that perhaps sums him up, that he is uncontrollably exuberant and boisterous. It sums up his personality: a larger than life individual, always with a ready smile and a pretty loud sense of humour. Gregarious could also be another word used to describe him because a gregarious person is somebody who is fond of company and sociable. I think that also expresses the Hon. David Ridgway.

The Hon. Terry Stephens mentioned the Hon. David Ridgway's association with Rural Youth, and I actually have a faint recollection of writing something in *The News* when I was working as the Rural Youth reporter for the paper. It was one of the first jobs that young journalists received and certainly his name rings a bell. I remember on one of the trips that we undertook with David, he explained the history of his family in South Australia and it was quite a fascinating history. He also pointed out to us a property where his ancestors had lived. He was quite proud of his rural background but he seemed to be more accustomed to the life of a city slicker.

I certainly wish him well and his lovely wife, Meredith, and also his family. He is very proud of his family. I am sure he will do a great job in the Old Dart representing the interests of South Australia, just as his predecessor Bill Muirhead did. It is an important job—lots of talkfests and long lunches and dinners and important deals to be done—post-Brexit and also with a trade deal to be done with Australia.

I note that famous English cricket legend Ian Botham, Lord Ian Botham I must say, is now Britain's trade envoy to Australia. I am sure that David is going to have a lot to do with the 'Beefy' baron, who is winging his way to Australia at the moment because he will be part of the Ashes coverage on the Seven television network. Baron 'Beefy' also happens to have a very fond interest in South Australian wines, particularly from the Barossa Valley, so I am sure he will have a lot in common with David.

Even though we crossed paths briefly in my journalistic years, I obviously got to know David much better in the past three and a bit years since I was elected. I must say that I often enjoyed his company, particularly when he was ensconced in the office down the corridor from where we are at the moment.

He also lived near me at Torrens Park. I recall him spinning a story to me one day, but I did not know what to make of it. He was telling me that he would walk from Torrens Park into Parliament House on a regular basis. The Hon. Jing Lee is nodding in agreement. I must say that there were a few times I went out looking for him, because I often travel down Unley Road, and I cannot say I ever actually spotted him undertaking that trek into the city.

The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I always used to look at his girth and I thought that I have not noticed it shrinking. I accept that he said it and that he did it and it seems to have won the support of the honourable members in here.

The PRESIDENT: I could remind the Hon. Mr Pangallo that standing order 193 says that you should not make injurious reflections; however, I now recall that that is about a current member. We are not discussing a current member, so I will let you continue.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Thank you, Mr President. I do not mean it in a disparaging way. As I said, I certainly enjoyed his company and his great sense of humour. He was an approachable person and I respected his views and the advice he gave me as a novice MP.

Sitting back during question time, particularly when he was a minister, I admired the way he used to take stick, particularly from the honourable Leader of the Opposition in this place. He seemed to take it quite well when it was dished out to him. I think it is a measure of his character that he was able to do that and then walk out of this place and still be on good talking terms with his colleagues.

I look forward to the day that our paths should cross again, should I be fortunate enough to make it to London and enjoy his bonhomie, which I guess is another word that sums up his personality—cheerful, friendly and genial. I wish the Hon. David Ridgway all the best in his new appointment in the UK and look forward to catching up with him again.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (17:03): I would like to very briefly pay tribute to the Hon. David Ridgway. I knew David for the 15½ years that I have been in parliament. I took a number of trips with David around the state. You get to know a person very well while you are on a trip. You get to know things about a person that you would not know just by sitting in parliament.

I remember that one day we went to Baird Bay. We were on a boat where you see seals and all sorts of things. I stripped off and jumped in. I was swimming around and having a great time, but I did not know that he had jumped in as well. He had skin-coloured jocks on. I was swimming and all of a sudden this white thing went past me and it actually shook me for a minute to think what it was. I actually thought it was a dugong. I told David that, and I must say he was not very happy with that comparison.

At another time, he and I went to look at the problems with windmills near Peterborough. We stayed in a house and the whole idea was to listen for any negative effects. I must say, it was probably a futile exercise, but anyway I woke up in the morning with Hendrik Gout putting a TV camera in my face.

It was not very flattering, getting out of bed with a tracksuit and a jumper on. Lo and behold, two years later I see it on *Today Tonight* airing a bit of a negative story. There is me in bed, near the Hon. David Ridgway.

Ridgy was at his best when he was meeting with people. He got a bit of flak when he was a minister because he did quite a bit of travel, but I am sure he represented Australia well. He has a unique personality. I could think of no better person than the Hon. Mr Ridgway to represent this state in England. I wish him and Meredith and the family all the best in their future careers, and I look forward, if we can get over to London in the next three years, to catching up with him.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I. Pnevmatikos.

Bills

FIREARMS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

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

At 17:07 the council adjourned until Wednesday 13 October 2021 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***VICTIMS OF CRIME PAYMENTS**

16 The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (24 August 2021). Will the Attorney-General advise:

1. Do the state's model litigant rules apply to private sector corporations including private schools?
2. Does the government, the minister, the department or any other agencies monitor out of court payments for child sexual and other abuse cases?
3. Was the Attorney-General aware that the former Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Jim McDowell, was a member of the board of governors of St Peter's College while he was chief executive?
4. Is it correct that exemplary damages cannot be awarded to abuse victims, including victims who were children at the time of the abuse, once the perpetrators have received a criminal conviction?
5. If the above is correct, is it the case that there is a powerful disincentive and disinterest that operates for compensation of abuse victims to report crimes committed to the police?

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Attorney-General has advised:

1. No. The South Australian government's Model Litigant Guidelines do not apply to private entities, such as private schools.
2. No. Out of court payments may be made to claimants as a result of private agreements between parties. If the South Australian government is not a party to such an agreement, it does not have access to the details.
3. The Attorney-General was aware that Mr Jim McDowell was at some point on the board of governors of St Peter's College.
4. Exemplary damages can be awarded in exceptional circumstances to punish and deter a defendant, in addition to general damages (compensation) for loss suffered by a plaintiff. The High Court of Australia has held that exemplary damages cannot be awarded where the defendant has already received substantial punishment under the criminal law. However, aggravated damages can be awarded on top of general damages where the perpetrator's conduct is particularly egregious and has a particularly harmful effect on the plaintiff.
5. No. Exemplary damages usually only form a small portion of the overall quantum awarded to a plaintiff. A criminal conviction does not bar compensation for loss and should not act as a disincentive for victims to report crimes.

ADNYAMATHANHA HERITAGE SITE

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (25 August 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Premier and the Minister for Environment and Water have advised: Every effort has been made to follow due process regarding the works at this site.

The park is jointly managed by the state government and the traditional owners through the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park Co-management Board. Of the board's eight members, four are Adnyamathanha community representatives nominated by the Adnyamathanha Traditional Lands Association (ATLA). The board is established under a co-management agreement and ensures the Adnyamathanha community is fully involved in decisions regarding management of the park.

Work at Arkaroo Rock is being undertaken by the Department for Environment and Water (DEW), including upgrades to the existing car park area, which have commenced following appropriate investigations that did not identify any heritage sites in the car park area. Further proposed works including walking trail infrastructure and developing a new viewing platform at the rock art site, which have not commenced, are being progressed under the notifiable acts process as required under the co-management agreement. DEW is also continuing to engage the Adnyamathanha community members through their community representatives and Adnyamathanha rangers in this work.

To ensure there were no known heritage sites in the car park areas, DEW completed a search of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (DPC-AAR) central archives. This search identified no known heritage sites within the footprint of the existing car park area or proposed works.

DEW also notified ATLA through its special administrator, pursuant to the Indigenous land use agreement and consulted extensively with the board on the proposed works well before work commenced in the car park area. ATLA did not respond, while the ATLA representatives on the board approved the works in the car park to proceed.

When works commenced at the car park, DEW engaged Adnyamathanha rangers to observe all ground-disturbing works in the car park area to ensure the Adnyamathanha community had assurance there were no heritage sites or objects being disturbed in the area of the works.

Neither DEW or the ATLA representatives on the board were aware of potential damage to cultural heritage at the car park location until concerns were raised by the Adnyamathanha Yura Language and Heritage Association (AYLHA). DEW ceased work on the car park until AYLHA's concerns could be investigated.

DEW is currently engaging with all parties, including ATLA, through its special administrator and AYLHA to conduct an onsite heritage inspection prior to any works recommencing on the car park. This is to ensure all concerns are addressed.

In June 2021, DEW commenced the process for a section 23 permit under the act for all other proposed works at the rock art site, including construction of the new viewing platform and protective barrier, as the rock art site itself is a registered Aboriginal site. No works will commence on these aspects of the project until approval is granted pursuant to the act.

LAND TAX

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (8 September 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Attorney-General has advised:

The Valuer-General determines the average percentage change in site values in accordance with section 8A(4)(a), (b) and (c) of the Land Tax Act 1936. Land Tax Act 1936 section 8A:

- (4) For the purposes of subsections (2a), (3) and (3b), the average percentage change in site values for a particular financial year will be determined by the Valuer-General after the application of the following principles:
- (a) in determining the average percentage change in site values for the financial year, the Valuer-General will take into account changes in the site value of land according to valuations applying under the Valuation of Land Act 1971 with respect to a period of 12 months expiring on a date to be determined by the Valuer-General, being a date that falls on or before 30 June in the financial year immediately preceding the relevant financial year;
 - (b) the average percentage change in site values must take into account changes in the site value of residential land and changes in the site value of other land (as identified by the Valuer-General), with the averaging being undertaken in accordance with a method determined to be appropriate by the Valuer-General after taking into account the provisions of this act and the Valuation of Land Act 1971;
 - (c) for the purposes of paragraphs (a) and (b)—
 - (i) vacant land zoned for residential purposes will be treated as residential land and vacant land zoned for any other purpose (other than primary production) will be treated as other land; and
 - (ii) land used for primary production must be excluded.

Properties are revalued annually by the Valuer-General with a date of valuation of 1 January each year. The latest calculation of the average percentage change in site values of 7 per cent therefore considered the movement of values determined as at 1 January 2020 to those determined as at 1 January 2021.

The Hon. John Darley MLC makes reference to Core Logic figures. It is believed that the figures quoted are from the Core Logic publication, Hedonic Home Value Index, released on 1 September 2021. This publication shows index results as at 31 August 2021 and considers only residential properties.

	Capitals			
	Sydney	Melbourne	Brisbane	Adelaide
	All Dwellings			
Month	1.8%	1.2%	2.0%	1.9%
Quarter	6.4%	4.0%	6.1%	5.3%
YTD	19.8%	12.4%	15.3%	12.8%
Annual	20.9%	13.1%	18.3%	17.9%
Total return	23.8%	16.0%	23.1%	22.7%
Gross yield	2.5%	2.8%	4.0%	4.1%
Median value	\$1,039,514	\$769,968	\$612,377	\$522,180

Core Logic, Hedonic Home Value Index, 1 September 2021.

An extract from the report shows that the home value index for dwellings indicated a 17.9 per cent increase in the last 12 months (1 Sep 2020 to 31 Aug 2021) and a 5.3 per cent increase in the last three months (1 Jun 2021 to 31 Aug 2021). It is also noted that those percentages relate to improved properties, not site values as is required by the Land Tax Act 1936.

The latest Core Logic figures have a time frame for the annual movement that does not match that used by the Valuer-General in determining the site values for the purposes of section 8A of the Land Tax Act 1936.

Based on this advice, the Premier is satisfied that DEW followed the correct process prior to commencing work at the car park site.

SURPLUS LAND DISPOSAL

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (9 September 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Planning and Local Government has advised:

- Premier and Cabinet Circular 114—Government Real Property Management (PC114) describes cabinet policy on the utilisation, purchase and disposal of government real property.
- PC114 includes policies and procedures designed to assist agencies to, amongst other things, enable ready identification of underutilised or surplus property from an agency perspective and assessing, from an agency, whole-of-government and state strategic perspective, the merits of retaining or disposing of property.
- Under PC114 government agencies are required to regularly evaluate their ownership and/or occupation of real property and this is the context for the current review.
- In accordance with the requirements of PC114, Attorney-General's Department has been undertaking a review of all land within the Minister for Planning and Local Government's portfolio.
- Total holdings consist of more than 1,000 hectares of land throughout various areas of the state—including within the metropolitan area and regions.
- PC114 provides mechanisms to ensure that sites of strategic significance are efficiently identified and assessed to ensure maximum community benefit from government tenure and use of its property holdings.
- The current review process is expected to be finalised in the coming months.

HILLS PARKING

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (22 September 2021).

The Hon. R.I. LUCAS (Treasurer): The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport advised:

The possibility of using the land for a park-and-ride facility was not considered to be a viable option due to its distance from existing public transport services. The land is located approximately 300 metres from stop 46 on Mount Barker Road, which is the main route for services to the city. Any redirection of the bus services that use Mount Barker Road to access the parcel of land would be inefficient for existing passengers adding time and cost for these services.

As part of the Transport Network Planning Studies Program, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport is investigating options for expanded car parking for bus commuters in the Adelaide Hills.