

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 27 February 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Bills

ELECTORAL (PRISONER VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (10:32): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY (DOMESTIC VIOLENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 February 2019.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (10:32): This is a bill that adds domestic violence as a ground for discrimination under the Equal Opportunity Act 1984, which can be considered by the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity should a complaint be made.

In South Australia, discrimination is against the law when it is based on a particular personal characteristic or ground specified in the act, including age, association with a child, caring responsibilities, disability, gender identity, intersex relationships, marital status, pregnancy, race, religious dress, sex, sexual orientation, spouse or partner's identity, and happens in an area of public life and causes loss or humiliation.

The opposition, in presenting the bill for our consideration, has stated that the nexus of this bill is the fact that the Equal Opportunity Act already provides protection in a range of areas; however, it does not currently provide protection for people exercising domestic or family violence. The act as it currently stands does not have the carve-outs of any specific victim of crime. By way of background for the parliament, the now Labor opposition flagged this bill previously and progressed some work on it back in 2015 and 2017. Needless to say, no reform occurred, with concerns no doubt being raised by the then attorney-general in carving out specific groups of the community.

Domestic violence is unquestionably a scourge on our society. I have claimed for decades that rape, for example, is not a sexual offence: it is an act of violence. I maintain that position, that violence, whether in a domestic setting or not, whether a victim is a member of the family or not, is unacceptable. Violence being perpetrated by a person who is in an intimate relationship with somebody is no exception. It is a crime and, from my perspective—and I think I share it with members on both sides of the house—should remain a crime. It should not be diminished as anything less than a very serious crime.

This government has already taken swift action in terms of domestic violence reform since forming government. The new strangulation law, which I reported on in the parliament yesterday, has had many cases of prosecution in the less than a month it has been operating. There have been 37 charges in 26 days. There is a tougher stance on intervention breaches, the implementation of the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme and the DV round tables, to name a few.

Just this morning, I have come from the launch of the Voices of Change pilot here in South Australia, a combined initiative of Women's Safety Services SA and the commonwealth. They are

piloting this in New South Wales and Western Australia as we speak. I met a number of women of varying ages who have been trained and given special support to be able to speak up about their circumstances. They are better able to aid our media and any of us in a leadership position to hear their story. They are able to articulate it in a safe manner and do so in the clear knowledge that they are motivated to ensure that our daughters and granddaughters will largely not be exposed to this behaviour and how they can best deal with it in the future. I thank them for that.

I acknowledge Lauren Novak's attendance there this morning. She has been a powerful advocate as a member of the media. I wish some others, including male journalists, would take this up. I do not doubt for one moment that they are familiar with it. They live in families and communities. They understand that this is something that their friends or family are also exposed to. It is time that we have initiatives that will make a practical difference to ensure that we minimise this scourge on our community.

Work between the Office for Women and the Attorney-General's office is also occurring to educate our business community in the workplace, those who might be alert to and be able to identify a work colleague who may be the victim of domestic violence. They might also be able to identify a colleague in their workplace, their community or their friendship group who is perpetrating abuse or financial deprivation of others, and I think the White Ribbon program has been a powerful advocate for this. This is the type of work that is very important for us to bring to the fore.

In talking to and helping to educate the business community, it is also important to appreciate the significant impact on their employees and the workforce as a whole. It is not just the victim: it is other people in the workforce who may become knowledgeable about what has occurred, their responsibility to act, etc.

This is important work, and I commend the Hon. Michelle Lensink in another place, and indeed others who have advocated for change in this area to ensure that these initiatives are brought to the fore. The government stands firm that we must work with our business community to understand where any current impediments lie, how we can assist them with acknowledging and understanding domestic and family violence in its many forms and how they can assist vulnerable people.

The Office for Women acknowledges the importance of women's economic participation. They are currently developing a new key strategy, the employment and leadership strategy. The office will work closely with small and medium businesses in South Australia to support their role in women's participation and assist them to incorporate policies to support all employees affected by domestic violence in the workplace. Genuine change will only occur if businesses really understand their role in preventing and responding to domestic and family violence.

It is fair to say that leave—paid or otherwise—for a victim has been the subject of discussion and implementation in the public and private sectors. These are initiatives that are important to advance. At this point, the members of the government and I take the view, as part of the Liberal Party's position on this, that a lot of work is to be done. The work that was done as to the potential for abuse and discrimination in this area was raised by the member, who is the mover of this, who I think for a short time sat on the 2016 inquiry of the Social Development Committee. I read that report, then I had a brief viewing of it again the other day. They touched on it, but we do need some data to deal with it.

As I said, the report suggested the option to consider amending the Equal Opportunity Act. I stand here in this parliament as the legacy of someone who started equal opportunity in this state, the Hon. David Tonkin, who was brought up by a single mother. When he was in opposition, he introduced equal opportunity legislation for the first time in Australia. To the credit of Don Dunstan, when he came into office he perpetuated that into legislation, and I am the beneficiary of some of his advice and counsel.

I applaud all the initiatives that are raised by the opposition, in particular that of the mover of this bill. I know that she has a personal commitment to try to expose weaknesses in our laws and to do all she can to protect women and children in these circumstances. We have had a look at the bill. It is not in a form that I think is going to provide protection. I think there is a weakness in the provision as to those who are to be excluded, particularly the attempt that is made to exclude perpetrators from

being able to get access to this. For example, if they were claiming discrimination in the workplace because they were identified as a recipient of an intervention order, an employer might say, 'We do not want you here anymore. You are obviously somebody who is not consistent with what we want in the workplace because you beat up your wife.'

These are the sorts of things we have to work through and look at carefully. But if we are going to deal with victims of crime, is it just going to be dealing largely with women in the workplace or is it going to be all victims of crime? Do victims of crime include a young person who does not get a shift anymore at the local McDonald's because she has been a victim in that circumstance by virtue of being exposed to family violence in her family household? These are examples we have to look at. I do not question the merit, the passion and the personal commitment of the mover. I think the bill in its current form is ill-advised. We have a lot of work to do in this area. I indicate that the government will be opposing the bill.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is called to order.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (10:43): I rise today to support the Equal Opportunity (Domestic Violence) Amendment Bill 2019, introduced into this house by the member for Reynell in her capacity as the shadow minister for women. I want to take this opportunity to thank her for her advocacy in this area. It is not just since she has been elected to parliament. Like many in this house, she has raised this issue through her previous roles and shared her own lived experience because it was important for her to show leadership and to make sure that we continue to address this concern.

This amendment bill will provide people experiencing domestic violence, who are discriminated as a result of that experience, with an avenue to seek redress. We are only at the beginning of truly understanding the damage and trauma that occur as a result of domestic violence. Both state and federal governments are committed to making a substantial cultural shift in Australia.

However, only recently have we really considered the damage and trauma that domestic violence causes and begun to understand that domestic violence is not just physical abuse; it can be financial, emotional, sexual, stalking behaviours and control. Most importantly, as a nation we are committed not only to supporting people who are experiencing DV but also to stopping it at the start by identifying how we act, how we speak and how we accept disrespectful behaviour.

The amendment before us today layers the response from a mature society that recognises that the impact of DV is not just confined to someone's private life behind closed doors. As we respond by assisting someone who is experiencing domestic violence, it can often involve the health system, police, the courts and, potentially, child protection. Today, this amendment acknowledges the impact on their employment. This is a time when we are more aware of domestic violence and when we encourage workers and employees to be open about their situation. They do so with the belief that it will result in support from the workplace.

We must be aware that it may, in fact, result in a different outcome, making the individual wish that they had withheld from the workplace the issues that they were or are experiencing. This is an amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act 1984, enabling a protection or remedy for the circumstances when people experiencing domestic violence can be subjected to discrimination in the course of their employment. At this time, the commissioner has no scope in the act to hear these matters because the experience of domestic violence is not a ground for discrimination.

It was an absolute honour for me to be the minister for the status of women in the Weatherill Labor government. During this time, the premier promoted an awareness of domestic violence in the public service, with all departments undergoing White Ribbon training. We also introduced additional leave for public servants experiencing domestic violence. In South Australia, we have supported national organisations such as ANROWS and Our Watch to invest in research to understand the impact of domestic violence. Through policy, legislation and working collaboratively with departments, through the Multi-Agency Protection Service and Violence Against Women Collaborations, we are making a difference.

In addition, there were changes to intervention orders, changes to the Residential Tenancies Act, programs such as Staying Home Staying Safe and the addition of a magistrate. I acknowledge that this work is being continued by the current state government. We heard this morning about recently passed regulation laws and the continuation of work done around Clare's Law, which is now in operation. Everyone in this house knows that that is something that needs to change. It will only change when we stand up and speak out.

One of the key issues where I think there is still much for us to understand and develop is the impact on someone who has experienced domestic violence and what they have to do to rebuild their life. The research in this area shows that people are often impacted for many years after an episode of domestic violence that might have gone on for some time, that might have been short and intense or that might have resulted in incredible loss of economic control and choice.

We know that financial tactics are often used, but they are less recognised than physical and emotional aspects of domestic violence. There is considerable loss of wealth on separation if someone is to leave. Often, what is not understood—and I guess some of the case examples included employment—is when a partner comes to the workplace, causes an issue and embarrasses that person or threatens violence.

We also know that if someone has to move very quickly from their current home to another place of safe haven, it is very costly to that individual. We know that if there are disagreements around child support they have less income for their own children. We know that the research shows us that often people leaving a situation have to seek out welfare support to feed their own families.

Amendments such as the one before us today acknowledge that we still have a long way to go to thoroughly understand the ramifications of the damage that domestic violence can cause. I am rising because I would like the parliament to support this bill, and I have to say that I am incredibly disappointed to hear the words from the Attorney-General today, someone whom I consider to be incredibly progressive and supportive of women's issues. I hope that we move forward in this area particularly. I would have encouraged her to make an amendment if she did not feel that this was adequate. That opportunity was presented to her today.

When we think about the Equal Opportunity Act, we know that it has changed over time. We know that it looks at discrimination around sex, age, disability and race, and that it also pays attention to concerns around issues of discrimination on the basis of marital status, religious affiliations and caring responsibilities, but we are a mature society that knows there will come times for change, and today is one of those. That is why I rise today to support this bill and ask the house for its support for this amendment.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (10:52): I would like to commend the member for Reynell for her commitment and efforts to speak out against domestic and family violence and all her work to address gender equality. Certainly, on this side of the house, and I think on both sides of the house, all ideas and feedback about potential measures to address domestic and family violence are welcomed and require due consideration.

At first glance, when I looked at the bill proposed by the member for Reynell, I thought the idea had merit. However, for any legislation to have maximum benefit, I believe that it requires consultation, awareness and education, backed by support and resources for those whom it impacts. Legislative reform works best when it serves as a prompt for a conversation in the community and when that conversation works to better inform and educate the community and bring them along on the journey. I know that some of that consultation occurred, and I did have a look at that back in 2016.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elder, pause for just one second. The member for Reynell continues to interject. She has been called to order. It would sadden me if I had to remove members during such an important topic this morning. The member for Elder has the call.

Mrs POWER: Back in 2016, the government at that time released a discussion paper regarding domestic violence and actually proposed the specific issue we are debating today. Interestingly, the feedback from both the community and the sector certainly did not show clear

support for it. In fact, in the community survey summary in one of the reports provided, where it says the community was asked what actions would best encourage victims to be more confident to seek support and assistance in the workplace and other environments, the specific question was: do you think domestic violence should be a ground for discrimination? Thirty per cent came back saying yes, 38 per cent came back saying no and 32 per cent came back saying unsure.

The results from the sector also support this. They suggested the following policies and actions to better support victims of domestic violence in the workplace: promotion of where to go to get help; employee assistance, in terms of a domestic violence worker; domestic violence leave, which is well underway; training for managers; and White Ribbon accreditation. The results of that consultation clearly show me that there is more work to be done in bringing the community along on this journey and certainly making sure that the business community, which would be most impacted by this, are involved in the consultation and that their voice is heard and considered. In doing so, there is an opportunity for education and awareness raising.

We all know the horrendous impact of domestic violence. We know the shocking statistics that mean we have far too many women living in fear and living in unsafe homes. We also know that as a community we can no longer turn away from this issue. I think our community has every right to ask and demand to know what their government is doing to address domestic and family violence. I think they want to know that their government is committed to genuinely addressing the issue, and I think for them that means they want a government that is not only talking about the issue and raising awareness but taking action.

Furthermore, when it comes to government, the community expects talk and action to be backed up by funding. This Marshall Liberal government has announced an \$11.9 million of new funding and investment to address domestic and family violence. People in the sector tell me that it has been a long time since they have seen such significant funding in this area. As the Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention, for me it is about looking at what we are doing to take action that translates into tangible, positive benefits. That is, what are we actually doing? Furthermore, it is not just about what we are doing; it is about the process with which we are addressing domestic and family violence. So it is not just what we are doing but also how we are doing it.

I am really proud that we are working alongside the sector, that we are working with the sector and the community. We have already had five domestic and family violence round tables and we have a sixth coming up in Murray Bridge. We have introduced a range of measures that will lead to tangible benefits for people in our community, such as the Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme, funding the crisis hotline 24 hours a day, seven days a week, funding our peak body—a range of things that have not been done to this point in time.

Finally, I hope that our differing opinions on the bill are not politicised and that the opposition does not go about suggesting that the Marshall Liberal government is not genuinely committed to addressing domestic and family violence or, even worse, scaremongering in our community. I think that would be absolutely outrageous. To date, we have been bipartisan on this issue, and all political spheres have together clearly sent a message to the community that domestic violence in any form is not acceptable. I hope we can continue that bipartisan approach so that together we can take action that leads to tangible benefits for people living in our community.

Ms Hildyard: Stop saying we didn't do anything.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is now warned. I remind her that she will have a right to speak at the conclusion of this debate, unless she is ejected beforehand. The member for Elizabeth has been waiting patiently.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:58): I am a patient man, sir. I will make a very brief contribution to the bill, but I must say that, like the member for Reynell, I am a little upset, too, about the comments of the member for Elder that suggested, if I understood them correctly, that during our term of government we did nothing in terms of domestic violence reform. I was always certainly very active, as were the member for Reynell, the former member for Enfield and, indeed, the former member for Cheltenham, as I am sure his successor will be. I should mention that the member for Stuart, too, has been quite active in this area.

Today, I was originally going to make quite a play of the very real bipartisanship that has existed across the chamber on this issue. There has been a certain measure of bipartisanship—unlike on many, many other issues—and it is disappointing to hear those comments.

I think we all generally accept that a lot of the reforms that have come from the Attorney-General in recent months have been very good reforms in the main, and they were reforms that were well on the agenda in the previous term of government. We can argue about how quickly they should have been brought forward, but to suggest that we were not considering them and working towards them is simply untrue—and there are many examples of that.

The bill we have before us today makes some very simple changes. It is not out of the ether: this has been brewing for a while. Again, we were talking about this in the previous term of government, and the member for Reynell has consulted widely with domestic violence groups. These are the people the member for Elder claims to be close to and talk to all the time. Surely they are telling her the same things, and surely they are telling the Attorney the same things on the occasions she might meet with them.

This is a very simple change. It protects women in the workplace, and it gives them protection they do not have. I cannot see any cost to this bill. I cannot see why we cannot just pass this today. At worst, it does nothing and at best it gives women the protection they need.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 20
Noes 23
Majority 3

AYES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	

Second reading thus negated.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (DRUG OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:07): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
 Noes 20
 Majority 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

SENTENCING (HOME DETENTION) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:12): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
 Noes 20
 Majority 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.

NOES

Hughes, E.J.
 Michaels, A.
 Piccolo, A.
 Szakacs, J.K.

Koutsantonis, A.
 Mullighan, S.C.
 Picton, C.J.
 Wortley, D.

Malinauskas, P.
 Odenwalder, L.K.
 Stinson, J.M.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

MOTOR VEHICLES (OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 February 2019.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:18): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
 Noes 20
 Majority..... 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
 Cregan, D.
 Gardner, J.A.W.
 Luethen, P.
 Murray, S.
 Pisoni, D.G.
 Teague, J.B.
 Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
 Duluk, S.
 Harvey, R.M. (teller)
 Marshall, S.S.
 Patterson, S.J.R.
 Power, C.
 Treloar, P.A.
 Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
 Ellis, F.J.
 Knoll, S.K.
 McBride, N.
 Pederick, A.S.
 Sanderson, R.
 van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.
 Boyer, B.I.
 Cook, N.F.
 Hughes, E.J.
 Michaels, A.
 Piccolo, A.
 Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.
 Brown, M.E. (teller)
 Gee, J.P.
 Koutsantonis, A.
 Mullighan, S.C.
 Picton, C.J.
 Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.
 Close, S.E.
 Hildyard, K.A.
 Malinauskas, P.
 Odenwalder, L.K.
 Stinson, J.M.

The SPEAKER: While the votes are being tallied, I want to remind members about standing order 172, 'Doors locked after three minutes':

The doors are closed and locked as soon after the lapse of three minutes as the Speaker directs. No Member may then enter or leave the Chamber until after the division.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, member for Lee and the Deputy Premier, please!

There being 23 ayes and 20 noes, with a majority of three for the ayes, the ayes have it.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of clarification, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of clarification from the member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On your recent ruling, Mr Speaker, on leaving the chamber during the division bills ringing, the Speaker informed the opposition that if members called for a quorum and left the building you would name those members. Does that apply only to the opposition, or does it apply equally across the chamber?

The SPEAKER: I did make a similar statement. I do not have the exact wording I used, but I can inform the house that I did inquire as to why a certain minister left after the beginning of the ringing of the bills. I note that he was here for the vote and that he went to the bathroom.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH (IMMUNISATION AND EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:25): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	23
Noes	20
Majority	3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowardrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.
Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.	

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

Motions

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:31): I move:

That this house—

- (a) welcomes the federal Liberal government's commitment to the \$90 billion shipbuilding program, which will secure the future of South Australia's defence industry for decades;
- (b) notes the significant work being undertaken by the South Australian government to ensure that South Australians can reap the maximum benefit of the shipbuilding program; and
- (c) notes the significant negative impacts on the current workforce as a result of the former federal Labor government's failure to progress any future shipbuilding contracts during its last term in office.

Together, we stand on the brink of a never before seen flow of work into South Australia. The only reason for this work coming is that the federal Liberal government has committed \$90 billion of taxpayers' money over the coming decade to modernise and strengthen Australia's naval forces, which will build a strong and sustainable sovereign Australian shipbuilding industry.

'Sustainable' is the key word that those opposite seem to have a tough time coming to grips with. Let us never forget that, during the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd federal Labor quagmire, zero—yes, zero, nought—vessels were commissioned, causing a massive hiatus in the work done at Osborne. Too often, those opposite conveniently forget that fact. In contrast, 54 separate vessels have been commissioned by the federal Liberal government. They will create a huge amount of work coming right here to South Australia, and particularly in the western suburbs of Adelaide, in which the electorate of Colton sits. This work will be here for generations to come and that is very good news for the people of our great state.

Currently, two offshore patrol vessels are being built by ASC Shipbuilding, with production directly employing up to 400 workers at Osborne and sustaining 600 indirect jobs. In addition, the redevelopment of the Osborne South Shipyard, a colossal structure where the Hunter class frigates will be assembled, is underway. In parallel, the Naval Shipbuilding College is also well underway. This is just the beginning. Naval shipbuilding is set to deliver an unparalleled economic benefit to our state. Around 5,200 direct jobs will be created through naval shipbuilding activities in South Australia plus more in the supply chain, the training sector, the education sector and other associated opportunities.

The next chapter in this book of good news is the landmark contract to build 12 Attack class submarines here in South Australia, a \$50 billion project. The Attack class submarines project is the largest defence procurement in our nation's history, which is something we should all be very proud of. The project will set a number of national firsts in scale, in size, in complexity and in duration.

Earlier this month, the Premier attended the Strategic Partnering Agreement signing in Canberra, where the agreement between the Australian government and the Naval Group was formalised. To date, work on the submarines had taken place under the design and mobilisation contract. The signing is a key step in the procurement process, with the agreement representing the contractual basis to the Attack class submarines project. The \$35 billion Hunter class—

Mr Malinauskas: What is the local content requirement?

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is called to order for interjecting something about local content.

Mr COWDREY: —frigate program, which will deliver nine antisubmarine frigates to the Royal Australian Navy, will create and sustain 1,500 direct jobs. In addition, 600 jobs are needed for the redevelopment of the Osborne South Shipyard and opportunities through that supply chain. These opportunities include many South Australian-based businesses—for instance, structural steel for the mammoth shipyard has been sourced by South Australian-based steelmaker, Liberty OneSteel in Whyalla. The opportunities around naval shipbuilding are not just in Osborne, Port Adelaide or more broadly in the western suburbs of Adelaide, or at Lot Fourteen. No, the opportunities that a strong and sustainable naval shipbuilding program provides will have positive impacts and flow-ons throughout our regions and our state.

The Defence Landing Pad, to be located in Adelaide's new innovation neighbourhood at Lot Fourteen, will provide a home for global companies to develop their Australian business strategies and plan local operations. It will add to our already thriving prime and associated contractor environment a new one-stop shop supporting international defence companies to establish in South

Australia that will drive defence industry investment. The Defence Landing Pad will enable international businesses to build relationships with South Australian businesses and create opportunities for our supply chain collaboration.

This is just one example of what the Marshall Liberal government is focused on: ensuring that we as a state make the most of the significant opportunity and investment that the federal government has made in naval shipbuilding here in South Australia. It is our obligation and our responsibility to ensure that we build capability, that we as a state make ourselves known for these skills and these industries and in the future seek further opportunities so that the impact of these investments lasts far beyond the already committed works.

The Minister for Industry and Skills tells us, sometimes ad nauseam, about the 20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships, but the program is incredibly important. It is important because we need to work hard and make sure that we have the requisite skills in place to deliver on these projects. It is an incredible opportunity for our young South Australians, our next generation. They have an opportunity that those before them did not.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to maximising the local benefits of this huge investment into our state and, as I said, this includes ensuring that we have the skilled workforce needed to deliver this project. Investing in training equipment like welding simulators and providing funding for additional work-based apprenticeships will help us create the skilled workforce that is required to fully capitalise on the naval shipbuilding program.

As I mentioned, the Naval Shipbuilding College, a fantastic new facility, is also underway and will play an important part in preparing our state for the jobs of the future and the skills that we need for our future. In addition to new apprenticeships and new traineeships, the Marshall Liberal government is also introducing the following measures to further develop South Australia's skilled workforce. We are working with industry to strengthen South Australia's VET system, including giving industry a stronger voice through the re-establishment of industry skills councils.

We are reforming the subsidised training list so that it is guided by industry and opening up funding contestability. We are establishing a new technical college in Adelaide's western suburbs, with a focus on defence and naval shipbuilding. The opportunities naval shipbuilding presents are not limited to advanced manufacturing, to engineering, to project management or to the trade sectors.

Just yesterday it was reported that the education and research sector is also already seeing benefits. It was reported that Adelaide University, Flinders University and the University of South Australia have signed an agreement with French company Naval Group, working on the subs, and France's National Centre for Scientific Research to fund an international research laboratory in Adelaide. The research lab will work on artificial intelligence, autonomous systems and ergonomics, also known as human factors. It is reported that Lot Fourteen, on the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site in the Adelaide CBD, is likely to play host to the lab, with hubs expected to be placed at each of the universities.

All vice-chancellors of the three universities are supporting this announcement. The Vice-Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, Professor Peter Rathjen, said that he welcomed further collaboration with CNRS, Naval Group and the defence industry. The Vice-Chancellor of Flinders University, Professor Colin Stirling, said that Adelaide was an ideal location for the laboratory. The Vice-Chancellor of University of South Australia, Professor David Lloyd, also welcomed the collaboration. Quite frankly, this level of collaboration between our universities is unheard of. The scale and breadth demonstrate the opportunities associated with naval shipbuilding and the commitment that the federal Liberal government has made.

Sadly, due to the federal Labor inaction I mentioned earlier, the Australian government has had to put in place, and backdate to 1 July 2018, the ASC Shipbuilding Structural Adjustment Program to support workers who, unfortunately, have been made redundant. Through this program, workers and their partners from ASC Shipbuilding or an affected supply chain business are supported through immediate access to intensive employment opportunities through Jobactive employment providers, including job search, résumé preparation, preparation for interviews, retaining, self-help facilities, skills assessments and career advice workshops. In addition, they have been provided with

assistance by way of a \$2,000 employment fund to assist workers to retain and obtain licences and tickets, as well as relocation assistance, if it is required.

As a member of this place, as a Liberal, as a South Australian and as a proud member of the western suburbs, I am incredibly proud of the commitment that the federal government has made by way of naval shipbuilding here in South Australia. I am incredibly proud to be part of the Marshall Liberal government, which is ensuring that we make the most of these opportunities for our local community and for our state.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (11:42): I move to amend the motion, as follows:

Delete paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) and substitute the following:

- (a) welcomes the 2016 defence white paper and the 2017 Naval Shipbuilding Plan and its commitment to developing a national naval shipbuilding capability;
- (b) calls on the federal government to secure a guaranteed level of Australian content in current and future shipbuilding programs to ensure the development of a national naval shipbuilding capability; and
- (c) calls for an independent naval shipbuilding authority to oversee the level of Australian content in future shipbuilding programs.

Over the years, all of us in this chamber have heard ad nauseam the sort of speech just given by the member for Colton. More recently, the South Australian public has become accustomed to both sides of politics trying to claim credit for the fact that we now have an extraordinary opportunity coming our way in the form of the submarine program, with the Future Submarines being built here in South Australia. Truth be told, both sides of politics have had a hand in this exercise. We know that, if it were not for the ferocious campaigning and fighting for our state, the Future Submarines build was going to Japan. That is now a commonly accepted fact.

Equally, we also know that on the back of that pressure coming from state and federal Labor, it was ultimately a federal conservative government that changed their tune on sending the work to Japan and instead opted for a sovereign capability here in Australia, with the Future Submarines being built in Australia by the Naval Group.

So let's dispense with the tired old arguments around who can claim credit for what in regard to future sub builds. Instead, let's just focus on what is actually going to happen for our state in the future because I think we are all very cognisant of the fact that this is now an extraordinary opportunity. This is not just a once in one generation opportunity but a once in multiple generations opportunity. This is not likely to be something that we are going to see come to our state again in the future. We must make sure that we do everything that is humanly possible to maximise the opportunity for this state and all the chances for jobs that are coming our way.

What we have seen over the last fortnight is a dropping of the ball when it comes to ensuring the delivery of jobs for our economy, because what we know is there is a legitimate contest. It will not surprise people that in France they view the awarding of the submarines contract to Naval as an extraordinary opportunity for the French economy. The Naval Group is celebrating this as a boon for French jobs. French politicians are celebrating this as a winning of the industrial Olympics for France.

So quite understandably, quite rationally, quite pragmatically, the French will do everything they can to maximise the opportunity of this \$50 billion Australian investment delivering for French jobs. It is equally important that we as a nation and that we as a state acknowledge that legitimate competition and do everything within our power to ensure that jobs will be delivered here in South Australia.

As the member for Colton referred to in his remarks a bit over a fortnight ago or thereabouts, a very important contract signing occurred interstate between the Commonwealth of Australia and the Naval Group: the strategic partnership agreement. The federal Minister for Defence, minister Pyne, was present, obviously, for the signing. Indeed, the Premier flew over for this photo opportunity. This event seemed to fly below the radar. One would have thought that the signing of the single biggest strategic partnership agreement for the largest procurement that our nation has ever entered into would have received a little more fanfare than just a singular quiet photo opportunity.

Quite a few of us in state and federal Labor were taken a little aback that there was not much fanfare associated with such a significant event, and now we are starting to learn why. As information has started to filter out about this strategic partnership agreement, we have learned that there are some very real and legitimate concerns about whether or not that agreement is going to deliver the level of local procurement that all of us in South Australia want to see and whether or not it is going to deliver the real jobs that we have been promised. Let's just have a quick look at the historical context.

With the Collins class submarine, the current class built here in South Australia on the back of advocacy from state Labor and delivered ultimately by federal Labor—but put that aside—we know that approximately 70 per cent of all the work that has occurred on the Collins class submarine has been done with local content. Look at another program: the Anzac class of frigates. We know that they have delivered about 80 per cent of local content for Australia.

So where are we at with the submarines—the future build—the largest ever capital project that the Commonwealth of Australia has ever entered into since Federation? What is the local procurement requirement in the strategic partnership agreement? What is the minimum local content standard? Well, we have learned that there is none—none. There is no local content requirement in the strategic partnership agreement from the information that we have garnered through forensic inquiries made in the Senate estimates process.

If that does not have everybody alarmed about how many jobs are actually going to come our way, then I am not too sure what will. Yes, it is true that there are clearly going to be jobs from the submarine build in South Australia, but are we maximising this opportunity? Are we doing everything we can? Where was the Premier's advocacy, where was this government's advocacy, in trying to secure a local content requirement?

We have heard nothing. We have heard nothing but complete silence, and that is borne out by the fact that there is no local content requirement within this agreement. There are plenty of people in local industry who are genuinely concerned about this, as well they should be. We know that if you are going to have a local content requirement in such a contract, it would exist in this one. That is what the pundits tell us. That is what one would reasonably expect—that an agreement of such importance would contain some reference to local content, yet we know there is none.

Of course, this comes on the back of some pretty large promises that have been made by the conservative side of politics when it comes to local content. We know that a 90 per cent number was thrown around that people were trying to have an association with. We know that minister Pyne himself referred to 60 per cent plus local content. In December last year, minister Pyne said that these jobs would be delivered through an assured level of local content. He told journalists, 'This will be a local build. A local build is defined as being around 60 per cent plus.'

So we expect this to be a local build, yet we find out what the Strategic Partnering Agreement actually says: nothing. It is utterly delusional for anyone in this place, particularly people who are responsible from the party or the government, to suggest that they can now guarantee that 60 per cent figure when the very agreement that underpins this contract has no reference to local content. What guarantees and assurances can the Premier of this state or the member for Colton give the people of South Australia that we are doing everything we can to maximise this opportunity? None, it turns out—none.

It is starting to demonstrate a bit of a pattern in the way this government behaves when dealing with the Commonwealth of Australia. It turns out that the modus operandi of this conservative Liberal government is to take their orders from their conservative Liberal mates. We have seen it on the Murray, the way they sold us out of our 450 gigalitres of upwater, and now we have seen it on the most important opportunity that this state has ever had in its history: being able to build the single largest procurement engagement exercise that has ever occurred in the history of Federation. Let it be known that on this side of the chamber we will do everything we can to fight for South Australian jobs, not capitulate and kowtow to their masters in Canberra.

Mr BROWN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:53): I rise to speak in support of the motion put by the member for Colton:

That this house—

- (a) welcomes the federal Liberal government's commitment to the \$90 billion shipbuilding program, which will secure the future of South Australia's defence industry for decades;
- (b) notes the significant work being undertaken by the South Australian government to ensure that South Australians can reap the maximum benefit of the shipbuilding program; and
- (c) notes the significant negative impacts on the current workforce as a result of the former federal Labor government's failure to progress any future shipbuilding contracts during its last term in office.

The \$90 billion shipbuilding program committed to by the federal Liberal government has been a landmark decision which will reap benefits for South Australia for many years to come. The decision will modernise and strengthen Australia's naval forces and will underpin employment, build workforce capacity, investment, innovation and experience in shipbuilding in Australia. In particular for South Australian investment, it will yield significant economic benefits. The investment will create significant supply chain growth opportunities which are in addition to the more than 5,000 direct jobs that will be created through naval shipbuilding activities in South Australia.

The funding will enable the build of 12 Attack class submarines, which I am told is the largest defence procurement initiative in Australia's history. The funding will enable a \$35 billion Hunter class frigate program, which will deliver nine antisubmarine frigates to the Royal Australian Navy and will create and sustain 1,500 direct jobs. This will be in addition to the 600 jobs needed for the redevelopment of the Osborne South Shipyard and provide opportunities through the supply chain. The supply chain benefits will be substantial. The new Lot Fourteen innovation neighbourhood will provide a location which will attract global companies to develop their Australian business strategy and plan local operations.

A new one-stop shop, supporting international defence companies to establish in South Australia, will drive defence industry investment. The Defence Landing Pad at Lot Fourteen will enable international businesses to build relationships with South Australian businesses and create opportunities for supply chain collaboration. The investment by the federal Liberal government will assist in bridging the unemployment vacuum that was created by the previous federal Labor government's lack of vision. Unfortunately, it dropped the ball regarding Australia's shipbuilding industry and its workers.

We know that in Osborne today the last program is winding up. I can tell you that there are still employees there today being told that their jobs are about to finish. The contract is now winding down and their jobs no longer exist until this shipbuilding operation is back up to speed, back on the build, where it should have been four or five years ago. We know that there are some employees being re-engaged down there, but they are not the same ones who have been told their job no longer exists because they have come to the end of that contract.

It shows that if this is going to be managed—and not to play politics with this and say that one side of politics is better than the other—it will require a united front on both sides of politics to recognise this as a big build for Australia. If we work together on the fact that it needs to happen in a methodical way that looks after the federal government's interests, the state government's interests and those of employees, contractors and builders alike, then it can be an absolutely wonderful opportunity for Australia.

To summarise, we know the new patrol boats are just starting off. I believe there are going to be two built in Adelaide to start off with, of the perhaps 12 that Australia will build. It is a starting point. They are employing people who start off by doing the groundwork, what we call laying down the keel. They will be building the bulkheads. There are no electricians yet. They are not mechanics, they are not chippies, they are not electricians or technologists with technical expertise, because they are not required right now. Those areas of expertise are not needed.

This is where the vacuum and the lack of cohesion from one build to the next needs to be absolutely methodical and straightforward so that all employees in this region can have a job from one week to the next, one month to the next and one year to the next. This is so we can create

consistent work in a consistent workplace where people can live their lives, build houses and dreams and know that this work will continue for many years to come.

The ASC Shipbuilding Structural Adjustment Program, announced by the Australian government, will support workers who have been made redundant, and it will be backdated to 1 July 2018, because of the lack of foresight by our federal Labor government. I am advised that workers and their partners from ASC Shipbuilding or an affected supply chain business are also eligible for this program. The program will offer a range of services for employees both before their positions are discontinued and after. The types of services offered will include career advice, skills assessment and labour market information to assist people to make decisions on their next steps.

The service will also include intensive employment support through Jobactive employment providers, job search support and retraining. This program will include a \$2,000 employment fund to assist workers to retain and obtain licences and tickets, as well as relocation assistance if required. The investment by the federal Liberal government and the efforts of the Marshall Liberal government in continuous naval shipbuilding will create thousands of jobs for decades to come. There will be a period of supported transition as our current shipbuilding workforce redeploys to new opportunities being created across our defence industry base. Two of the offshore patrol boats are currently being built by ASC, with production directly employing up to 400 workers at Osborne and 600 indirectly.

This gives me a bit of an opportunity to address the comments made by the member for Croydon (the Leader of the Opposition), who talked about the Collins class submarines and the history of Australian shipbuilding, as we know it so far. I do not want to play politics, but I want to make sure that our Liberal government recognises that it actually does take effort to ensure this will be a good and profitable build and one that builds a product that we can be proud of for many years to come.

I note that the six Collins class submarines that were started in 1990 and finished in 2003 were costed at \$4 billion to start off but blew out to \$5.1 billion—27 per cent; \$5 billion to \$4 billion is not much. This is a \$90 billion build, and if we blow out that budget by 27 per cent, that is an extra \$24 billion that this one overall contract will cost if we do not do it properly. It will blow out to \$117 billion on the same basis as the Collins class submarines.

The opposition leader is worried about local content. Belonging to the Liberal Party government, I too want as much local content and build in South Australia as possible, but not at any cost, not at any blowout for many, many years beyond what it is meant to be. Absolutely, these boats have to work. There were six Collins class submarines. They only ever had, at some stage, a 35 per cent workforce working on the submarines because they were such high maintenance dependent. They were costing a fortune to maintain and operate. It was not just the worker base but also the fact that the Collins class submarine had huge issues of maintenance and standard.

One of the biggest pitfalls, they tell me, is that we changed our mind during the build. The defence system wanted this and then they wanted that, and then it did not fit and then it did not work, and they would not talk each other. Technological advances were always on the go. One of the things that I hope we do with this large contract is to make sure that this build is a good fit, works for Australia's purposes, does not blow out and is not at any cost. This is unlike the Labor Party on the other side, which says: 'Just employ people, just spend money, just get jobs.' No, not at any cost at all.

From my own history, having trained as a boilermaker/welder through an apprenticeship program, I am really excited about the investment the Marshall Liberal government is making to build the capacity and capability of South Australians. The program is going to yield a great many benefits for trade industries and it will provide opportunities for trainees. The more than 20,000 new apprenticeships and trainees that will be created have been made possible through the federal government's Skilling Australians Fund. They will offer really great opportunities for people to upskill and reskill in order to take advantage of new employment opportunities like this shipbuilding program.

These positions will be supported by the establishment of a new technical college in Adelaide's western suburbs, with a focus on defence, and a range of other measures, including the re-establishment of industry skills councils to give industry a strong voice and a pathway to work,

with government to strengthen and influence the vocational education training system. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:03): I rise to speak on the amended motion. One of my motivations for being in politics was employment. When I finished school and university, it was really difficult to get a job. I had fantastic mentors. My parents both worked. They had a business, and they supported post secondary education. My concern today is this issue because when I am out doorknocking people ask me, 'What are the jobs of the future? What will my children do? What will my grandchildren do?' We know that we have a fantastic opportunity in South Australia with this shipbuilding program. We all agree that this is a wonderful opportunity.

There are discussions that there will be up to 25,000 jobs in South Australia, so imagine my disappointment and my surprise that there is absolutely no commitment to local content. How do we expect our parents and grandparents to encourage their children to train in the areas that are going to be needed for this shipbuilding program?

I acknowledge the Skilling Australia program and I acknowledge the Naval Shipbuilding College, but what we need to do is make all South Australians aware of what the jobs are and the pathways to get those jobs. Whether it be an electrician, a mechanic, a welder, a fitter and turner, like my own father when he did his apprenticeship, or be skills in technology or design, we know that those jobs are going to be needed.

What we do not know is if those 25,000 proposed jobs are ever actually going to happen, because what we hear is the politics being played out. When we hear people being told in November 2017 that we are going to create 25,000 jobs in South Australia, and in December 2018 being assured by minister Pyne that these jobs will be delivered through an assured level of local content, that this will be a local build, that is what our parents and grandparents hear. 'Fantastic! This is what we are going to encourage our children to do.'

We know that science, technology, engineering and mathematics are going to be crucial in taking up these jobs. I am excited about it. This is something that we can share. We can be part of world's best practice of this amazing advanced manufacturing. We welcome it; this is fantastic. But when we hear that there is no guarantee of local content, how can we say this to our South Australians? How can we encourage them to train in this sector? This is the concern that I raise with this issue today.

What I am very concerned about is our Premier not standing up for our state. Sure, he might have been there for the signing, but where is his commitment, where is our understanding of the state government supporting, encouraging and knowing how many of these jobs there will be? That is why I rise today to support the amended motion.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (12:07): I rise to welcome the federal Liberal government's commitment to the \$90 billion shipbuilding program that is centred in this state and to speak in support of the member for Colton's motion. We know that as the program to build air warfare destroyers at the Osborne naval shipbuilding precinct comes to an end, the federal government is now centring its naval shipbuilding program in South Australia, with the construction of the first two offshore patrol vessels, followed by the Future Frigate program and the submarine program.

This \$90 billion commitment will modernise and strengthen Australia's naval forces. We know that ASC has built up considerable skills over the last 10 years on the air warfare destroyer program, and the highly skilled shipbuilders, in conjunction with this new naval shipbuilding program, can be the basis for building a strong, sustainable sovereign Australian shipbuilding industry. It will certainly define the future of advanced manufacturing in Australia and it is happening right here in South Australia.

These first two offshore patrol vessels are going to be constructed in South Australia by ASC and will overcome the valley of death between the end of the air warfare destroyer program and the beginning of the Future Frigate program. Unfortunately, prior to the commitment of the construction of these first two offshore patrol vessels at Osborne, the gap saw the steady release of the workforce and hence the loss of valuable skilled workers prior to the commencement of the Future Frigates shipbuilding program.

It was therefore welcome news when in November 2018 work began on the first of these offshore patrol vessels at Osborne, with the welding of the first two component blocks of steel that will form part of the first vessel. The new ships will be known as the Arafura class, with the first to enter service in 2022 to be called the HMAS *Arafura*.

The ASC chief executive noted that the construction of the first of the offshore patrol vessels is the company's second surface shipbuilding project and will see Australia embark on a continuous naval shipbuilding program for decades to come. This multidecade program is set to deliver unprecedented economic benefit to South Australia. The offshore patrol vessels that are being built will directly employ approximately 400 workers at Osborne and create another 600 indirect jobs.

Following from that, the Future Frigate program, which will involve the construction of nine high-end antisubmarine warfare frigates, will replace the eight ANZAC class frigates. Construction is due to commence at Osborne in 2020 and has a total program value of \$35 million, creating approximately 1,500 direct jobs.

BAE Systems was announced as the successful tenderer for the antisubmarine warfare frigates, and these Hunter class frigates will be the most advanced antisubmarine warships in the world. This is a big deal not just for South Australia but also for the United Kingdom, with the news of the wins being welcomed by the Secretary of State for Defence, Gavin Williamson, who referred to the project as the biggest maritime defence deal of the decade. We can see that there are terrific opportunities and they are based right here in South Australia.

This has required the redevelopment of the Osborne naval shipyard because there is the requirement to build not only ships but also the construction site to build them. This has already started and is scheduled to be completed by 2020. The infrastructure itself has an estimated cost of \$535 million and the redevelopment will create up to 600 jobs. We have already seen the earthworks commenced, the piles being laid and over 55,000 cubic metres of concrete being placed in the foundations. The structural steel for these sheds has been ordered from Australian steelmakers BlueScope Steel and Liberty OneSteel in Whyalla in preparation for the main fabrication and assembly halls.

In fact, in December 2018, the steel raising for the new shipyard involved the elevation of more than 8,000 tonnes of structural steel, which had been fabricated by local South Australian companies. Two of these local suppliers were Samaras Structural Engineers and SA Structural. These are two of over 50 local suppliers involved in the project. We talk about delivering jobs for South Australians, but actions speak so much louder than words—and this is certainly one of them.

I would also like to touch briefly on the Future Frigates. Construction is also due to commence in 2023 at Osborne, with a total program value of \$50 billion. As we have heard from others in this house, that represents the single biggest defence spend in this nation's history, and it is happening right here in South Australia. Again, the Naval Group Australia estimates that 2,800 jobs will be created in South Australia; of those, approximately 1,100 will be direct jobs and then a further 1,700 will be supply chain jobs.

It is also estimated that the shipbuilding workforce will need to increase by some 3,600 staff from 2021. Around 77 per cent of these are tradespeople in fabrication and electrical and mechanical engineering. Further to that, as the member of Colton mentioned, on 11 February 2019 the Strategic Partnering Agreement was signed between the Australian government and Naval Group Australia. Work on the submarines has taken place under a design and mobilisation contract. The formalisation of this agreement represents the contractual basis of the program.

The federal government's Naval Shipbuilding Plan states that the shipbuilding workforce in South Australia will need to increase by around two to three times from current employment levels, with demand for construction workers reaching a peak of around 5,200 in 2026. While continuous naval shipbuilding will create thousands of jobs for decades to come, unfortunately there is a period of transition as our current shipbuilding workforce redeploys to new opportunities being created across our defence industrial base.

Just by outlining the extent of the shipbuilding program to occur between now and 2030 in South Australia, we can see that the size and skill levels of the naval shipbuilding force in South

Australia will need to increase significantly to meet demand. That is why the Marshall Liberal government is developing a comprehensive defence work plan. We talk about having minimum requirements for local content, but we need to make sure that over and above that we have the skills in place to grab this opportunity.

We are looking at funding over 1,200 apprenticeships within those qualifications I have mentioned previously over the next four years. This is part of our commitment where we allocated \$100 million in the recent state budget to also secure \$87 million of funding from the federal government's Skilling Australians Fund. This will support the creation of an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia.

This really shows, if we need to skill our workers to be able to provide local jobs rather than just having a commitment inked on paper, how it will further solidify, because employing a local workforce that is skilled will be so much more economical as well as reliable. It is necessary for the future success of these three significant projects.

Another step the Marshall Liberal government is taking in the planning process is the recent announcement of the Defence Landing Pad, which will be located in Adelaide's new innovation neighbourhood at Lot Fourteen. This will provide a home for global companies to develop their Australian business strategy and plan local operations. It will be a one-stop shop that will support international defence companies to establish here in South Australia and drive defence industry investment. It will also provide a terrific opportunity for South Australia to capture new defence industry investment as part of a growing local industry with significant employment opportunities.

The companies will also have access to government and industry support services in one single location. These will provide assistance with local regulations, business establishment and real estate as well as provide information on workforce availability and skilling opportunities. Further to those skilling opportunities, just yesterday it was reported that Adelaide University, Flinders University and the University of South Australia have signed an agreement with French company Naval Group and the National Centre for Scientific Research to found an international research laboratory right here in Adelaide. This research lab will work on artificial intelligence, autonomous systems and human factors as well.

Again, this will skill many South Australians not just in the defence industry but also in the broader advanced manufacturing industry with desperately needed skills in this state, and that will help grow a new industry here and provide jobs for many decades to come. In fact, Flinders University Vice-Chancellor Professor Colin Stirling said that Adelaide was an ideal location for such a laboratory. The members for Waite and Davenport and I met with Professor Stirling, as well as with staff of Flinders University, last year regarding how they are trying to build these sorts of relationships to work not only with the defence industry but also with advanced manufacturing.

South Australia's economic future will be significantly bolstered through this naval shipbuilding program. The Marshall Liberal government is working very hard to maximise local employment opportunities for all South Australians.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Pederick): Chair of Committees, member for Flinders.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:17): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker; what a fine job you are doing. I rise today to make a contribution to the very important motion brought to this house by the member for Colton. It is a very important motion because it is a very exciting time for South Australia. The motion reads:

That this house—

- (a) welcomes the federal Liberal government's commitment to the \$90 billion shipbuilding program, which will secure the future of South Australia's defence industry for decades;
- (b) notes the significant work being undertaken by the South Australian government to ensure that South Australians can reap the maximum benefit of the shipbuilding program; and
- (c) notes the significant negative impacts on the current workforce as a result of the former federal Labor government's failure to progress any future shipbuilding contracts during its last term in office.

The Australian government has committed \$90 billion over the coming decade to modernise and strengthen Australia's naval forces whilst building a strong, sustainable, sovereign Australian

shipbuilding industry. That naval shipbuilding is set to deliver unprecedented economic benefits to South Australia.

We have always had a history of shipbuilding in South Australia from the very early days. We were a coastal colony, and shipping was very much a part of our small and insular economy even then. Shipbuilding in South Australia began even before formal white settlement. In 1803, American whalers built the 30-tonne *Independence* at American River on Kangaroo Island—and I have no doubt the member for Bragg is well aware of that.

So shipbuilding began in the very early days and it continued, but a perennial problem for South Australian shipbuilders was the lack of suitable timber. Much was imported from the other colonies, in particular Tasmania and New South Wales. The government dockyard was operating by the 1850s and, along with a shipyard at Goolwa, was producing paddle steamers and barges for the River Murray trade—interesting and exciting times.

Shipbuilding continued and reached a new peak in the 1940s. Whyalla was famous for its iron and steel but also for its shipbuilding industries. We manufactured our first ship for the Royal Australian Navy even before the Japanese had bombed Pearl Harbor in December 1941. A total of 58 ships were built in the Whyalla shipyards. Ultimately it closed in 1978, which was a sad day, but we proved that we could do it, and it was a really important part of the state's economy, for Whyalla in particular.

In between times, we had been building coastal ketches, and many wooden and timber boats were made in backyards at home. In fact, my own Uncle Wilf built a boat called the *Saucy Ann*, which he steamed from Port Lincoln to Coffin Bay, and if he had not had Axel Stenross with him he would have turned back—that is what he told me anyway.

We, of course, were building Collins class submarines in the 1980s. There were a few problems associated with those submarines, as the member for MacKillop pointed out, and we are now about to embark on building Future Frigates and Future Submarines. It is a very exciting time for South Australia. Around 5,200 direct jobs will be created through naval shipbuilding activities in South Australia, and many more supply chain opportunities.

The contract to build 12 Attack class submarines in this state is the next step forward. It is a \$50 billion project—huge numbers. It is a mammoth undertaking; we are proud to take on the challenge. It is the largest defence procurement in the nation's history and is an undertaking of national firsts in size, scale, complexity and duration. In fact, it will define the future of advanced manufacturing in Australia, and it is happening right here in South Australia. It is a critical transition for our manufacturing sector to take us into the 21st century.

The \$35 billion Hunter class frigate program, which will deliver nine antisubmarine frigates to the Royal Australian Navy, will create and sustain 1,500 direct jobs, in addition to the 600 jobs needed for the redevelopment of the Osborne South shipyards and opportunities through the supply chain. As well as that, two offshore patrol vessels are being built by ASC Shipbuilding, with production directly employing up to 400 workers at Osborne and creating 600 indirect jobs.

The Defence Landing Pad, which has been spoken about by members on this side, is to be located in Adelaide's new innovation neighbourhood at Lot Fourteen here in the CBD and will provide a home for global companies to develop their Australian business strategy and plan local operations. This undertaking is attracting global interest. A new one-stop shop supporting international defence companies to establish in South Australia will drive defence industry investment, and where better to do it than right here in South Australia? The Defence Landing Pad will enable international businesses to build relationships with South Australian businesses and create opportunities for supply chain collaboration.

In relation to training and skills, our government is committed to maximising the local benefits for this huge investment into our state, which includes ensuring that we have the skilled workforce needed to deliver this project. We are also introducing measures to further develop South Australia's skilled workforce by working with industry to strengthen South Australia's VET system, including giving industry a stronger voice through the re-establishment of the Industry Skills Council.

Most significant in all of this is that we will be creating more than 20,000 new apprenticeships and traineeships utilising the federal government's Skilling Australians Fund. This is significant: it gives school leavers the opportunity to take on a trade, undertake their training and, more importantly, to live and work in the state they grew up in. I think that is a critical point in relation to this project. I know that we have a number on this side who have undertaken apprenticeships in the past and become skilled in their trades and are very proud of that, and we will be continuing that tradition in South Australia.

So, while continuous naval shipbuilding will create thousands of jobs for decades to come, unfortunately there will be a period of transition as our current shipbuilding workforce redeploys to new opportunities being created across our defence industrial base. But, by and large, it is a tremendously exciting project. It will set up South Australia's industrial base for the coming decades, and set us in good stead for the 21st century, and really set us up as the defence state in this commonwealth.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:24): It is my pleasure to rise to speak to this motion because our government was elected on a platform of jobs, better services and lower costs. I am therefore rising to support this motion, which recognises that the Australian government has committed \$90 billion over the coming decade to modernise and strengthen Australia's naval forces, while building a strong, sustainable sovereign Australian shipbuilding industry—which we will benefit from in South Australia—and that is fantastic news.

Naval shipbuilding is set to deliver unprecedented economic benefit to South Australia. Around 5,200 direct jobs will be created through naval shipbuilding activities in South Australia, plus many more supply chain opportunities. When I have been out doorknocking over the last five years, both as a councillor and now as a state member, one constant piece of feedback and ambition from our community both young and old has been a priority to create more jobs in South Australia. The landmark contract to build 12 Attack class submarines in South Australia is the next step forward in this \$50 billion project. This project is the largest defence procurement in the nation's history and is an undertaking of national firsts in size, scale, complexity and duration. It will define the future of advanced manufacturing in Australia, and it is happening right here in South Australia.

On 11 February 2019, a Strategic Partnering Agreement was signed by the Australian government and Naval Group, and work on the submarines has taken place under the design and mobilisation contract. The formalisation of this agreement represents the contractual basis for the program. The \$35 billion Hunter class frigate program, which will deliver nine antisubmarine frigates to the Royal Australian Navy, will create and sustain 1,500 direct jobs, in addition to 600 jobs needed for the redevelopment of the Osborne South shipyards and opportunities through the supply chain. Two offshore patrol vessels are being built by ASC Shipbuilding, with production directly employing up to 400 workers at Osborne and 600 indirect.

The Australian government has not made a decision to move deep level maintenance to Perth. Let me make this clear: the Department of Defence is creating options to prepare for contingencies, and it is the National Security Committee that decides these matters. The Defence Landing Pad, to be located in Adelaide's new innovation neighbourhood, Lot Fourteen, will provide a home for global companies to develop their Australian business strategy and plan local operations.

A new one-stop shop supporting international defence companies to establish in South Australia will drive defence industry investment. The Defence Landing Pad will enable international businesses to build relationships with South Australian businesses and create opportunities for our supply chain collaboration. Let us look at training and skills and how we are preparing for this.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to maximising the local benefits of this huge investment in our state, which includes ensuring that we have the skilled local workforce needed to deliver this project. Investing in training equipment like welding simulators and providing funding for additional work-based apprenticeships will help us to create the skilled workforce that is required to fully capitalise on the naval shipbuilding program. The Marshall Liberal government is also introducing the following measures to further develop South Australia's skilled workforce:

- we are working with industry to strengthen South Australia's VET system, including giving industry a stronger voice through the re-establishment of industry skills councils;

- we are creating more than 20,000 new apprenticeships and traineeships, utilising the federal government's Skilling Australians Fund;
- we are reforming the subsidised training list so that it is guided by industry and opening up funding contestability; and
- we are establishing a new technical college in Adelaide's western suburbs with a focus on defence.

The Australian government has announced the ASC Shipbuilding Structural Adjustment Program to support workers who have been made redundant, backdated to 1 July 2018. Workers and their partners from ASC Shipbuilding or an affected supply chain business are eligible for this program.

The program has two components. Pre job loss transition support will include skills assessment, career advice workshops and information on local labour market intelligence. This component will be delivered by Hender. The second component, post job loss, provides immediate access to intensive employment support through Jobactive employment providers, including job search, which is preparing résumés and preparing for interviews, retraining and self-help facilities.

The support includes immediate access to intensive employment support through Jobactive employment providers, including job search. This should be a terrific support to these people, who might need to change their career for a period of time. The assistance includes a \$2,000 employment fund to assist workers to retrain and obtain licences and tickets, as well as relocation assistance if required.

Let's just for a moment outline the federal Labor government failures. Any job losses at ASC and elsewhere in the shipbuilding industry are a result of Labor's valley of death. As the air warfare destroyer programs near completion, the Air Warfare Destroyer Alliance, including ASC Shipbuilding, has been steadily releasing its workforce. While continuous naval shipbuilding will create thousands of jobs for decades to come, there will be a period of transition as our current shipbuilding workforce redeploys to new opportunities being created across our defence industrial base.

In February 2019, in our last parliamentary session, I had the opportunity to ask the Premier for an update on the formal signing of the \$50 billion Future Submarines contract and what this project will mean for South Australia. I was so happy to hear the good news in reply from the Premier. He said:

What a happy day it was for South Australia yesterday when I was in Canberra for the signing of the Strategic Partnering Agreement between Australia and the Naval Group, between Australia and France, between the people of this state and the people of France. What a great outcome for our state... We are on the precipice of an unprecedented flow of work to South Australia...

This is exactly what my King electorate want to hear and what they have been asking for. The Premier reminded us all that zero vessels were commissioned under the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd debacle. He also told us that 54 separate vessels had been commissioned by the Coalition, and they will create a huge amount of work coming to South Australia for generations to come, and this is very, very good news for the people of our state. We absolutely love jobs coming to our state because this is what South Australians and the people living in King told me matters to them. They care about jobs and they care about our young people being able to have the choice of a career in South Australia.

The Premier told us that signing the strategic partnership agreement was a signature for a \$50 billion plan, and that is only part of the work that is coming to South Australia—a total of \$90 billion. Construction work is underway at the moment on the massive frigate yard, and it has already been decided to build a massive submarine yard. More than \$1 billion worth of construction work is underway right now down at Osborne. We have set to work. I also commend the Minister for Industry and Skills, who has worked very hard to make sure that we have the skills in our community in place.

The yard is underway and the Naval Shipbuilding College, a fantastic new facility, is underway so that we can prepare for the jobs of the future and the skills for the future. I am really looking forward to securing South Australians' future in SA, and we will do all we can to ensure South Australians reap the maximum benefit of this program.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:34): I guess the question is about maximum benefit. We all want to see these incredibly important projects that are going to happen here in South Australia maximise the state's opportunities, especially when it comes to the provision of jobs. That is why it was concerning that, in the negotiations that took place, the federal government did not lock in obligations in relation to the provision of employment in these important naval build contracts.

At one stage, the federal government indicated that 90 per cent of the work, or 90 per cent of the jobs, would be sourced here in South Australia, but then that dropped again. Upon closer questioning recently from Senator Penny Wong, it became very apparent that, contractually, the companies involved were not locked in to job numbers or job percentages in South Australia. That is a source of concern, but it is not to say that these projects are not going to be significant or very significant job generators.

I think the federal government have some form on maximising local opportunities. I know this full well, given the crisis we went through in the steel industry and in the lead-up to the steel industry going into administration. As the local member, I entered into debate with the federal government about mandating the use of Australian steel on federally funded projects, and they just would not come to the party. They belatedly did some work on protecting the industry from a range of dumped steel products, but when it came to using their ability, their capacity, especially in conjunction with the states, for federally funded or partly federally funded infrastructure projects, they would not mandate the use of Australian steel.

I always attempt to be fair, and there are some projects where they are using Australian steel. The Inland Railway project will be using steel sourced from Whyalla as the only producer of rail in the country, and there have been one or two other projects. However, instead of taking a more generalised approach to ensuring that we maximise the use of Australian steel, that has been lacking.

When it comes to the submarines, there is a little bit of a rewrite of history. We know that the submarines were going to go offshore to Japan, and we know that was the Abbott government's intention. If we as a state had taken a passive approach, the submarine contracts would have been lost overseas. However, to the credit of the Weatherill government, a concerted state campaign was launched to secure those contracts for South Australia.

It was always interesting that a number of federal Liberal politicians, when discussing the submarines, would consistently talk about the Whyalla Steelworks. There is no doubt that the Whyalla Steelworks will get some of the work, but the federal Liberal members would often refer to the submarines themselves as being built with the use of Australian steel. I will not bore members with tonnages and throughputs in the steel industry in Australia, but to not just imply but explicitly state that the steel for the submarines would be sourced from Whyalla was utter nonsense because we do not produce a flat product at Whyalla and we do not produce the specialised flat product at Whyalla.

Whether BlueScope, which does produce a flat product, produces the nature of the product needed for the submarines is questionable. However, the overall tonnages we are talking about over an extended period of time for the building of the submarines are fairly marginal, even as a high-value product, when it comes to the steel industry in Australia. Clearly, other countries have the capacity to produce those specialised steels.

It would be great to see it happen in Australia, but the investment that would be needed would not be justified by the scale of the submarine project and the length of time over which it would be built. Clearly, some of the port facilities, some of the factory-like facilities, that are going to be needed and some of the long product will be sourced from the steelworks in Whyalla.

I think we need to remember not only the active campaigning to ensure that we got the submarines here in South Australia but also that governments past—Labor governments past—took a calculated risk in making very significant public investment in Techport. It was an incredibly important initiative that has paid dividends for our state from thereon. I cannot recall whether the Liberal opposition at the time supported that public expenditure. It would be interesting to go back. I would not be surprised to see that they had attacked public expenditure on Techport because we were talking about a significant amount of money, but it was a significant amount of money that was well invested to benefit the future of our state.

I think it is important—I know that there are some tradespeople opposite—that I have a few words to say about the naval contracts. I am probably the only person in this chamber who has actually worked in a shipyard, in the double bottoms and tanks of ships, as a painter, docker and grinder. I know the capacity of shipbuilding to provide a whole range of jobs from semiskilled to trade jobs to professionally qualified people, such as engineers and others.

It is an incredibly important job generator for a state like South Australia, so I am not going to say that the lack of a lock-in in percentages is a disaster because, clearly, there are going to be jobs. But I do feel that we are failing to maximise the benefits for the state by not being up-front and explicit in the signing-off of contracts. The more jobs that we create here in South Australia and the fewer in France and elsewhere is what we should be seeking.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:42): I rise to support the motion:

That this house—

- (a) welcomes the federal Liberal government's commitment to the \$90 billion shipbuilding program, which will secure the future of South Australia's defence industry for decades;
- (b) notes the significant work being undertaken by the South Australian government to ensure that South Australians can reap the maximum benefit of the shipbuilding program; and
- (c) notes the significant negative impacts on the current workforce as a result of the former federal Labor government's failure to progress any future shipbuilding contracts during its last term in office.

The Australian government has committed \$90 billion over the coming decade to modernise and strengthen Australia's naval forces whilst building a strong, sustainable, sovereign, Australian shipbuilding industry. We have heard a lot of bleating from the other side, initially from the leader of the Labor Party (member for Croydon), the member for Ramsay and now the member for Giles about how many jobs and how much work South Australia will get.

Guess what? If we were only getting one job, it would be 100 per cent more jobs than Rudd-Gillard-Rudd got for South Australia and shipbuilding in this state. But we will have thousands of jobs coming to this state through the great work of the Australian federal government and the Marshall Liberal government, which I am so proud to be a part of, in making sure that we get this work so that we can keep these people employed.

We have seen what has happened with the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd failure where there has been a valley of death. We have had to put in programs to support workers coming out of that. Labor do not even support people from their own electorates working on these vessels to help secure the defence of our great nation.

I briefly want to contrast how many ships or vessels Labor commissioned under Rudd-Gillard-Rudd with what is happening now under a federal Liberal government. I will just look at the numbers. That is right: zero under Rudd-Gillard-Rudd and federal Labor when they were in power. I will give you the number of how many are going to be commissioned under an Australian federal Liberal government: 74 vessels. What a boost to this state and to the federal government of Australia.

It just smacks of utter hypocrisy that the state opposition in the Labor Party are bleating about jobs. When they should have been fighting for jobs and lobbying the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd government, they were caught up in their own turmoil. I am so proud that we are delivering and that the federal government are delivering. It is such a great thing for this state to have this massive level of investment. Any day of the week, 74 vessels beat zero. I commend the motion and commend the member for Colton for bringing it to this house.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (12:46): I thank all members who have contributed to the motion today: the members for MacKillop, Flinders, Morphett, King, Hammond, Croydon, Ramsay and Giles, no matter how verbose or fanciful their contributions. I could finish by reiterating the failings of the Labor Party with regard to naval shipbuilding here in South Australia, but they have been well recited in the chamber today. No amount of spin or pandering will change the fact that the Rudd-Gillard-Rudd government failed to provide a sustainable pipeline of work in naval shipbuilding here in South Australia. I will instead reinforce that the Marshall Liberal government is committed to maximising the

local benefits of this huge investment into our state by the federal Liberal government. I look forward to support for the original motion.

Amendment negatived; motion carried.

HEYSEN CULTURAL LEGACY

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (12:48): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the significance and value of the art of Sir Hans Heysen OBE and Nora Heysen AM to South Australia's and Australia's cultural heritage;
- (b) recognises the work of the Hans Heysen Foundation and the Nora Heysen Foundation in preserving and promoting the work of Sir Hans Heysen and Nora Heysen; and
- (c) acknowledges the value and significance of The Cedars as a cultural precinct.

I think that it is right that I outline for the house the background to Sir Hans's life by way of illustrating his contribution to the rich cultural heritage of this state.

Sir Wilhelm Ernst Hans Franz Heysen was born in Hamburg on 8 October 1877. He was the sixth child of Louis Heinrich Wilhelm Heysen and his wife, Maria. Louis migrated to South Australia in 1883 and Maria migrated the next year, bringing with her their five surviving children. The Heysens came believing in the same necessary dream that other immigrants believed: that a more secure life could be found here and that their children would benefit from their foresight.

Louis became a merchant, although, at the outset, far from a successful one. The new settlement had a narrow and unreliable economy. The Depression of the 1890s brought great hardship to the Heysen family. It must be remembered that 13 banks failed in the Depression of those years, including the Commercial Bank of Australia, one of the country's largest, which suspended operations.

Sir Hans was educated at five schools in Adelaide, leaving in 1892 to work in a hardware store. Later, he assisted his father to sell produce from their market cart. Importantly, he went to stay for a period with a family friend in Hahndorf. This way, he was not a first settler in the town but would become its most famous resident. Artist and teacher James Ashton took a keen interest in young Hans's work and was, I think, the purchaser for value of his first painting. His success was materially supported by many wealthy benefactors in South Australia. Robert Barr-Smith paid Hans's fees at the school of design within the Art Gallery of South Australia for 12 months, a significant gift.

Importantly, in 1899, a group of four businesses offered Hans a remarkable contract. They would loan Hans £400 to ensure he could study in Europe. The condition was that they would sell the works that he painted there to recover the money that they had outlaid. Heysen agreed to this bargain. When Heysen returned to South Australia, he achieved immediate success and recognition. Importantly, state galleries acquired two of his major works and, in 1904, his painting *Mystic Morn* won the Wynne Prize for the finest Australian landscape painting. He would win that prize nine times.

Lou Klepac's work to document Hans's life is both faithful and accurate and records that in 1908 Hans and his wife, Sallie, moved to the Adelaide Hills and later purchased The Cedars. It should not be overlooked that Nora Heysen, Hans's daughter, was the first woman to win the Archibald Prize for a portrait and the first female Australian war artist. Her life is extraordinary in its own right and I will turn to that subject in a moment.

Achieving fame as an artist in your own lifetime is, I understand, very difficult and seldom possible. Hans Heysen was Australia's first celebrity artist. Members might say that at least in Sir Hans's time fame was a measure of talent and usefulness. Hans's art is not a historical artefact; it remains vital and important. As Robert Hughes said in his work *The Shock of the New*:

The basic project of art is always to make the world whole and comprehensible, to restore it to us in all its glory and its occasional nastiness, not through argument but through feeling, and then to close the gap between you and everything that is not you, and in this way pass from feeling to meaning. It's not something that committees can do. It's not a task achieved by groups or by movements. It's done by individuals, each person mediating in some way between a sense of history and an experience of the world.

It was new and shocking for an Australian artist to paint Australian scenes with a spiritual wonder and with an Australian colour palette. As Lou Klepac has said, what to others was 'the bush', for Heysen was the mystical essence of nature. As members would know, my mother was an art teacher and so art and the history of art was at least a passing subject in our household.

Members opposite might be surprised to know that I once discussed the value of Heysen's work with the late John Bannon, whose own father was an art teacher. John's view, a view I accept, was that Heysen made it permissible to reflect on Australian landscapes as South Australians, and Australians had not done so in their own right but instead as Europeans, bringing a European mind under Australian stars. Heysen did something quite different. Instead, Heysen, with Germanic precision and patience for perfection, was willing to record not only the emblematic quality of South Australian landscapes but also their power over us. He was capable for the first time of expressing the continuity of the landscape, our place in country, the inconsequence of our strivings and the arrogance of our plans when faced with nature.

Heysen was the first successful celebrity conservationist in South Australia, and we are grateful that he was. He famously paid off local farmers to preserve the local landscape and to prevent them from turning majestic gum trees into 400 fence posts. He also consolidated his holdings, where possible, in order to ensure that others in his community would appreciate what he, for many years, had appreciated. He did not want to destroy the local landscape for any short-term or short-sighted economic purpose but to preserve it for us today.

Heysen was courageous. He had the courage to be a new artist in a new country and to say new and different things about how we should relate to landscape. The artist John Olsen said in this sense that Hans Heysen was the first non-Indigenous artist to understand Australia's interior, and his paintings of the arid Australian interior are particularly moving. I believe that it was a trustee of the Art Gallery of South Australia who also once quipped that Hans's iconic work did for the gum trees what Norman Lindsay's work did for the nude—it made them fashionable.

Nora Heysen's legacy is of equal value to Hans Heysen's legacy. She was a determined artist of profound skill and passion. Her portraits are remarkable. They have a clear-eyed quality, which is sometimes haunting. Nora completed over 170 pieces while an official war artist. She said of her work, 'If I was going to do war subjects, I wanted to be as near as I possibly could.' She spent seven months in New Guinea in the course of the Second World War and returned to Australia suffering from dermatitis.

Her portraits of work in medical clearing stations are particularly moving. All war correspondents and even war artists face criticism, some of it unfounded. Nora was criticised for painting real scenes of military personnel at work, sometimes well behind the front lines. It is this work that is now particularly valuable. It provides a remarkable historical record of lived experience of service personnel, particularly women. It is hard to imagine a journalist taking photographs of the subjects that Nora had painted because, without the artist's brush, they do not have the same power and influence. They are, in this way, the only true record of her subjects performing very necessary everyday tasks. Their cultural and social value is inestimable.

In the time remaining I want to record the value of the work being undertaken by the Hans Heysen and Nora Heysen foundations to preserve and promote the significance and importance of the work of Hans and Nora Heysen. It must be remembered that transactions necessary to give rise to the Hans and Nora Heysen foundations required substantial generosity on the part of the Heysen family. Without that generosity, it would not be possible for a substantial body of work to be located in one place, and it might instead be the case that that work would be elsewhere in private collections. It is not. It is housed at The Cedars. The Cedars is significant to Hans's work and also to Nora's work.

I also commend the members of the foundation committee and the corporate directors of the foundation trustee for the work that they do as volunteers and for the work of the many volunteers at The Cedars. Without their work it would not be possible to maintain the facility. Of course, members will know, and I understand that it has in fact been recorded in this place, that George van Holst Pellekaan recently received a Medal of the Order of Australia for, in part, his services to the Hans Heysen Foundation for the conservation and preservation of Hans Heysen's work. Equally, Allan

Campbell received an Australia Day Award and Medal of the Order of Australia for work to preserve and promote The Cedars, Hans and Nora Heysen's contribution and legacy.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:58): I very briefly rise to endorse the motion. I hope that the motion is passed immediately by this house. In the short time available, I wish to recognise the work of Hans Heysen, for whom my electorate is named, and his daughter Nora and the significance of The Cedars, which was his home for 56 years, from when he purchased it in 1912 until his death in 1968.

The Hans Heysen Foundation has done wonderful work. I encourage everyone to visit, if they can, the National Gallery of Victoria's *Two Generations of Australian Art* that is commencing shortly. In amplifying and endorsing what the member for Kavel said, I emphasise that this is a living legacy that we all share. I endorse the motion.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (13:00): As shadow minister for the arts, I would like to speak on this motion. I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later time.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

SERVICE SA MODBURY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 100 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with the proposed closure of the Service SA Modbury Branch, announced as a cost-saving measure in the 2018-19 state budget.

SPEED LIMITS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders): Presented a petition signed by 182 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reduce the speed limit on the Flinders Highway from the Anxious Bay Road turn-off to the Liberty Roadhouse to 60 km/h, and make any consequent adjustments to the approaching speed limits north of the Elliston township.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Report of the circumstances giving rise to the Proclamation that the District Council of Coober Pedy Declared to be a Defaulting Council

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:03): I bring up the 14th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. What action did the Premier take when the Ambulance Employees Association warned on 6 November last year that ramping was the worst that it had ever seen?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04): I think this has been well documented. We took the issues—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —with regard to ramping at our major hospitals very seriously. As you are aware, sir, we inherited a situation where there had been chronic ramping at our hospitals, which was exacerbated by the failed Transforming Health where beds right across the system were closed. Of course, we have taken action to address those issues.

Some people say, 'What were those issues?' What are those things we have actually done? Well, we have made it very clear that we have kept open the 20 beds that were slated to be closed at the Repat hospital. Those opposite had already made a plan—in fact, they had actually signed a contract—to sell the Repat site, so those beds were clearly not going to remain open beyond the end of last year. They are still there now, so that's 20 extra beds that have gone into the system. Since then, we have opened up another 20 beds, so in fact we have a 40-bed differential on the Repat site over and above what would have been there if Labor had retained government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in March last year, but they didn't. They were thrown out of office. They were thrown out of office because they had mismanaged the health system in South Australia. By contrast, what we're doing is everything we possibly can to increase the capacity of our hospital system in this state. There are 40 additional beds at the Repat hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There are 40 extra beds at the Repat hospital over and above what would have been there if Labor had been returned to power. There are an extra 10 beds, psychiatric intensive care unit beds, at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Those opposite, of course, were responsible for opening the new hospital. They failed to open it at full capacity. They had major problems with the implementation of the contract. By contrast, we have worked diligently—

Mr Malinauskas: It took another 12 months for you to open up the hospital.

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —since we were elected to make sure that those PICU beds were available. That has increased the capacity at the new Royal Adelaide Hospital by 10 beds. We have a plan now to make 10 new forensic mental health beds available at Glenside, which will again take people out of beds at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and ease the pressure on the emergency departments in our state.

On the weekend, we announced new criteria-led discharge protocols. These are protocols that we put in place after extensive consultation with health practitioners in South Australia. Unlike those opposite, who exacerbated the situation in terms of emergency departments in South Australia, what we have done is everything we can to alleviate it. So we have those that would exacerbate the situation and those that would alleviate the situation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Yes, we have the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You may be interested to know, sir, what the situation was before we were elected to government. Very helpfully, the Australian Institute—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Will the Premier please resume his seat for one moment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Comparing and contrasting the past administration to the current one is debate.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order for debate. I have the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! Premier, please be seated for one moment. I have allowed members, in order to compare and contrast in a limited manner, some preamble. That might include referring to what was done by a former government. Obviously, there is a line. If that line is crossed, then I will intervene, member for West Torrens. Before I call the Premier back to his feet, I call to order the member for Lee, the member for Playford and the member for Hurtle Vale. The Minister for Education is also called to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Some people would have it that there has been a deterioration. I think it is important to take a benchmark of what the performance was under the previous government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Each year, the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare publishes statistics. For the last financial year, and those opposite were in government for nine of those 12 months, we had the worst emergency department clearing times in the nation. We had the lowest proportion of emergency department patients who were seen within the clinical time frame for—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, Premier.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The question was about ramping, sir, not emergency department clearance rates.

The SPEAKER: For debate, I do not uphold the point of order. Is the Premier finished?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No, I keep getting interrupted. I would like more time if possible, another five minutes.

The SPEAKER: I will give you a few seconds, then let's wrap it up.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Maybe another five minutes to canvass some of the salient points because I keep getting interrupted, sir.

The SPEAKER: A few more seconds, then let's wrap it up. Thank you, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I find it difficult to understand why the member for West Torrens doesn't understand that relationship between emergency department clearing times and ramping out the front of a hospital. It seems to be a pretty obvious relationship to me, and so when we look at the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare statistics, what they showed under those opposite was that we had the worst performing emergency department in the country, the second to worst, the third to worst and the fourth to worst. That is what we inherited from those opposite, and that is what we are setting about to fix up.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, Premier. The Leader of the Opposition.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. What action did the Premier take when, again, the Ambulance Employees Association warned on 6 November last year that it couldn't respond quickly to priority cases even when lives were at risk?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): I appreciate that the Leader of the Opposition has given me another four minutes to talk on this, because as I have already outlined to the house, we—

The SPEAKER: You don't have to use those four minutes, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Sir, I feel like I have an obligation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —because it seems to me like those opposite are in a constant state of denial. For some reason they feel that, despite all of the available information, all of the information which has been compiled completely and utterly independently of the government—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —somehow all of that independent information is wrong and there was a great health system under those opposite.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will resume his seat. The point of order is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is clearly debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport is warned. I have allowed the Premier some time to warm up. Could he please come back to the question, thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes.

Mr Malinauskas: What did you do after 6 November?

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is that we inherited a system which was not performing well. This is evidenced by the statistics compiled independently of the government and presented nationally. This is not something that is just done for South Australia: it is done for the entire nation, and it ranks every single hospital in the country.

The worst in the country last financial year was the Royal Adelaide Hospital. This was the hospital that those opposite had spent \$2.4 billion to build. It is the most expensive hospital in the history of the world. They believed that it was operating perfectly, but the independent umpire said that it was the worst performing emergency department in the country. The second to worst was the Modbury Hospital, the third to worst was the Lyell McEwin Hospital, and fourth was the Flinders Medical Centre. That is what we inherited from those opposite. Since we inherited that situation—

The SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —which took hundreds of beds out of the Repat site, we have done everything we can to restore and alleviate the situation. Some of it is putting more beds back into the system. Some of it is sitting down and listening to clinicians about their ideas, and there have been a number of suggestions which have gone through the scrutiny of the department and which have been put in place. We have made management changes within our health system. We have made governance changes, and we are 100 per cent convinced—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that what we have been doing since we were elected is to reverse the problems that were created by those opposite.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

HOSPITAL BEDS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Given the warnings to the government about patient risk in November last year, why did the government respond by closing 61 beds?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13): Well, I've got no—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I've got no idea what the Leader of the Opposition is referring to. I am very well acquainted with the number of beds that those opposite talked about closing. We know that they said that, to improve the health system in South Australia, they were going to close three hospitals.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Premier begins his answer by immediately talking about the last four years.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Relevance, sir. It's clear.

The SPEAKER: Debate. I have the point of order. As I said, I will allow the Premier some preamble, then I expect him to come to the substance of the question. Then the member for Florey.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It has been suggested by the Leader of the Opposition that there has been a massive cut. I think he is talking about 61 beds cut since we came to government. When I hear about cuts to beds in South Australia I've just got this big flashing, strobing red light flashing at me saying, 'Labor, Labor, danger, danger.' The reality is that over a long period of time they announced that they were closing hospitals—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —St Margaret's Hospital, Hampstead and Repat. They closed Repat; they sold Repat. The people of South Australia said, 'We're voting Liberal if you tear up the contract to sell the Repat.' That's precisely what we did.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: I think the Premier is finished.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He certainly is.

The SPEAKER: He is finished.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Kurna. We will switch to the member for Florey. I will come back to those on my right.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:14): My question is to the Premier. In light of his comments about poor performing emergency departments, will he assure the people of my area that the work on the Modbury Hospital emergency department will be completed before the work at the Lyell McEwin emergency department?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:14): I thank the member for Florey for her question. She has been a staunch advocate for the Modbury Hospital along with the new member for King and the new member for Newland and, of course, the entire Liberal Party. She has been fighting for Modbury. She found it very difficult being in a party that always wanted to slash services and drive more and more people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The reality is we've been very happy to meet with the member for Florey, who seems to me to have a pretty sensible approach to improving services in her local area. The reality is I do not have a detailed answer between the sequencing of Modbury Hospital and Lyell McEwin Hospital, but I'm happy to come back to you with some more information. But, suffice to say, what we want to do on this side of the chamber is to improve the overall healthcare system in South Australia, and that doesn't mean cutting off—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —services that sit outside of the three major teaching hospitals. Of course we want those hospitals to be as good as they possibly can, but in addition to that we see a very logical role, a very important and critical role, for other hospitals in South Australia, like the Modbury Hospital, like The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, like the Noarlunga Hospital and, of course—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —like the Repat site, which we will be keeping as a genuine health precinct going forward. Transforming Health was a mess.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was all designed to drive more and more patients—

Mr Malinauskas: Why don't you come up with an idea of your own? Apart from KordaMentha, what have you come up with?

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the three major teaching hospitals. That did not improve a single outcome in terms of our health system. We will not be following the blueprint laid down by those opposite. We will be putting the resources where they are necessary. I remind this house—and it is important to remind this house—that, since coming to government, we have put more than \$900 million back into the health budget in South Australia.

We do that because we've got a genuine concern that if those opposite were re-elected—thank heavens they weren't, but just say they were elected—the cuts that they had put into their forward estimates would have been brutal and devastating on health outcomes in South Australia. We rejected those brutal cuts. We put \$900 million and we are setting about the important task of restoring the health system to our state.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Hammond, I call the following members to order: the members for Light, Badcoe, Playford, Wright, Ramsey, Hurtle Vale, Reynell, the deputy leader and the member for Waite. The member for Hammond has the call.

HOME BATTERY SCHEME

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on the latest figures for the Home Battery Scheme?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:17): Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: It's hardly surprising to have the Labor Party's energy spokesman laughing, chuckling, because he opposed this program. But do you know what? Not everybody behind him opposes it.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: He's diesel.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Primary Industries is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: As you know, Mr Speaker, we intend to deliver 40,000 batteries to households in South Australia. It's actually going incredibly well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question. I would also like to know.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We reached a very important milestone recently, with over 1,000 subsidies now approved. In fact, as of Monday this week—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —1,046 subsidies have been approved. Importantly, subsidies of up to \$6,000 per household, plus the opportunity to access low-interest loans for the balance of the purchase price of the battery, plus for the installation of new solar, if that's what the household would like, is an outstanding opportunity for households and, very importantly, outstanding for all other households and businesses in the state as well. When we take the peak off the top demand of the day through this program, all other electricity consumers will benefit from lower prices as well. We have seen a surge—more than a 250 per cent increase—in requests since the start of this year, which is fantastic by any system. We have—

Mr Malinauskas: What were the numbers?

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We have householders now having access to eight battery brands and more than 60 system providers. We have encouraged nearly 1,000 new jobs into the state through three new companies manufacturing in South Australia, which is fantastic. Fifteen per cent of these approvals are for households with energy concessions, who are the people that we want to help, the people who I would expect that the people on the other side—

Mr Hughes: What about Housing SA?

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is called to order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —of the chamber would want to help: lower-income people who need more support financially, quite understandably. When we look at where these 1,046 approvals have been, they have been in Port Pirie, the member for Frome's electorate and, very interestingly, postcode 5114. That covers the electorate of King and that covers the electorate of Newland—two champions of people who need support in their electorates—but very interestingly, it also covers—

Mr Brown: How many in that postcode?

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —the electorates of Elizabeth and Taylor. I know that the member for Elizabeth and the member for Taylor want their constituents to get cheaper electricity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —that is more reliable. It used to be that the entire Labor Party opposed this policy. It's getting tighter and tighter and tighter. It's actually starting

to funnel down just to the member for West Torrens because people in Liberal-held seats and people in Labor-held seats are benefiting from this program. Coastal suburbs down in McLaren Vale have also been very strong in their uptake of this. We are bringing batteries and diverse brands.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Consumers have choice. They have the opportunity of a range of batteries. They have a range of installers. They have up to a \$6,000 subsidy from the government and higher subsidies for lower income people. This is an outstanding policy. This is a policy that is being delivered, that is being rolled out and that is picking up pace, while the Labor Party is an opponent—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting. He's on two warnings.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —of lower prices, more reliable electricity and cleaner energy. While the opponent of cleaner energy in the front row barks away, I know that his colleagues support this program as well.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier accept that extreme ramping was a contributing factor in any of the cluster of nine deaths of South Australian Ambulance patients late last year?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: that question contained a lot of argument and is inappropriate according to standing orders.

The SPEAKER: Does the Premier accept that something may have contributed? If the member for Kaurna wants to rephrase it or insert some fact, with the leave of the house, I will allow the question.

Mr PICTON: I don't know how. It doesn't have any argument, but I will do my best. Does the Premier accept that ramping was a contributing factor in any of the nine deaths of South Australian Ambulance patients?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow that question. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23): We canvassed quite a lot of this yesterday. There was an independent review of a number of reported adverse incidents. What we have now is confirmation that there were 12 adverse incidents that occurred last calendar year, of which I think the member is referring to nine that occurred in the last five months, between August and December of last year. Those matters are now subject to further investigation by the Coroner. It's up to the Coroner to determine what the causes of that situation or those adverse events were and we will wait to find out what the Coroner has to say. Those opposite who—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —haven't been privy to conducting that research and investigation themselves are somehow out there at the moment trying to assert what the cause was. Personally, I would rather wait to see what the Coroner finds out. What I would say, though, is that the South Australian Ambulance Service did independently get this work done to evaluate the peak in the number of incidents reported last year. This is excellent, because it is shining a light on the problems that have existed in this organisation for some time.

If we look at the detail provided in the report and in the 14 recommendations, it talks about a culture that is more focused on achieving the KPIs rather than the right patient outcomes. I commend the South Australian Ambulance Service for commissioning this research and making sure that they could look at this information and take action on it. We wish them all the very best in working

with the health department more broadly to make sure that we can provide the very best service possible for the people of our state.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:25): My question is again to the Premier. Why has the government announced today that it is likely to cancel elective surgery operations this week rather than reopening the 61 hospital beds it has closed at Hampstead, Flinders and the Women's and Children's?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): Well, I don't have any specific information that would suggest that there has been a cancellation of elective surgery, but I am happy to ask the health minister detailed questions on that and come back. I would point out, though, that we do have information that gives us a very clear picture of what we inherited from those opposite with regard to elective surgery. I know that those opposite are not interested—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated for one moment. Is there a point of order?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir; it was debate. The Premier gets up and immediately says he can't answer the question and wants a debate.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, I have the question. I am assiduously listening to the Premier. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. I do know that those opposite hate hearing about the failures of the system that they had created. It must be difficult for them to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —cope with, because in their Pollyanna delusional world, they believe that somehow they handed over this perfect system that was all operating. This suits their narrative because, of course, the minister who handed it over is now the Leader of the Opposition—very awkward.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, be seated. Debate? I have the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Personal reflections, sir—

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order. I do not need a speech. I do ask the Premier to respectfully come back to the substance of the question concerning elective surgery and related matters.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: One of the things that you have to do when you are the leader of a political party is take responsibility. All we hear from the Leader of the Opposition is, 'I was only the health minister for three or four months.'

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He was in the cabinet for a lot longer. Leaders take responsibility.

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: What he wants to do is punt responsibility to one of his other mates. The reality is that we inherited a mess. You need to take responsibility—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is a point of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for that mess.

The SPEAKER: Premier, be seated. Has the Premier finished? I do have the point of order and I understand it is for debate. In fairness to the Premier, I have given him some scope. He is facing a cacophony of noise from members on my left. I have the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He didn't even attempt to answer the question. He is just engaging in debate.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can leave for half an hour under 137A. It is not an opportunity to make an impromptu speech when a point of order is made. Thank you, we will see you in half an hour. The Premier has the call.

The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. The Australian Institute of Health and Welfare compiles statistics for all hospitals in Australia. I note, with regard to elective surgery, which is ranked by hospital, that South Australia last financial year—nine months of which the Labor Party were in office—actually had five of the 10 worst hospitals in the country for elective surgery. But for some reason they want to continually say, 'Why is the Liberal Party doing this?' I guarantee you, sir, that every day—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we are in power we are working to fix the mess that we inherited, whether it be maintenance of our country hospitals, whether it be the massive backlog in upgrades that are required, whether it be dealing with the emergency department waiting times or clearance rates, whether it be in regard to elective surgery, or whether it be in regard to the performance of the South Australian Ambulance Service. Every day that we are in power, we are working to make sure that we return our health system to the very best system it can possibly be.

I just refer you, sir, and this parliament to an understanding of the reality—which is independently assessed; it's there for everybody to look at—that the health system under the previous government was not functioning. It had the worst emergency department clearance rates in the country—worst, second worst, third worst, fourth worst. It doesn't get much worse than that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And it had five of the worst 10—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurua is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —hospitals in terms of elective surgery waiting times. That is what they delivered. We are fixing it up.

FORENSIC PSYCHIATRISTS

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:30): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney please inform the house on work to alleviate pressures on forensic psychiatrists in our court system?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:30): I thank the member for Colton for the question. Whilst I was quite happy to make a ministerial statement on this yesterday, I will proceed in question time to respond. The government recognises the importance of protecting the community from predators and will take all available steps to ensure that South Australians remain safe.

Members would be aware that we have two pieces of legislation to deal with serious offenders. Firstly, we have the Criminal Law (High Risk Offenders) Act 2015 and, secondly, the Sentencing Act 2017. Both of these acts do two things. One is they enable us, with the support of two legally qualified medical practitioners, to apply to keep people in continued detention. Secondly,

if an offender wants to seek a release on licence, then they need again two legally qualified medical practitioners to do that.

Consistent with the legislation that we changed last year to tighten thresholds for access to the right to have this release, they need to be able to satisfy, with the support of two medical practitioners, that there is a capacity for them to be both willing to control and capable of controlling their sexual instincts. We have reversed the onus. The law has been tightened. It still requires two legally qualified medical practitioners.

Members would be aware—there has been media coverage of this—that there is only a small pool of psychiatrists who specialise in criminal matters who are qualified to undertake forensic assessments. Members may not be fully aware that this issue in relation to there being a small pool of psychiatrists, and therefore sometimes delays in court proceedings as a result of this small pool being in existence and the work being distributed under the direction of the forensic mental health service in South Australia, in fact wasn't a new issue that came as news to the now opposition.

Why? Because in March 2017, nearly two years ago, the then minister for health received advice from the Law Society in writing of the urgency that needed to be given to addressing this shortage. Who was the minister for health at the time? The Leader of the Opposition.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The plaintive pleas of the Law Society to address this issue fell on deaf ears. Obviously, no-one was prepared to take responsibility on that side to actually deal with this issue. When the—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: When the legacy of the failings of the former government, who swept this issue under the rug—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Industry is called to order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —were ultimately unearthed by this government, the solutions were developed expeditiously. So late last year we met with members of the forensic mental health service, representatives of the courts, the legal profession and members such as the Legal Services Commission, who are of course responsible for dealing with a number of these issues. There needed to be prompt attention approving a number of measures to streamline psychiatric court assessment processes to be able to deal with these direct, immediate shortages.

We all know that experienced forensic psychiatrists don't just fall out of the sky and that they don't get trained up in five minutes. We need to address that. One of those suggestions by the director of forensic mental health was to look at introducing consultant psychologists who are not legally qualified medical practitioners under the act. We are acting on that and we will continue to act on these matters, notwithstanding the previous abandonment of responsibility by the previous government.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:35): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it would be acceptable if patients had their elective surgery cancelled this week, as was announced today?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:35): Sorry, I didn't hear the question.

The SPEAKER: Can we have the question repeated, please.

Mr PICTON: My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it would be acceptable if patients had their elective surgery cancelled this week, as was announced today?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, I have already said in my previous answer that I am more than happy to come back to the house with an answer regarding elective surgery. The reality is that I am not the Minister for Health and I don't have a detailed understanding of every announcement that is made by the health minister. There are two chambers in this parliament: there's one that's green and there's another one that's red. In the red one, there's the Minister for Health. He could answer this question.

There's this other new invention called the telephone. You can text people, you can ask your members in another chamber, if you wish, or you can send a messenger down there, or you can make out you're going to the toilet and you could whiz down there, so to speak, and you could ask your mates to ask that detailed question, if you need it urgently. I am happy to ask that question. In fact, I might even be able to get on the blower and text the minister myself and come back if you want to ask that question again in a couple of minutes' time.

HAMPSTEAD REHABILITATION CENTRE

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:36): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier be keeping the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre open, or will he be closing it?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36): Of course, the previous government announced that the Hampstead—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call. The question is very clear. I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The previous government, sir, as you would be more than aware, made an announcement that the Hampstead centre was going to close. It was made at the same time they announced that they were going to close St Margaret's and the Repat. Thankfully, we have been able to save the issue in regard to the Repat.

There was a plan by the previous government to take many of the rehab services for those who are living with brain injury or spinal injury down to The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I think it is more than clear that we have made a decision, as the government, to move those services to the Repat site. That doesn't stop us from moving ahead with our planned expenditure on The Queen Elizabeth Hospital. I think that is in the order of \$270 million to \$280 million worth of upgrades, which will occur at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Why is the 20-bed modern Cassia Ward still closed at the Women's and Children's Hospital, despite the emergency department reaching 165 per cent capacity this week?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:38): I am not going to accept the question as a matter of fact. The reality is that Cassia Ward and the medical short stay ward at the Women's and Children's Hospital have been temporarily amalgamated, as they are very often at this time of the year, during the summer period, when there is a lower level of occupancy. This is a matter for the leadership of the women's and children's local health network. The capacity is available to be activated as soon as it is actually needed, but I am advised that it's not needed at the moment.

I know those opposite think that they could run the health system better than the current people who are leaders within our hospitals. They did actually have their chance. That experiment didn't go particularly well, so the reality is I think what we will do in government is just to continue to back the leadership within our hospitals.

I must say that we have a new chief executive at the Women's and Children's Hospital in that local health network. We are very satisfied with the performance of the chief executive, and they make decisions regarding capacity on an ongoing basis. As I said, the Cassia Ward and the medical short stay ward are temporarily amalgamated, as they are pretty much every year at this time of the year.

URBAN INFILL DEVELOPMENT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Will the minister act to reverse changes to the planning act that allow extreme subdivisions, sometimes as many as six dwellings on one block, which cause increased congestion on suburban roads and the reduction of valuable green space?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:40): I just wonder whether the Speaker put you up to this, member for Florey. This is a concern that he has been badgering me about for a long period of time. Yes, there is actually work that's currently ongoing. There are some pockets in some council areas across our state and our city that do have really small minimum lot sizes, and I take, and we do take—

The SPEAKER: Like Campbelltown.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Like the Campbelltown City Council which has minimum lot sizes of around 150 square metres. I'm not going to do the maths on my feet, but it does mean that we see four, five, six and even seven for one development on an individual lot. There have been a number of concerns raised about how we deal with the associated parking issues that tend to arise as a result of that. For your awareness, member for Florey, I also had a letter from the former minister for planning, raising similar concerns about the Lightsview development which he himself put in place, which I found quite humorous, but there you go.

The Campbelltown City Council wrote to me about this last year in about September. After having a bit of back and forth over a couple of months about how it is best to deal with this from a citywide perspective, we agreed to go forward and return a statement of intent in relation to the Campbelltown City Council doing some work to look at more appropriate minimum lot sizing and then those associated issues in relation to setback, shared driveways, car parking provision and the like.

We want that work to inform things more broadly because we see this as an issue, and it is something that is probably at its worst in Campbelltown City Council, but it would certainly have some relevance to other pockets around our city. But we have to do other things as we look to scale back some of that high-density development.

People are choosing to live within the five to 10-kilometre radius from the CBD. We have seen now that naturally people are gravitating towards these suburbs and, as a planning system, it needs to be able to facilitate that development. Whereas before we were seeing huge amounts of redevelopment on the urban fringe—and certainly under planning minister Holloway there was a whole heap of rezoning out to the north—people are now choosing to live and want to live much closer to the city.

So, to offset potentially losing some density around increasing minimum lot size, there are other things that we need to look at. We are very keen, for instance, to look at more legacy industrial sites, to look at more areas where we can facilitate more high-density developments. As a government, we want to facilitate higher population growth and that means again that our planning system needs to reflect that.

But I certainly take your point in your question, too, around open space. That is something of major concern to me because it seems that open space only goes one way and that's backwards. It's why we took to the election a policy for greener neighbourhoods to provide a fund out of the Planning and Development Fund that the Minister for Environment is going to look after to partner with councils to look at doing something simple like planting more trees, which we know helps to deal with the urban heat effect.

Through some reforms that the Minister for Environment and Water is looking at, there is a whole lot more that we want to do to green our city and to put money into greening our city. Essentially, we want to use the existing process, and potentially new processes as part of the landscape act, to be able to put in more money so that we can actually have a greener city that supports higher density and that does so in a way that communities can still have that amenity so that in this beautiful city in which we live, Adelaide, we have the opportunity to be able to enhance it further.

GOVERNMENT TRAVEL SERVICES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. Was a probity adviser present in all meetings between government ministers and QBT travel and its officers during the tender process for the across-government travel contract?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44): I'm not aware that QBT have met with any ministers, so my understanding is that the entire process was overseen by an independent probity officer. That information ultimately went to the Under Treasurer and the decision came to cabinet. There was certainly no presentation to cabinet with regard to that proposal, and I don't recall any meetings between QBT and cabinet ministers.

GOVERNMENT TRAVEL SERVICES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:45): My question is again to the Premier. Was a probity adviser present when the Premier met with the Chief Executive Officer of QBT travel, Andrew Burnes, in May last year?

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford can leave for half an hour under 137A.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: I'm trying to listen to the question and the answer in silence. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:45): No, absolutely not. There was no probity officer because it wasn't a meeting about a contract. In fact—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —I basically arrived after a conference had started and I left before it ended. So it's very difficult to conduct complex negotiations while you are actually on the stage. I don't know how the member for Lee might have operated in that regard. I will be quite honest with the chamber: I had no idea that Helloworld and QBT were linked. When I was growing up, QBT was Qantas Business Travel. That was—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, that's what QBT is.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left and right, order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Maybe some opposite—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —thought it was just 'kwibbit'. The reality is, I had no understanding that 'kwibbit' or QBT was part of Helloworld.

I was delighted to be invited to attend the Helloworld national conference. This had a number of very prominent South Australian travel agencies which are linked to Helloworld, many national companies that are linked to Helloworld. My understanding is that they are one of the major if not the major domestic travel agency in Australia. They were here on an extended visit. They had quite a familiarisation with the excellent product that we have here in South Australia, and we make no qualms whatsoever of being front and centre to promote this state.

We have a huge ambition to grow the size of the tourism sector in South Australia. Previously, this was the position held by the previous government. They used to come into this chamber on a pretty regular basis talking about how important the tourism sector was for this state, and we share that ambition that the previous government had. They seem to have lost it recently. We think it's perfectly plausible to have people coming to our state to look at our products so that

they can go back and inform their customers, their clients, about the wonderful product that we have here in South Australia. Now, we have an ambition to grow the tourism sector to \$8 billion per year.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We do this because we know that tourism is a major employer in this state. We know that it creates many, many jobs and we would like it to create many, many more in the future.

GOVERNMENT TRAVEL SERVICES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:48): Supplementary, Mr Speaker: was the Premier's attendance at the Helloworld conference approved by the probity adviser to the tender process for the across-government travel services contract?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:49): As I said, I wasn't aware that there was a link between Helloworld and QBT and I'm certainly not even aware that there was a process underway at that point in time, but I can assure people in this chamber that there was never any discussion whatsoever between me and any members of Helloworld about a government tender for government travel. I do not know how it operated under the previous regime, but, as I have said, this process was completely and utterly overseen by an independent probity officer. The information went to the Under Treasurer, who prepared recommendations that ultimately went to cabinet.

The SPEAKER: Helloworld shares are down 4¢ today, by the way. Member for Davenport.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:49): Thank you, Mr Speaker, for that information.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport has the call.

Mr MURRAY: I am delighted to address my question regarding the Repat to the Premier. Could the Premier update the house about the release of the Repat master plan and how the state government is working with the commonwealth government on reactivating the Repat?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50): I would like to thank the member for Davenport for his question. He has a long and abiding interest in the Repat site, as does his predecessor, who I see has just snuck into the gallery. This morning, I was joined by the member for Davenport, the member for Elder, the member for Gibson, the member for Waite and also three federal members as we made our commitment as a state government to reinvest \$40 million worth of state taxpayer money into the revitalisation of this iconic precinct here in South Australia.

You would be more than aware, sir, that it wasn't that long ago that the previous government said that they were going to close the entire Repat site. This took more than 100 beds out of the southern system and has caused many of the problems and much of the situation that unfortunately exists down at the Flinders Medical Centre now.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have announced that we are putting \$40 million back into the Repat.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We tore up the deal that was done by the previous government. In fact, they did two deals. They did the first deal, which was one of those ironclad deals. That fell

over, so they did another deal. Of course, we were in the happy position to be able to tear up that contract, terminate that contract, when we came to government. The federal government were there because they, too, are a believer in that site. I was joined today by the federal health minister, Greg Hunt; the federal ageing minister, Ken Wyatt; and of course the local member, the member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, who have all been advocating for improved services on that site. That is exactly and precisely what we are going to have there. What we are going to see before very long—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is a new state-of-the-art facility for brain and spinal rehabilitation patients in South Australia. This has been long overdue, and we will be very happy to open those facilities as soon as possible. There will also be an 18-bed specialised facility to care for some of the most vulnerable South Australians who are suffering extreme behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia. We are also going to see a new state-of-the-art gymnasium for brain and spinal injury patients here in South Australia, not only patients but also elite athletes, as well as a town square in the heart of the Repat to create a community hub and outdoor space.

None of this would have been possible without the very strong support of the entire South Australian community. I want to commend members who I have already identified but, in addition to them, I would like to reference the people who worked down on that Repat site. They were there this morning. We had a huge number of people turn up: past patients, clinicians, doctors, nurses, allied health professionals, people who were groundsmen, people who worked on the site and people who cooked the meals.

There was a fantastic culture at that site, a focus on the people who were the patients on that site, but nobody more so than the veterans. They were there this morning in number. In particular, I would like to acknowledge and put on the public record my thanks to Augustinus Krikke, who led the campaign on the steps of this parliament to keep the Repat open. There were veterans on the steps for 161 nights. That was their commitment to keeping the Repat open. They had a petition that had more than 100,000 signatures; in fact, it was the largest petition in our state's history. We stopped the closure, and now we are getting on with the very important task of revitalising this important precinct.

Mr PICTON: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I hear the point of order, I welcome to parliament today the former member for Davenport, a fine inquisitor of question time.

Question Time

Mr PICTON: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the Premier was reading and referencing a document that was marked for cabinet, and in reference to past practice I ask that you obtain that document and see whether he quoted from it in the parliament.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right, be quiet! There is a point of order on the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the member for Kaurana is not giving accurate information to the house, and that is a bogus point of order.

The SPEAKER: I always call these things as I see them. I didn't agree with the member for Kaurana, but I will have a look at the footage, and if there is something to bring back and table to the parliament then I will order that. The member for Lee.

HELLOWORLD TRAVEL

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:55): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Who invited the Premier to open the Helloworld conference?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I don't have that detail. I can find out whether it came via email or a telephone call to my office. I am happy to find that out and come back to the house.

HELLOWORLD TRAVEL

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier, any minister, any Liberal MP, staff member or their family members ever received a travel benefit, upgrade or airfare from Helloworld Travel or any of its subsidiaries?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I know it is almost impossible to believe, but I don't have the details of all the travel records. Maybe if you could all flick them into my office and I can go through all of your personal details I might be able to answer that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But the reality is that I know what those opposite are trying to do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know what those opposite are trying do.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett is called to order

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's not going well for Labor at the moment, sir. There is no, as the Leader of the Opposition would talk about, uplifting—

Mr PICTON: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —central narrative. I think they are his words: there's no central, uplifting narrative.

The SPEAKER: Could the Premier please resume his seat. Member for Kaurua, before I hear the point of order, I am trying to give the opposition as many questions as possible. When these points of order come up and this cacophony of noise continues it is most difficult, but I will hear the point of order.

Mr PICTON: The Premier is engaged in debate.

The SPEAKER: Debate. I have the point of order. I uphold the point of order, but I do ask the Premier to please return to the substance of the question. The Premier has finished?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, sir, I do not have at hand or in a cabinet document the details that those opposite are requesting, but I will make inquiries and if there is anything to report I will come back to the house.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee and then the member for Narungga.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HELLOWORLD TRAVEL

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:57): Did the Premier seek assurances from his cabinet and all Liberal MPs that they or their family members have never received a travel benefit, upgrade or airfare from Helloworld Travel or any of its subsidiaries during the tender process?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57): I know that there would have to be warnings delivered to members of cabinet under the previous regime, but can I tell you, sir, that members of my cabinet are fully aware of their obligations, and I am not in a position of anything which would suggest that there has been any breach whatsoever. Now, if those opposite would like to assert something rather than drag up their grubby innuendo, then I suggest that they put something forward.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: There's a stranger in the house.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy and Mining is called to order. The member for Narungga; I will come back to the member for Lee.

FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on the eco-sensitive accommodation currently being proposed for Kangaroo Island, and what changes have been made since the previous government announced this in early 2018?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:58): I thank the member for Narungga for that very pertinent question given there has been some coverage in recent days about concerns with respect to nature-based tourism activity which is being planned for Kangaroo Island.

In fact, it is an issue that I raised in parliament last year in response to a question from the government as to the government's support—and historic bipartisan support—for these sorts of activities, because we know how important the visitor economy is. We know that nature-based tourism and the incredible natural assets are part of South Australia's landscape. They are so important in drawing people to visit our state and, in turn, investing in our state and spending money in our economy. It all works towards creating jobs and doing great things for South Australia.

This is a great state, and that is why this government, when we were in opposition, was so confident in supporting the previous government's work around nature-based tourism. It is with great disappointment that that bipartisan support seems to have fallen by the wayside. Not only did we get a media release today from the opposition calling for the axing of the project, which is on Kangaroo Island, but I have also had very concerning correspondence from the member for Mawson about this. The project in question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The project in question, which the opposition are now calling to be axed, they gave it a grant of \$832,000.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: They backed this project so strongly out of the Future Jobs Fund. The member for West Torrens, with the support of Ian Hunter and the member for Mawson, when he

was a minister, who put out a joint media release, made quite clear that they loved this project and that they would give it \$832,000.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I then—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I then receive a letter from the member for Mawson, and it's taken me some weeks to respond because I was so shocked by it.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Lazy!

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Mawson interjecting out of his seat?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I've just been called lazy by the man who spent half of question time outside. The member for Mawson's letter alludes to the fact that there was a change. He says that this work was taking place at, initially, two sites. It was initially two sites. Do you know how many it is now? Initially, two; it's still two. His letter then says that he is concerned about seven sleeping pods with—

The SPEAKER: Is the minister reading the letter?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: No, I'm not. I am looking at some quotes. I am happy to table the letter, though.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: More than happy to.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: it will be accompanied by a government docket. All of that docket should be tabled.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. The minister has agreed to table the document, but I will have a look. If it is attached to anything else, then I will come across that when I get to it. Thank you, minister.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: When the government approved this project, how many structures did it have? It had 22 structures involved; now, 20. The central community hub within this formerly under the previous government had 190 square metres; now, 172 square metres. It's a bad day for the member for Mawson. He slipped right down the ranks, right down the backbench and he's been seen to be just playing petty politics. It is very sad that—

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Lee, I welcome to parliament today the former member for Wright and the great former Speaker of the house Mr Michael Atkinson. I look forward to a glass of slivovitz with him in discussing my question time performance this afternoon. The member for Lee.

Question Time

GOVERNMENT TRAVEL SERVICES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:02): As do we, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Has Helloworld Travel or any of its subsidiaries hosted or sponsored any South Australian Liberal Party fundraisers?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:03): Not that I am aware of.

GOVERNMENT TRAVEL SERVICES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:03): Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Can't hear him from the kids' table.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My question is again to the Premier. Has the minister or any ministerial staff attended a Liberal Party fundraising event hosted or sponsored by QBT, Helloworld Travel or any of its subsidiaries?

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: What's the difference between that and the previous question?

The SPEAKER: Would you like to repeat the question, member for Lee?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Has any minister or ministerial staff attended a Liberal Party fundraising event hosted or sponsored by QBT, Helloworld Travel or any of its subsidiaries?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:03): The previous answer I gave was that I wasn't aware that there had been any sponsored. Now he is asking whether people attend these functions that I'm saying that I'm not aware have occurred. I can't add any more detail. I'm not aware of any events which this company has sponsored in South Australia. If I'm not aware of any events occurring, I'm certainly not aware of any people that attended these events. So I think that perhaps you could get Kevin Naughton to whiz up some new questions for question time tomorrow.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: I refer you to *Erskine May*, the 1997 edition, and I quote:

A Minister of the Crown may not read or quote from a despatch or other State paper not before the House, unless he is prepared to lay it upon the Table. Similarly, it has been accepted that a document which has been cited by a Minister ought to be laid upon the Table...

I asked you yesterday, sir, to examine a cabinet document that the Premier was reading from and citing from in the chamber—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right, please be quiet.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I ask, sir: do you have possession of the document the Premier had in the house yesterday? Have you compared it to the *Hansard* and has he cited from it?

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has raised this point of order. It has been laboured. I have made investigations and I stand by my comments from yesterday. I will also quote Blackmore's *Practice of the House of Assembly*, 1885:

It is obviously right that the House should have access to the same sources of information as a Minister, if the latter makes statements, or bases arguments, or asks the House to accept conclusions, founded upon Public Papers which he quotes.

I also quote from the *House of Representatives Practice*, 6th edition, from 2012, pursuant to standing order 201, which provides:

...if a Minister quotes from a document relating to public affairs, a Member may ask for it to be presented to the House. The document must be presented unless the Minister states that it is of a confidential nature.

It goes on. I have made investigations, as I said I would yesterday, and I have nothing further to add. If the member for West Torrens continues to pursue this line of questioning, I will be taking it as refusing to accept the authority of the Chair and he will be named.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have a point of clarification. Can you assure the house that you are satisfied that you have been furnished with the appropriate documents in order for you to make your judgement?

The SPEAKER: Yes. Yes, I am.

Personal Explanation

FORENSIC PSYCHIATRISTS

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:06): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Today in question time, I made two statements: one in relation to the March 2017 notice to the former government as to the information on the lack of psychiatrists available for forensic assessment. I further made a statement that at that time Mr Malinauskas, who had also been written to by the Law Society, was the minister for health as at March 2017. It was clear that the implication was not correct. The minister for health at that time was minister Snelling. I am still advised and maintain that the Law Society forwarded a letter, a 'submission' they called it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to the minister—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Could the Deputy Premier please be seated for one moment. The Leader of the Opposition can leave for half an hour. A personal explanation is not open to be debated.

The honourable member for Croydon having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You can. Would you like to? The Deputy Premier has the call. This is a personal explanation. It is not open to debate.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and maintain the position that the submission, as it was described, from the Law Society in respect of this matter, was to Mr Malinauskas. My understanding from that was as the minister for health. I accept that he was the minister for health several months later in September 2017—

The SPEAKER: Yes, this is only to correct the record, not for argument.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: But I wish to correct the record.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Either way, he's guilty.

The SPEAKER: Minister for Industry, you can also leave for half an hour.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

Grievance Debate

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:08): I rise today to speak about an issue that is extremely important to me and to the people of Ramsay I am very privileged to represent in this place, and that is the issue of employment and job opportunities in South Australia. My constituency should have every right to be upset with the Marshall Liberal government because jobs are important. If you do not have a job, you have very few choices in life, yet this government has cut 29 job-creating initiatives, including the Future Jobs Fund, the Job Accelerator Grants and the Investment Attraction agency.

As we approach the one-year anniversary of this government, we are starting to see the effects of this on our unemployment rate: in November 2018, it was 5.3 per cent; in December 2018,

it was 5.9 per cent. The January 2019 rate was 6.3 per cent. In the final 10 months of the previous Labor government, 18,100 jobs were created. In the first 10 months of the Liberal government, the number of jobs decreased by 200. ABS data released today has shown that construction work done in South Australia has fallen for the past two quarters.

If we just contrast this with what Labor did in government, a total of \$2.5 billion was invested into projects: the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Torrens to Torrens upgrade, the Northern Connector project, the Darlington upgrade, the O-Bahn tunnel extension, the Festival Plaza redevelopment and the construction of Adelaide Botanic High School, which is now of course locked out to anyone living in a Labor electorate. All of these large-scale capital works programs have either now been completed or are coming to an end.

It does not matter which way you look at it, this government is failing to create new opportunities for South Australians. They are too busy appointing their mates to board positions and making dodgy deals. The government should always put the people first. We should be looking at creating new employment and training opportunities, not cutting them. To add insult to injury, the government is also cutting back on its Service SA centres and we are only at the start of the cuts to bus transport services. Even if you are working, the government is trying to make it even harder to get to work or renew your driver's licence. Premier Marshall has always gone on about government getting out of the way, but I think we all know what that is code for: cuts, closures and privatisations.

Labor will always stand up for the workers and the people who want to work. When Labor was in government, we did all we could to generate new economic activity and create new jobs. We even got multinational companies like Boeing and Technicolor to set up headquarters here in South Australia. Labor believes that South Australia can lead the nation in growing key industries, such as defence and space; renewable energy and mining; tourism; food and wine, which is a bit hard with a cut of \$11 million to the budget; health and biomedical research, which is also a little bit hard with the abolition of the health industries; IT; and advanced manufacturing. These are jobs not just for the present but also for the future.

We are not seeing that type of vision or long-term planning from the Liberal government. They are just happy they made it after 16 long years in opposition, but they have nothing to show for it—no plan, no vision, just cuts, closures and privatisations. If the Liberals do not want to do the hard yards, if you do not want to put your hands on the wheel, take control and take the issue of unemployment by the scruff of the neck, then I say we on this side are ready to make jobs our number one priority for the people of South Australia.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The SPEAKER (15:13): Just for clarification, a number of members have been ejected. I am fairly merciful today and I will allow them to come back into the chamber for members' maiden speeches, including the Leader of the Opposition.

Grievance Debate

YORKE PENINSULA SAND DRIFT

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:13): I rise today to speak on the numerous issues with sand drift, sand retention and sand replenishment that have arisen in recent years up and down Yorke Peninsula. Since I started representing the community of Narungga less than 12 months ago, and in the months preceding that as a candidate, Complaints have been made to me about the sand situation at North Beach near Wallaroo, Black Point, Fisherman Bay, Balgowan, Point Turton and The Pines. Indeed, I was told quite a humorous story about The Pines in which one shack owner was quite appreciative of the sand drift issues that have arisen because the accumulation is happening right in front of his shack, and never has the beach looked so plentiful and full of sand. That is just off the top of my head.

In addition to that, there are other communities that desperately need a boat ramp improvement. I am loath to endorse any solution while the record on coastal protection on the peninsula is so lacklustre. Beautiful Marion Bay, for example, has a flawed boat ramp which makes

it almost impossible to launch a boat unless you are a local with experience in the most difficult of conditions. However, based on the examples that we have on the peninsula, a solution that includes a rock groyne places at risk the pristine beaches around Marion Bay, which attract so many tourists each year.

North Beach is a particularly bad example of sand drift issues, where a rock groyne installed to protect the entry to the marina is blamed for catching a great deal of sand. It inundates the shacks closest to the boat ramp marina entry with sand at their front doorstep. Shacks down that end literally, without a word of exaggeration, have sand that accumulates to a height above the roof level out the front of the shacks. This makes the shacks unusable. The very reason people buy on the beachfront is so that they can walk out the front door, onto the beach and into the water.

In Fisherman Bay and Black Point, new boat ramps have impeded the natural drift of sand along the beach. On one side there is plentiful sand, and on the other there is a rough, rocky base that one finds if one digs deep enough beneath the surface sand. Residents of these two communities visit primarily because of the pristine beaches. The sand drift issues we have on the peninsula put at risk those residents and visitors who patronise those towns every year.

In Point Turton and Balgowan, the boat ramps are impossible to use at low tide because the ramp silts up between the rock groynes that guard the ramp from the dangerous wave conditions that can impede the launching of a boat. Point Turton sea rescue have reached out to me and said that they fear that lives will be at risk when they cannot get their rescue vessel out to save victims.

Indeed, they relate a story about returning to the ramp towing a stricken vessel and becoming beached at the boat ramp. Members of the sea rescue squadron literally had to get out and push the sea rescue boat and the stricken vessel across the silted-up entrance to the boat ramp. It took some 20 minutes to get both boats to safety. One worries that, if an emergency call goes out and the squadron is required to push the boat out of the boat ramp, that 20 minutes might be the difference between life and death for those people trapped at sea in the most harrowing of circumstances.

Similarly, professional fishermen and charter fishermen in Point Turton are having issues and having their business put at risk by the boat ramp silting up. The YP Council is currently attempting to dredge the entry to the boat ramp. It is a process that needs to be entered into regularly at quite an expense to the council. I am sure that this process could be streamlined and made cheaper. Balgowan residents have approached me with a cheap and effective solution. I look forward to investigating that further to try to alleviate issues that they face at their boat ramp.

There are more problems up and down the peninsula, but this is just a quick overview of some of the issues that boat ramps face on the peninsula and beaches. YP is an extremely popular fishing destination. Based on my understanding, Port Hughes boasts the busiest boat ramp outside metropolitan Adelaide and is popular with many beachgoers.

I look forward to welcoming the Minister for Environment and Water down to the peninsula soon—indeed, he has given the undertaking to visit in the short term—and working toward a solution for these problems and toward a better guardian of coastline so that future boat ramp improvements do not impose the same problems on communities that the current situation does.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the communities at the aforementioned towns who have reached out to me and relayed their concerns. It has been a pleasure to visit all of those communities and view the problems faced by them and discuss how potential solutions might be reached. Thank you to those communities. I look forward to welcoming the minister to the peninsula in due course.

GULFVIEW HEIGHTS

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:18): I rise today to speak about a very important issue in the suburb of Gulfview Heights in the seat of Wright, which is the now bone-dry lake. The lake—and I am being very generous in calling it a lake; it is really just a dust bowl at the moment—is nestled between Bayview Parade, Gulfview Circuit and Parkside Drive in Gulfview Heights.

In fact, it was once actually a focal point for the community. I have seen photos from about 10 to 15 years ago with families picnicking, kids fishing and people using the park and benches to sit

and enjoy the beautiful scenery. None of those three things can be done anymore because there is no water in the lake. This is something that occurs every year.

This area was part of the Delfin expansion into the north-east. It stretched through Modbury Heights, Gulfview Heights, Wynn Vale, Golden Grove and Greenwith. When local councils took over management from Delfin, after they pulled out, local people were given a commitment by both Salisbury and Tea Tree Gully councils that the maintenance that had occurred while Delfin had been in control of the area would be maintained. That was very good maintenance indeed. It meant manicured lawns and watering of all the community spaces. This, of course, included the lake in Gulfview Heights.

The system that kept the lake surrounds watered year round was turned off during the drought in 2009 and unfortunately, since then, has not been turned back on. Over recent years, the lining of the lake has deteriorated to the point where it can no longer hold water all year round. In winter months there is enough rainfall to keep it full, despite the lining leaking water the whole time, but in summer months it quickly becomes empty.

The lake, as we now know it, is an arid desert; it is scarred and all the wildlife that used to live there have left. In fact, when I was doorknocking around the lake last week, I was told by a resident that he now has a problem with snakes coming across from the lake into his front yard in search of food. I am sure that is not what he thought he would have to put up with when he bought his property in Gulfview Heights 20 years ago.

In some of those photos I referred to earlier, showing families fishing and picnicking, there were ducks. I can tell you that ducks are now about as easy to find as a Service SA centre is soon going to be. A number of local Gulfview Heights residents have raised these concerns with me, explaining that they have been lobbying Salisbury council for many years for a permanent fix to the problem. Today, I am pleased to say that it looks as though there is a glimmer of hope. Last week, our campaign began to bear fruit.

There was a very substantial changeover between past members and new members at the council elections last year and some newly elected members of Salisbury council seem to have had far more success in getting something done about this issue than their predecessors ever did. In fact, on Monday night the council voted to include a discretionary item for consideration in this year's council budget. If this goes ahead, it will mean that the clay base of the lake will be replaced so that it will again hold water all year round and the watering system that surrounds the lake will be reactivated.

That would be a huge win for the community. Since Delfin left, the community feels largely ignored by the councils that took over the management of the area. But, at this point it is just a discretionary item. Yesterday, I sent further correspondence to residents of Gulfview Heights letting them know the good news from this week's council meeting. In that letter I included a petition for them to sign, calling on the council to make sure that this is not a discretionary item, but that it is actually included in the 2019-20 budget for Salisbury council.

As the years pass and people come and go from the suburbs, there is a lot of change and people tend to forget what the area used to be like. What I have noticed about Gulfview Heights is that a lot of people have been there since the suburb was first created, and they remember. They remember what the suburb was like when they first built there. If you hop on YouTube you can see the original Delfin promotional video from 1990. It was that fantastic maintenance and upkeep of the public areas that attracted them to the area in the first place. Gulfview Heights lake was one of the main reasons people bought in that little neck of the woods. It is no wonder that people are up in arms about how the lake has deteriorated over the years.

I would like to mention some positive news that is happening in Gulfview Heights. The Kiekebusch Road Reserve, which is a little bit further down the hill in Gulfview Heights and a very popular play space for families in the area, is now going to have a very substantial upgrade courtesy of Salisbury council. It is going to have a new nature play space, upgraded equipment, outdoor gym equipment and an integrated running and walking track as well. I give a shout out and a thankyou to Salisbury council, but more specifically to two new councillors in the area for that ward, Adam Duncan and Maria Blackmore, for all their hard work.

Just recently, I sent a letter to the Minister for Transport asking for an update on a promised establishment of a public bus route through Wynn Vale Drive and Gulfview Heights. I know everybody in the community who currently does not have access to a bus is waiting with bated breath to hear what the answer will be.

PROJECT ICE RIVERLAND

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:23): I rise today to speak about a drug rehabilitation pilot program that I recently opened and delivered to the good people of Chaffey, following last year's state election. It was an election commitment that I gave to the people of Chaffey. Sadly, my office had been inundated with families, family members and community members who had been impacted by the scourge of crystal methamphetamine, known as ice. Working closely with the community, the Riverland drug action group and particularly Project Ice Riverland, through public forums and the continual meetings of those groups, we came together and formulated a need for the Riverland.

We know that regional South Australia, by and large, has been dealt quite a severe blow from the impacts of methamphetamine use and what it means particularly to small regional communities. The use of crystal methamphetamine, known as ice, has been evident in Chaffey for some time, particularly in the wastewater. I would like to acknowledge the great work of SAPOL and the service sectors that have been a part of this consultation process over a long period of time.

Leading up to the election, I met Dr Quentin Black, who heads up PsychMed where he has been running the MATRIX program, a program that has been running in the US for 30 years or more. It is a project that has been tried and tested and is seen to be a very effective program. Delivering on my election commitment, last Tuesday I officially opened the PsychMed centre in Berri, which will administer the MATRIX drug rehabilitation program. I opened the facility with Dr Quentin Black, who is a medical practitioner and clinical psychologist. We had Nicole Bowering there who is a program mentor. Sadly, she was taken over by ice and, over an extended period of time, she learnt what it means to have an addiction to crystal methamphetamine. She was there to show that the program works.

Dr Black believes that traditional approaches such as inpatient detox, drug substitution and residential rehabilitation programs are effective in only about 12 per cent of cases. The initial trial results from the MATRIX program in Adelaide found the intensive community-based treatment yields results up to six times better than those of traditional programs like residential rehabilitation programs. The Marshall Liberal government has committed \$580,000 to this pilot program in the Riverland to assist the people in our community with ice dependency. Our government recognises the challenges faced by individuals experiencing problematic substance abuse, and the people who support them, so we are very pleased to be able to support extending services in the region.

The MATRIX program combines practical training for escaping addiction with frequent, structured social support and the rewarding of participants' achievements. It includes supported detoxification and participation involving regular attendance throughout the program. It is about keeping minds active and giving participants the best support possible for rehabilitation. At the opening, about 40 community people came along and witnessed Nicole Bowering's story. It was a very sad story, considering the journey she had been on, but it had a great outcome. She had been through the MATRIX program and had experienced its great work and the way it engages participants and gives them the belief that they can get over that large hurdle of addiction.

The centre is a win, not only for the people of Chaffey but for the people within the Riverland and Mallee districts. We even have people coming from outside the region to explore the possibilities and opportunity to be part of the MATRIX program. I commend the Marshall Liberal government for showing the initiative of putting the pilot program in the Riverland in the electorate of Chaffey because, sadly, in regional South Australia, crystal methamphetamine is a scourge.

FLINDERS CHASE NATIONAL PARK

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:28): Today, I joined about 500 people from around South Australia on the front steps of Parliament House to rally against changes that have been put in place to a proposal at Flinders Chase National Park on Kangaroo Island, which this year celebrates its centenary. When we were in government, we built what is considered a world-class

walking trail through that part of Kangaroo Island. We did it with the support of locals from the Friends of Parks.

Along that trail we put campsites, with rainwater tanks and sinks and camping bases as well. While we were there, we walked not far from those sites, about 300 or 400 metres through some of the scrub, back across the trail, and saw where the proposed eco-friendly glamping tents were going to be put in place by the Australian Walking Company.

Since that time, things seem to have changed, with the proposal now for more solid structures to be built at very environmentally sensitive places, at Sandy Beach and Sanderson Bay. They were not in the original concept plans that were put up and that we saw. As I said, these camping spots were meant to be within the bushland that is in this pristine part of Flinders Chase. The added concern that people have on Kangaroo Island is that there will be an additional three kilometres of roadway through the park to get people to and from these places at Sandy Beach and Sanderson Bay.

On top of that three kilometres of roadway, there is apparently going to be an extra seven kilometres of spur trails. These are questions I put to the Minister for Environment in a very polite letter on 17 December last year. That is 10 weeks ago. I still have not had a response to any of those questions. I think that is pretty ordinary because you should not be just responding to me in my letter. I was actually writing on behalf of constituents, and we had 500 constituents—

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Point of order: the member for Mawson asked you not to respond to him, when actually I think he was referring to me.

The SPEAKER: Yes, could the member for Mawson please address all remarks through the Chair. Thank you.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Take a petty tiggly touchwood point of order because the minister knows that he is doing a very ordinary job.

The SPEAKER: Let's get on with it.

An honourable member: I think you're getting under his skin.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I think I have got under his skin. He has sold out the River Murray. He has sold out the people of Kangaroo Island. His agency now says it is an economic driver agency rather than an agency looking after the environment. Of the 500 people out on the steps there were about 50 from Kangaroo Island, but there were 450 people from around South Australia who have had enough of this new government and how it wants to trample all over the sensitive vegetation and upset the lives of animals—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —that inhabit the pristine parts of this state. The people I wrote on behalf of want an answer, and they want an answer from the Minister for Environment.

When I was a tourism minister, we supported projects like this. We gave a grant to the Australian Walking Company. We put \$8 million into upgrading the Kangaroo Island airport. We put several thousand more into private companies on Kangaroo Island so that we could upgrade the tourism that South Australia has to offer. Let's remember that we took the visitor economy in South Australia to record levels. We are not scared of offering people good accommodation, but it has to be in the right place. The Friends of Parks on Kangaroo Island also want this accommodation to be in the right place—not up on the top of a very environmentally sensitive cliff top and beach.

The people of Kangaroo Island and the Friends of Parks right around South Australia would just like some answers. As I said, I wrote a polite letter on 17 December—10 weeks ago. Since then, we have seen the Friends of Parks in the western end of Kangaroo Island and also on the Dudley Peninsula go on strike. They have withdrawn their services to parks that they have maintained for decades because they are so upset about the apparent changes to this proposal.

As I said, people were onside with the original proposal for these eco villas to be built within and close to the existing Kangaroo Island walking trail that was built by our government, which is seen to be a huge success. What they are not happy about is building on pristine coastline that should be preserved forever.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome today the students from years 7 to 12 from Mount Compass Area School, who are hosted by the member for Finniss. I also welcome to parliament today the former member for Enfield. We certainly miss his wise counsel, that is for sure.

Grievance Debate

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:34): Today, I rise to spread the good news about the reactivation of the Repat, which was launched this morning. Sir, you would remember, as so many on this side of the house do, when the Repat closed under the Labor government back in 2017. It was a disgraceful day in the history of public health in South Australia. The Labor Party still closed the Repat even though veterans slept on the steps of parliament for 161 nights. To protest the closing of the Repat, 120,000 signatures were presented to this parliament, but the Labor government, through trashing our state health system, still closed the Repat. That was despite former premier Mike Rann saying that the Labor Party would never, ever close the Repat.

The good news is that as of March 2018, when the Marshall Liberal government came to office, we tore up the contract for the sale of the Repat. The Repat has remained open. A master plan has been released to the people of South Australia, and today funding has been matched to that master plan. The Repat has a long, proud history, with many South Australians and veterans having a special connection to that place, a place of rehabilitation of not only people's bodies but their minds.

The hospital, located at Daw Park, has served Australian Defence Force personnel for more than 70 years. It was one of a number of repatriation general hospitals set up by the commonwealth government for returned servicemen at the conclusion of the Second World War. That is why today's joint funding announcement between a federal Liberal government and a state Liberal government of \$70 million to reactivate the Repat is so important. That activation of funds will ensure that the Repat remains a site of health services for South Australians for many, many years to come.

The federal government—today represented by the federal health minister, minister Hunt; the minister for ageing, Ken Wyatt; and local member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint—is injecting \$30 million into a statewide brain and spinal rehabilitation unit. The Marshall Liberal government at the announcement this morning was represented by the Premier; the Minister for Health, minister Wade in the other place; the member for Gibson; the member for Davenport; the member for Elder; and myself. We were there to share the fantastic announcement with our community—the community we have worked with, for and on behalf of for so many years to advocate for the reactivation of the Repat.

The state government will deliver \$40 million to the precinct, including \$14.7 million for an extra 18-bed specialised facility to care for patients suffering extreme symptoms of dementia. Over the past year, extensive community consultation has been undertaken to decide upon the best facilities to be used on the site of the Repat. Three concepts were developed for consideration and feedback following initial engagement with key community groups and clinicians.

Community forums, as recently as Sunday, were held at various locations to hear the views of the public, and that is so important. It is something the Marshall Liberal government will continue to do and will always do—that is, listen to the people of South Australia. A year was spent consulting the community and clinicians, and today we have a funded master plan, which is so important. As the member for Chaffey referred to in his remarks, this government is about delivering, and it is certainly delivering for the people of South Australia.

The amenities we see in the master plan are dementia services, older persons' mental health services, specialised brain and spinal rehabilitation, care transition and surgical procedures, all to be offered at the Repat. The new purpose-built state-of-the-art brain injury facility will be built to provide a 26-bed specialist inpatient ward, and the former rehabilitation wards will be redeveloped to provide a new 23-bed statewide spinal injury ward.

Following on from the Oakden scandal, an 18-bed specialist dementia care facility will be opened to care for some of our state's most vulnerable South Australians suffering extreme behavioural and psychological symptoms of dementia. This will form part of a dedicated dementia village, which will allow 60 places of care for people with dementia who have complex care needs. A town square will also be developed to create a cultural hub, including a new wheelchair training and sports gym, refurbishment of the SPF Hall and a new cafe. The Repat hydrotherapy services are open and running. Beds have been saved and will remain open, as will the beds at the ViTA precinct.

We are delivering on our election promise. We cannot do it without the help of the community. I thank all those community members for their patience and forbearance for many years since Labor proposed to close the Repat and for working with this government to reactivate the Repat.

Bills

ELECTORAL (PRISONER VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:39): I have to report that the managers for the two houses conferred together and that no agreement was reached.

Motions

PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION LEGISLATION

Government Business, Bills and Motions, Notice of Motion No.1: Hon. V.A. Chapman to move:

That she have leave to introduce a bill for an act to amend the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1990 and the Parliamentary Superannuation Act 1974.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:40): On behalf of the member for Bragg, I move:

That this notice of motion be withdrawn.

Motion carried; notice of motion withdrawn.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (FOSTER PARENTS AND OTHER POSITIONS OF AUTHORITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 November 2018.)

The SPEAKER: Before I hear from members on my left, I remind the house that this will be the members' first speech and therefore we ask that they be accorded the normal courtesies and respect afforded to new members on this very important occasion. The member for Cheltenham.

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:41): Mr Speaker, thank you. It is an honour and privilege to stand here today as the member for Cheltenham. I wish to acknowledge that this parliament convenes upon the traditional lands of the Kurna people, and I pay my respects to elders past, present and emerging.

I am proud to be in this place as a member of the Labor Party, the party that delivered Indigenous land rights, the party that made the apology to the stolen generation and the party that believes that real reconciliation is not simply about words but also actions, and by endorsing the

Uluru Statement from the Heart, treaty, Makarata and a constitutionally enshrined First Nation's voice to parliament our actions will speak louder than words.

I rise today as the member for Cheltenham thanks to the immense trust that my community has placed in me and the hard work of volunteers and activists. The 57-day campaign was short, but it was very, very busy. The Labor Party and I approached this campaign, as we do all campaigns, with the utmost respect for the community we seek to serve. In doing so, my volunteers and I braved some pretty extreme weather, including a number of weeks when the weather hovered either side of 40°. Being the single resident redhead in this place, as far as I am aware, doorknocking in that sun and heat certainly posed some unique occupational hazards for me. At times I felt like a desert dog walking the hot streets, and I always appreciated the kind offers of shade and cold drinks from residents.

Although I was born and raised in the electorate of Cheltenham, my election as the local member of parliament has been like a homecoming in so many ways. I will tell you my story and what has led me to this place through the people of my electorate and the communities and organisations I have met and visited on this campaign trail—firstly, the migrants. The seat of Cheltenham comprises people from countless ethnic and cultural backgrounds, and it is this migrant story of so many residents in my electorate that my family also shares. I am a child of a Hungarian refugee, Joseph Szakacs, and a girl from dairy country New South Wales, Valerie Brislane.

The Brislane and Lewis clan arrived in Australia from Ireland in 1842 and immediately started working the land in mid-north New South Wales. To this day, dairy and cattle are still in the family, and I have very fond memories of holidays in the area when I was growing up. My Uncle David would always put me to work and ensure that my hands were pretty dirty by the end of the day. Conservation played a big part on the farm, and I became acquainted with dairy cattle in a way that only generations of a family who tended the land could teach.

My father fled Hungary, leaving behind his whole family and everything and everyone he knew in the final throes of the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. He left his father, also named Joseph, and his mother, Margaret, and sister Sylvia. He would never see his parents again. He was an activist, and in that sense the apple has not fallen far from the tree. He was a target because he fought for freedom and he fought for justice.

My dad sacrificed everything for what he believed in. Dad's only way to safety, when the troops marched into Budapest, was to flee and cross the border into Austria in the dead of the night. He was caught, but he escaped again. Growing up, I would ask dad: why Australia? And he would often quip, 'Because of the beautiful beaches and the beautiful women.' But, as I grew older and met my dad's family, the truth was a little more sobering.

In one of the final conversations my father had with his own father, his dad told him clearly what to do: 'Escape, go, get as far away from here as you can and never come back.' On the campaign trail, when I was doorknocking I met some of those other Hungarians who also left Europe under such similar circumstances in those dark days. They were so grateful to have found a safe place to call home, a place to raise their children and to give them the opportunities they were denied.

I was lucky enough to have the support of many people on this campaign trail, and wharfies were one part of that group. My dad spent 40 years of his life doing exactly that: working on the waterfront in this state. My dad was a union member from the day he walked onto his first ship. Dad cared deeply about the safety of his workmates, but the waterside that he started work on was dramatically different from that of today. Dad tells of sweeping up and then manually packing asbestos into hessian bags. All that has changed only because of the collective power of unions to improve working conditions for ordinary working people. One stevedore still working, John, worked with my dad and still wears my dad's overalls as a mark of respect for him, which our whole family finds very touching.

When I was on the pre-poll booth talking to people who were about to cast their vote, I met an older couple who recognised me. They had been neighbours just two doors down from mum and dad in Royal Park before I was even born, and they knew mum when she was pregnant with me. They told me a story about how they would tease mum about her prospects of having a baby who had red hair. She did, as you can see, but they would never have imagined that their neighbours'

son would one day represent them in parliament—someone from Royal Park. Who would have thought?

Not only did I meet people who lived in mum and dad's street but I also met people who I grew up with as a kid, who I did nippers with at Grange Surf Life Saving Club, who I played basketball with, first at Athol Park Stadium and then at St Clair Recreation Centre, and who I swam with at the Seaton pool. I also met parents who sent their children to Seaton pool, where I got my first job as a swimming instructor and taught them how to swim. I saw people who attended the same kindergarten as me—at a convent run by Polish nuns—and people who bought their European smallgoods at the original Standom in the backstreets of Hendon before it closed, when they were lucky enough as kids, like I was, to get a free Vienna sausage from the ladies behind the counter.

I met other people whose surnames were just as tricky as mine. For the record, Mr Speaker, it is pronounced 'sock-arch', and I commend you on your pronunciation. Growing up, I was happy to spell it and explain how it was pronounced because it gave me a very small opportunity to talk about my own migrant story, one that I am so immensely proud of.

One of the advantages of being a successful candidate in an election is being asked to nominate where you would like the declaration of the poll to be conducted. I chose my first school, Our Lady Queen of Peace, in Albert Park. It was immensely important for me to recognise and honour the important and immense opportunities that education gave me because my parents did exactly what working-class parents do: they worked hard to do their best to help me have more and better opportunities than they ever had. They believed in the power of education and learning, and so do I. Our Lady Queen of Peace School has changed a lot since I was there, but their values are just the same.

I spent a bit of time away from my electorate when I was swimming, and in my early 20s I was lucky enough to earn a scholarship to the University of Missouri in the United States. When I returned to South Australia, I completed my law studies at Flinders University while working part-time, which is where I was fortunate enough to meet my fellow student named Hannah, who went on to become my wife. Bringing things full circle is the fact that numerous generations of her own family grew up almost in the very shadow of Alberton Oval in the great electorate of Cheltenham, and that explains why she is a Port Power supporter.

Now we have a four-year-old son, Patrick, and we are raising him in the community that we know and love. We took him to Seaton pool, the very pool where I learnt to swim and where I first started working, for his baby swimming lessons and now he is doing nippers at that same Grange beach that I was at as a kid. He even gets his free smallgoods, but, for better or for worse, that has graduated to fritz.

All these things have shaped the person that I am today: my parents, my neighbourhood, sport and the trade union movement. I lived in a household where my parents talked about the struggles of workers because they lived them. My parents were not politically involved, but they were politically engaged. They knew who would stand up for them and what they believed in. They were, and continue to be, proud Labor supporters and they always instilled in me the view—and I never forgot this for one second—that we were a lucky family. Australia has given my family safety, freedom and opportunity and with this comes an obligation to help others who were not as lucky as us.

Some of the earliest political memories that I have are of my dad and my godfather, Andrew, another Hungarian refugee, having robust political discussions over family barbecues. Often, they were in furious agreement—and possibly a degree of exuberant animation—over a couple of glasses of good red wine, but I was always engaged and my views were always valued and always appreciated. It was natural for me to grow up believing in the dignity of work, the importance of decent pay and work, the importance of work health and safety and the right of every person to go home to their family at night safely.

At the knees of my mother and father, growing up and at every job I have done since, I learned that working people have never been benevolently gifted the basic rights and conditions workers now take for granted. They fought hard, they campaigned and they won in the same way that women had to fight for the right to vote in this country and to stand for parliament. I acknowledge

that South Australia was the first place in the world to grant black and white women the right to do both.

Working people have had to struggle for every incremental improvement in their working lives: equal pay for equal work, wage increases, holiday pay, sick pay, carer's leave and maternity leave and we can go on to other labour movement gains, like Medicare and superannuation—the things that today we take for granted. We see that struggle continue to this very day with the battle for universal domestic and family violence leave. We must do everything in our power to ensure this right is won because all the evidence proves that this helps women and their children leave violent situations. It helps them keep their jobs and keeping their jobs is crucial to getting back on their feet, raising their children in a stable environment and moving on.

I am a union member and I am a proud trade unionist. Any time my political opponents seek to demonise or cast negativity on this, I stand taller and I stand prouder and more committed to the work that I have done my entire professional life for working families and their community. I am proud to have worked for both the Australian Manufacturing Workers' Union and the United Firefighters Union before I was elected secretary of SA Unions.

For those opposite who might never have been a member of a union, here is what unions do: they are a collective voice for working people. It is as simple as that. Unions represent millions of people across this country. Workers organise with them and fight on their behalf for better pay and working conditions, for fairer workplaces, to tackle sexual harassment and gender-based violence in workplaces, and for all the things that make working people's lives fairer, such as domestic and family violence leave, as I mentioned earlier, tougher work health and safety laws, cracking down on bosses who steal workers' wages and superannuation and the exploitative practices in the labour hire industry, which particularly hurt migrants and temporary visa holders.

One thing about working in the union movement is that you see the worst examples of the worst sorts of treatment that workers have had to endure: the sexual harassment, the bullying, young people desperate for jobs who take up positions that are unpaid or simply not paid at all, the sham contracting and the phoenixing, in which companies that have stolen wages and superannuation simply close down overnight and miraculously open under another name and begin trading like the whole thing never happened. It also includes women who are sacked for being pregnant—yes, this still happens. It is companies that believe they are doing young workers a favour by getting them to work for free, or the emerging extremist views out of the right-wing think tanks that advocate for the complete abolition of the minimum wage.

But it is perhaps the workplace deaths, always needless and often preventable, and the families who are left behind that stay with us the most. I have the utmost admiration for Pam Gurner-Hall—whose partner, Jorge Castillo-Riffo, died in a preventable workplace incident—for her tireless work and bravery on this issue. I commit to continue advocating in this place on industrial manslaughter so that our law seeks to properly deter and penalise workplace deaths that are both needless and preventable. Who will stand up for working people if unions do not?

For all these reasons, the union movement is campaigning to change the rules in this country because, to put it quite simply, the rules are broken. Workers' wages and super continue to be stolen. For too many businesses wage theft has become a business model. Union members who refuse to talk to the police investigators about stopping work due to safety risks can be sent to gaol, but the federal Minister for Small and Family Business, Michaelia Cash, keeps her seat in parliament when she does the same.

Who will stand up for unions and these people if not for the Labor Party, the party formed by and for working people? When I represented firefighters, we fought and won for laws to recognise the greater risk and occurrence of cancer in professional firefighters. These presumptive cancer laws were introduced by the then Labor government here in South Australia, and we became one of the first jurisdictions in Australia to do this.

I believe that government is important to people's lives. When government steps back, inequality rises, the power imbalance that leads to disadvantage goes unchecked and economic benefits do not trickle down. In fact, they never have and never will. I believe government should be progressive and strong, an instrument for change and opportunity for those people in our community

who, through a variety of factors, often thanks just to where and to whom they were born, face immense disadvantage. Government has a huge part to play in balancing the scales of fairness in their favour. When government steps out and leaves it to the markets and individuals, the results are wage theft, intergenerational poverty and poorer schools and educational outcomes, and communities become weaker and less resilient.

I have been a member of the Labor Party for close to 20 years, since the former member for Cheltenham signed me up. We believe in working in and for our community. In my community of Cheltenham, residents have sent me a clear message: they want me to listen and they want me to act. They are concerned about parking and community services in a growing community. They are worried about local jobs. They want young people who grow up in our community to be able to find work and housing and, should they choose, to be able to raise a family in the same area they grew up in. They want a fair share of infrastructure and community-building resources. They are worried about cuts to public transport and how that will affect their families and others staying connected in the community.

The Labor Party believes in the value of the collective, the strength of community, the dignity of work and the need for the economy to serve people and not simply the other way around. We are a party that always has and always will have a working-class conscience. However, it saddens me to say that when it comes to some of these progressive policies and values, we are either losing the debate or failing to win. In an era when we are seeing the emergence of fringe and extreme groups sucking the oxygen out of public debate, our job has become all the more critical because low-paid workers are being left behind.

People who have found themselves out of work are demonised and those on Newstart are living in poverty. Women continue to retire with deeply inadequate retirement savings. We need to urgently tackle the superannuation gap for women if we have a hope of decency in retirement. We need to arrest the alarming number of older women in retirement finding themselves in poverty or facing homelessness.

We need a compassionate and humane approach to refugees, where we stop accepting that the starting point for refugee policy is to make the lives of those people fleeing persecution as miserable as possible—people just like my father and hundreds and thousands of other Australians. These are the big debates, and I have been arguing these big questions my entire working life. We have to work harder to convince people about what we believe and help them to understand that sometimes we have to compromise and be pragmatic. When politics becomes too far removed from people's lives, it becomes easier for them to fall into simplistic solutions to big problems.

I am also a big believer in the power of sport to bring people and communities together. I was lucky enough to participate in a number of sports all the way into my adult life. I swam, and I am thankful for the lessons it taught me—perhaps, most importantly, it is doing my best as a parent to channel my son's emerging talents in the pool into something that involves a far more sociable approach than 4.30am starts.

Whether it is the numerous clubs in the Cheltenham electorate that run Indigenous and multicultural programs that break down barriers and stereotypes through women's sport or that are keeping our older members of our community active and engaged, sport and activity are pillars of our community. But we do need to do better to help and assist those families facing economic pressure to participate. A nine year old living in poverty is three times less likely to participate in extracurricular activities. As we see tragedies each and every summer, we need to ensure that water safety is accessible for refugees, for migrants, for people on low incomes and their children.

A mentor of mine, the former member for Cheltenham, provided sage advice to me many years ago. He said, 'In politics, make friends around ideas and issues and not on ideology.' I respect and commend my colleagues in this place from across the political divide for their commitment to public service. We have a duty as elected representatives to earn trust and pay the greatest of respect to political office. I will work with all of you to do our utmost in this regard.

I also commit myself to being an advocate and working collaboratively with those across this house where we share common policy views. I will work with you to deliver much-needed reforms to

South Australia's outdated and antiquated abortion laws, to carefully and responsibly decriminalise sex work and to deliver complete end of life care and dignity in dying laws for this state.

I could not be here were it not for the support of friends, colleagues, supporters and, of course, my family. You doorknocked, letterboxed, wobbleboarded, made phone calls and, of course, supported me on polling day. Without these individual contributions, I simply could not have done it by myself. Thankyous are always difficult. Unlike the Oscars, there is not an orchestra to call time, so I will be as quick as I can.

I have already been able to speak to so many people to express my sincere gratitude; if I have not yet had the opportunity, I will. Thank you to all my Labor Party parliamentary colleagues. It is so great to be here with you all. In particular, thank you to the opposition leader, the member for Croydon, and the deputy opposition leader, the member for Port Adelaide, for your friendship and leadership. Thank you to Reggie Martin for your stewardship of the South Australian branch of the Labor Party—the party is in good hands.

Thank you to PLUS and its executive, our members and Young Labor Left. Thank you to United Voice, the ASU and the CPSU. Thank you to David Gray for your leadership, your strategy and your friendship. Thank you to the members of the Cheltenham sub-branch of the Labor Party. I say an immense thankyou to the South Australian trade union movement, of which there are far too many individual leaders and unions to mention today. Thank you for your advocacy and your commitment to working people that is tireless in this state. I look forward to working with you all in my new role well into the future.

Thank you to my friend and leader of the ACTU, Sally McManus. Your leadership has never been at a more important time, and the movement has never had a more important leader. Thank you to my second family, the staff of SA Unions. I am so sad to be leaving you, but I am doing so leaving it in very capable hands. Thank you for making the last five years of my life so meaningful and so enjoyable.

Thank you to my campaign team, led by the incredibly hardworking, strategic and periodically grumpy Cheyne Rich, along with Samantha, Mahalah, Bia, Rhiannon and Karen. Thank you to my Cheltenham mentor, Julie Duncan. You have taught me so much. Thank you for always believing in me.

Thank you to the former member for Cheltenham, Jay Weatherill. Your contribution to the state is profound, and your personal support and contribution over many years, let alone in the last 57 days of this by-election campaign, mean a lot to me. Enjoy some quiet time with Mel and the girls before your next contribution to public life is made.

Thank you to my friends, some of whom have been my mates since school. I do not see enough of you and I am sorry for that. Thanks for always reminding me where I come from. Thank you to my parents, Valerie and Joe, whom I have already mentioned today. I could not have had a more supportive and loving upbringing. Thank you for everything. Thanks to my mother-in-law, Sue; father-in-law, Paul; mother-in-law, Irene; sister-in-law, Lauren; and brother-in-law, Nick. You are all part of our extended family unit. Thank you for your love and support.

Lastly, but never least, my wife, Hannah, and son, Patrick, thank you for always supporting me through many years that have seen me in jobs and roles that were demanding on us and on our family. You hardly saw me during the campaign—I am not sure whether that is a good or bad thing—but, as you always do, you cared for Patrick. You are an amazing mother and wife and I am so happy to be sharing this journey with you.

The Labor Party and the people of Cheltenham have placed their faith and trust in me. I am truly humbled. Thank you to them. With that faith and trust, I will continue on with what I have done my entire working life and what I have been elected to do: advocating and fighting for our community. Thank you.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (16:09): Mr Speaker, I thank you and I thank my parliamentary colleagues on both sides of the house for welcoming me to this place. It is a place that I am still in

awe of and will be for some time. As I begin, I would like to congratulate Joe Szakacs as the new member for Cheltenham and wish him well as we start this journey together.

The most important thing for me to do today is to express my absolute gratitude and appreciation that I am now the member for Enfield and part of this great place. So my first thankyou is to the people of Enfield for putting their trust and faith in me. I look forward to working with them to improve services to the communities that make up the electorate of Enfield. I thank those very diverse community members in Enfield for taking the time to discuss with me what is important to them, much of which aligns with the issues I will touch on today and which are also important to me.

There are many people who in many different ways contributed to my being here. Obviously, they are the people who assisted me in my campaign, but my journey started long before that fateful day of preselection on 14 December last year. I could not possibly mention everyone who has had an influence on me over my life, but there are key people and key experiences that have shaped me.

My parents and my brothers, Tony and Michael, and my sons, are at the core of that. My dad is no longer with us, and I am not entirely sure how he would have taken to my new occupation, but I hope he might have been a tiny bit proud that his daughter had the courage of her convictions and has been elected to this place in an attempt to make a difference. My family has taught me a lot, but perhaps the most important thing they have taught me is that no matter what gets thrown at you, you pick yourself up and dust yourself off and keep working hard for what you believe in.

I was not actually born when my family faced its toughest challenge. In 1974, like many others, they lost their home during the Turkish invasion of Cyprus. They fled to become refugees. My brothers lost their toys; my parents lost their property and treasured possessions. Perhaps worst of all, by the time we made it to Adelaide we had left all our extended family behind which, for me, meant I did not know my grandparents and I did not have my cousins to play with.

But I did have parents who both worked incredibly hard seven days a week to rebuild by making a new beginning in a new country, my mother especially. Whenever I get tired and think I might need to cut back, I think of her and what she went through, working with my father in the factory all day and heading off to the Clipsal factory at night for a shift. All the while, there was a home-cooked meal and clean clothes for us for school. My mother is the reason I will never complain that I am too busy.

When we arrived in Adelaide in 1976, there was a new language to learn and a new city to become familiar with. I still wonder how scary that would have been for my parents when I was just a baby and for my brothers who were so young. What I find quite surreal is how I have gone from living in a shed in Enfield to being the member for Enfield.

Although we were warmly welcomed and supported by so many people in our new home, it was not universally the case, and I still feel it should have been. It is something that sits with me that I hope to be able to influence in some way; that is, how we as a society treat our new migrants, whether they be refugees or skilled migrants. We should cherish the richness of new cultures and give these families every opportunity to feel at home and succeed in this great state.

My schooling years were critical and, may I say, they were quite positive. For that, I will always be grateful. I was lucky enough to have teachers who encouraged me to do my best. Yes, I was a nerd, but perhaps in different circumstances I may not have been such a high academic achiever. I recall my year 7 teacher at Kilkenny Primary, Mrs Krashos, giving me a card at graduation which had red poppies on the front.

She wrote that she knew whatever I chose to do I would do well, but she also said something that stuck with me. She said to never let anyone cut a tall poppy down. We need teachers in our schools to do what Mrs Krashos did: to see the best in our children and to help them be the best they can be, no matter how much money their parents make or what suburb they live in. Again, that is something I hope to be able to influence, and I thank all my teachers from Kilkenny Primary School, St Aloysius College and St Peter's Girls.

I knew when I was five years old that I was going to be a lawyer. My career options were presented to me as medicine or law. I could not stand blood and guts, so I studied law and commerce at Flinders University, which gave me the best start I could have hoped for in my career progression.

I must say that there was still a view then that being female, and being an ethnic female at that, would limit my career options. I believed that skill and ability would win out and, looking back now, I can say that it did, but I will come back to that issue.

Next month will mark 20 years since I was first admitted to the Supreme Court of South Australia. It has been an honour to be a member of a profession that does such good work protecting some of the most vulnerable members of our community, protecting the rule of law and promoting justice and equality. I thank my numerous colleagues and in particular those senior practitioners who mentored and guided me, and the newer practitioners who have allowed me the honour of mentoring them in the early stages of their careers. I also wish to acknowledge the privilege bestowed on me to hold leadership roles in the Law Society in recent years, and I know that the profession is in good hands.

For the past four years I have had the opportunity to run my own business. I often refer to NDA Law as my third baby. It has provided me with opportunities I never would have imagined and with challenges that many other small business owners face. I thank my staff for their loyalty, commitment and patience, especially Lisa Christo, Cara Grigg and Thea Birss, and of course our clients, but I thank three people who helped me to believe I could achieve success in this new business venture: Nick Bolkus, Iain Evans and Donny Walford, who volunteered on my advisory board when NDA commenced.

Watching any baby grow, one is filled with amazement and nervous anticipation. To all those incredible small businesses and family businesses who are the backbone of the South Australian economy, I want to acknowledge your hard work and bravery in doing what you do, just as my father did in starting his own business and I did in taking the opportunity to follow suit. It is critical to this state that all sides of politics do all that we can to support our strong economy for our businesses to thrive, for employment opportunities to grow and for the ability of government to make the best of that strong economy, to help those members of our society who need our support.

It was pointed out to me by a journalist on the day after the by-election that I am the first female member for Enfield and its predecessor, the seat of Ross Smith. I am grateful for that privilege but, in all honesty, it was not something that had occurred to me during the campaign. I am, however, grateful to be making this speech during the 125th anniversary year of the right to vote being given to women in this state.

South Australia was at the forefront of the suffragette movement and has led the way in many respects in gender equality. I myself have been inspired by some of the most influential women in this state, whether by a simple handshake with Dame Roma Mitchell when I was young, the leadership shown in two of my educational institutions by Sister Deidre Jordan, or a friendship formed with the Hon. Robyn Layton. These amongst many other brave and inspiring women have helped forge the path that I continue on proudly today.

To be inspiring and guiding, and providing opportunities to actively promote diversity in all its forms, is something that I believe we have a responsibility to do. For my part in the legal profession, it has involved demonstrating that systems and structures, and an accepted way of doing things, can and should be challenged to enable a more valued and valuable contribution for female participation. Do not be surprised if I throw up ideas to do the same here. My core beliefs come down to something very simple: fairness, opportunity and giving back—values at the core of the Australian Labor Party.

To the Hon. Paul Keating, who inspired me with his brilliant tax policies and who has the title of being the first person to make me cry on an election night; the South Australian branch of the ALP, Reggie Martin, Aemon Bourke and the team; Sonia Romeo, Josh Peak and other leaders of our great union movement; David Gray, Bob Harris and the Enfield sub-branch; Young Labor and the Labor Women's Network; every single person who gave up an hour of their precious time to volunteer in my campaign; each and every Labor parliamentarian, state and federal, who supported me through the campaign; and those who were friends well before that, in particular the Hon. Tom Koutsantonis: thank you.

To the person I could not possibly thank enough, James Agness, and to the incredible leadership team of Peter Malinauskas and Susan Close: thank you. I am truly excited to be joining the team, and I hope I can make a valuable contribution on behalf of the people of Enfield and the

South Australian Labor Party. Peter, in particular, I thank you and your team for taking me under your wing. I also wish to thank two former members and our former leadership team, Jay Weatherill and John Rau, for their significant contributions to the state and to the party during their terms. In particular, I thank John Rau for his mentorship and guidance, and I thank him on behalf of the people of Enfield for his dedication to the electorate that I now have the privilege of serving.

Lastly, but always most importantly, my children, Sebastian and Charlie: I want you to know that you are and always will be the most important people in the world to me and that every decision I have ever made since the day I became a mother has been with the filter for doing what is best for you, including this decision to enter parliament. Although this decision may bring us some short-term challenges, I hope that it has longer term benefits in my being able to make a contribution to South Australia for a more tolerant society and a more giving society with better government services, a better health and education system and a stronger economy with job prospects for you, your cousins and your friends. Perhaps this is an extreme effort to keep you home in Adelaide when you grow up.

Sebastian and Charlie, if I can drill one thing into you it is to be grateful in life. Although you have already faced some difficult life experiences, you have also been incredibly privileged. Gratitude will help you both to live your lives with optimism, to grab on to every opportunity and take on every challenge head-on. It will make sure you never forget that there are people less privileged than you we have a duty to help. If I can teach you that, I have done something useful.

I end with a final expression of gratitude for being a mother and a daughter; a sister, an aunty and a friend; a student and a teacher; a worker and a boss; and now a parliamentarian in this great place. I hope I do not let anybody down.

Honourable members: Hear, hear!

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.

LABOUR HIRE LICENSING REPEAL BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Ms HILDYARD: I guess that this is a more general question to start with, but given that the bill has only a couple of clauses I will try to put each set of my questions into parts 1 and 2 of the bill. There are only two clauses. Some may seem more general. My first question is: who did the Attorney-General consult with before introducing this bill and what was their feedback on this bill?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think that the position was very clear prior to the election when the principal bill that we are seeking to repeal was debated. The then opposition made it abundantly clear that, if we were to form government, we would repeal this legislation for all the reasons that have been outlined in the debate on behalf of the government. That was the case, that we made a commitment to it in the parliament and honoured it post the election.

Directly after election and on meeting with the Commissioner for Business and Consumer Affairs, Mr Soulio, it became clear that the then government had proclaimed their legislation (I think, at the eleventh hour) before the election. However, notwithstanding that, I met regularly with the commissioner to identify what processes were being undertaken by his department as a result of the legislation being proclaimed. He indicated that he had, over time, received over 100 applications from people who presumed that they would be responsible, liable, for the requirement to register

In light of the new government's position, I sought advice from the department about whether, in the concerns raised by a number of applicants and organisations, there was the capacity for amendment, even significant amendment, to improve the bill consistent with our position—that is, with the possible potential of leaving some inoffensive commitments in the legislation. That was presented to us as an option, not, as has been asserted during the debate, where amendments were prepared or anything of that nature—in fact, I made it very clear—with a view to seeing if there is another way to deal with this matter.

The new government considered all these matters. Having received copies of a number of submissions from the associations representing the industries to be caught by this legislation, it was clear to us that amendment was not an option, that they would be unfairly and unnecessarily captured by the definitions in the legislation. Therefore, the government made the determination that it would progress with the repeal of the bill.

Apart from the new member for Cheltenham, who came to see me as the secretary of SA Unions and presented his case—and I have detailed that in the debate on this matter—I think it is fair to say that, overwhelmingly, the submissions were by industry associations pleading for relief from the oppressive and unnecessary terms of this bill. I have referred to them, in short, in relation to the imprisonment terms and very heavy fines that may apply.

Consultation was on the two clauses, one of which reads, 'This Act may be cited as the Labour Hire Licensing Repeal Act 2018,' and the second, which reads, 'The Labour Hire Licensing Act 2017 is repealed.' It was not comprehensively consulted on outside the fact that we received an enormous number of association representations. Many of those, as I understand it from the commissioner, were also sent to his office. In light of the government's decision to proceed with the repeal, he identified that he would cease receiving applications from other prospective registrants and indicated that if the bill is repealed he would refund the application fees for the other applications already received.

Ms HILDYARD: Attorney, why did you announce that you would repeal the bill, thereby taking away rights for vulnerable workers, and only after that announcement establish a task force to look at the existing laws?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It was always clear to us as a government (and this was contemporaneous with the ultimate decision to proceed with the repeal) that we would with that—afterwards but with that—appoint a task force to ensure that the progress we expected to take place was taking place; that is, the commonwealth were in fact progressing their initiatives, and matters such as phoenixing, which was referred to in one of the maiden speeches today, as a practice—if I can give it as high a title as that—were being addressed. These were things that were important and we felt needed to be further pursued.

One of the reasons that we are vindicated by the decision we have made to progress to the proposed repeal of this legislation is that, even when asked to identify areas of exploitation or abuse of vulnerable workers, which this type of legislation is professing to protect, those examples were not forthcoming, and I think they were not forthcoming because there are existing practices and laws that do protect.

Let me give you one example, though, of where I think there has been a failing that is not remedied by this act or by the fact that we are proposing to repeal it. Today, I listened carefully to the member for Cheltenham's impressive contribution in his maiden speech. He referred to the Castillo-Riffo death on the Royal Adelaide Hospital grounds during the build of that facility. Sadly, it was followed by another death shortly thereafter, again on a scissor lift.

I heard the member for Cheltenham say how he was committed to ensuring that we establish an industrial manslaughter offence. It is not a new idea. It is one that has not been successfully prosecuted in this parliament in the past, although it has been raised. This is the idea of punishing a negligent or reckless employer who allows a workplace to be so unsafe that it facilitates the death of one of the employees.

I was interested to hear that because, as we now know, in Mr Castillo-Riffo's case, with the existing laws operating under the previous government, which included the operation of SafeWork SA in the prosecution of employers—in this case, it was multiple, as it was a joint venture—in respect of allowing an unsafe workplace and it resulting in the death of Mr Castillo-Riffo, which we now know were abandoned after some two years when the prosecution withdrew, there were never any disclosed reports from SafeWork SA, as the prosecuting agency, even after the prosecution was withdrawn.

I raised this issue with the then head of the CFMEU, Mr Aaron Cartledge, with whom I had a number of dealings. I am not sure what actually happened to him. I think he lost an election or something and he disappeared off the face of the CFMEU; nevertheless, he was in a leadership role

at that time. I raised the issue of how it was that one of his workers had died but that we had not had any indication from SafeWork SA about what was going on.

We had no report. It had not been referred to the Coroner, as best as we could understand at that stage, and this was in the early stage. Nobody seemed to be doing anything. His indication to me at the time, and maybe to others as well, was, 'We're letting SafeWork SA look after that.' Just have a bo-peep at the report of ICAC in the review they undertook in relation to SafeWork SA and the lack of adequate practices, expertise, competence and everything else in relation to that agency, particularly in the prosecutions unit.

All the laws that we have still require a competent government managing the agencies that are supposed to deal with these things to ensure that we have protections. I think that was a classic example of the woefully inadequate government-sponsored agencies that are there, and that are supposed to protect workers, hopelessly abandoning that responsibility. All the laws in the world are not actually going to be effective in protecting people in the workplace unless the agencies that are there to investigate, prosecute and protect are being managed properly.

I think that there are some significant areas of deficiency. I have just given one example today where the partner of Mr Castillo-Riffo had been very public in her concerns about the lack of protection for her partner, apparently in the face of there being alarm bells ringing in relation to the workplace circumstances. We can make all the laws we want here, but unless the government of the day, whether it is commonwealth or state, properly ensures the instrumentalities and agencies that are there to protect are implemented, this bit of law is not going to help.

There are plenty of other laws, but let's have a task force with it, which we announced with our decision to progress to the bill to repeal. Let's have with it a task force to ensure ongoing dialogue about the implementation of both current legislation and legislation that has passed since, and practices at the commonwealth level and some of the state practices that we rely on.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Attorney. Have any fees collected by business services in terms of application and registration fees been refunded? What was the value of any fees refunded?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I did mention in the second reading or in the rebuttal that a small number of fees had been refunded. I think I indicated at the time that—if I was not clear about it, I will try to make it clear now—I do not know the reason for that. I was advised by the commissioner that he had refunded them.

It may have been that an application was received and it was clear that the nature of the industry or the business that applied to register was not captured by the legislation. In those circumstances, I would expect that the commissioner would send the money back with a letter stating, 'Dear sir, you mistakenly identified this legislation as necessitating you apply. It does not apply, and therefore you are covered either by some other way or it does not apply to you at all.' I imagine that is the reason, but I have been informed and I have advised the parliament of the over 117 current applications, or whatever the number was that I indicated previously. It is the intention of the commissioner to refund those in the event the act is repealed.

The CHAIR: Given that there are only two clauses, I will allow a fourth question on this clause.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can I just add to that that I am advised by my adviser here that 10 applications were refunded.

Ms HILDYARD: How many labour hire firms had registered before the termination of the application process?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There were 125.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Ms HILDYARD: Under the current law, the labour hire licensing scheme started on 1 March 2018. On what legal basis have Consumer and Business Services decided not to comply with the law and refused to accept applications for labour hire licences?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am glad you mentioned the date. Of course, it was into the caretaker mode of the previous government, as we were in election mode. As I said, they slipped through a proclamation for commencement just before the change of government. Notwithstanding that and perhaps the validity of the previous government doing that during caretaker mode—let's not take issue with that at the moment; I am about to have a constitutional challenge about that—what I would say is that, having done it, if the commissioner, who is an independent statutory officer of the commission, made the assessment that, in light of the debate progressing for the repeal of the legislation, he would not continue to advertise or seek to enforce the terms, that was a matter for him.

He did not ask for my permission. I did not give any direction to him. I did not ask him to do it. He informed me that, in light of the government's decision to progress with the repeal of the legislation in the parliament, he would be discontinuing the processing of this until that matter was concluded one way or the other, obviously.

Ms HILDYARD: Has the department provided any advice or warning against noncompliance with the existing law?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not to me.

Ms HILDYARD: How will the government ensure adequate protections for workers engaged by labour hire firms, particularly those who cannot be located once particular industrial claims in relation to their conduct are made, should this bill progress?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If I am clear, it is on the basis that the labour hire firm in some way mistreats or fails to provide for its workers, who would otherwise, for example, be subject to a SafeWork inquiry of some failing under the Work Health and Safety Act, or they had not made provision in relation to the obligations under the Return to Work Act, or they had not paid their payroll tax, or they had not undertaken their obligations in relation to their employees under the Fair Work Act.

These are all areas in which currently there is legislation that applies. Payroll tax may not apply to all of them but more than likely it would, given the nature of these types of entities. In the event that this entity then either dissolves or disappears back overseas or the relevant directors die and so are no longer available—is that what you are saying?

Ms HILDYARD: I can clarify, if you like. I guess there are two parts to the question. One is—and you have partly answered it—how do you envisage that there will be protections for workers engaged via labour hire firms in a general sense? You have started to answer that, but I am also interested, Attorney, particularly should this repeal bill progress, in how you will ensure protections for workers engaged through labour hire firms when those firms, as I spoke about in my speech in relation to this matter a couple of weeks ago, cannot be located and there is no process any longer for registration of those firms.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If the Labour Hire Licensing Act is repealed, there would not be any registration. The act sets up a licensing and regulation process. It is a typical Labor model; that is, you make everybody sign up and pay fees. They then monitor it. They have a list that they can check, and you cannot practise or operate your professional business, essentially, unless you are registered. The instrument of discipline with these Labor-type models is that you get struck off and therefore lose your right to operate your business or practice or profession if you are no longer registered, and then there are massive penalties if you purport to operate or trade without a licence. That is the nature of the models of these things.

We are saying that, whether you are an individual, a partnership, a corporate entity, a co-op, or any other amalgam for the purposes of operating a business, you have obligations when it comes to employment under a whole lot of legislation. I named three or four of them a minute ago: to provide a safe workplace, to pay people the right amount of money, to pay the workers comp levy and to pay the benefits that employers are obligated to pay—unless they are self-insured or unless they work for the government. Even if they work for the government, there are some protections.

A really important one in this area is, of course, the entitlement to remuneration and benefits. We have a whole lot of commissioners, for example, at the South Australian Employment Tribunal

whose job on a daily basis is to negotiate and mediate resolutions in relation to underpayments or failure to provide benefits. This is something that happens in the real world, and because of reckless indifference or deliberate conduct by the employer there has been a failure to pay the right payment or benefit to somebody. There is a remedy to it, as there should be, and that is why we have a law to remedy that.

How would they have protection? Workers who felt they had been in some way deprived of a benefit or entitlement or placed in an unsafe work circumstance would have the protection that they have right now at the federal and state level. That is important to have. I suggest it is much more important than this. If you have unscrupulous people, having a licensing or registration process—

Ms Hildyard: But it helps you to find them.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: You say it helps to find them. The member interjects to say it helps to find them. Give me a break. If they have disappeared, if they have packed up their business and they have nicked off out of the country, believe me, you are not going to find them. That address at such-and-such road, Seaton, is not going to be there, or it is going to be empty and the desk is going to be cleaned out—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! The question has been asked. The Attorney is answering.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The question has been asked and I am happy to answer it.

The CHAIR: Yes, and you will be heard in silence.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This is the misconception. There is some idea that you are going to be able to arrest some ghost who is no longer sitting behind the desk at the address and you say, 'For that unscrupulous conduct, Mr Commissioner—

Ms Hildyard: Get them registered before they start.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, order please!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —you shall forthwith deregister this person.' Well, big deal. What is that going to do to help protect those people who were apparently unfairly or badly treated as employees? There is not a single piece of benefit to those people. What is important to those people is, firstly, that they have a legal framework of protection for when they are abused or treated with such reckless indifference that they are not even advised of their entitlements. That is the first thing: to make sure they have a legal framework under which they can make a complaint, under which they can seek a remedy and under which there is a benefit to them, not chasing some ghost who has closed up their office and nicked off.

In the real world, the member might like to appreciate that there are unscrupulous people out there, and they are in the employment business as well. This type of registration, this type of superficial process of saying, 'We will deregister you,' as a means of protecting workers is a complete nonsense. When you are not paying your taxes, not paying the super benefits for employees, not providing them proper WorkCover, making them work in an unsafe workplace, not giving them accommodation, paying them half the wages, a threat of being deregistered does not carry weight or any benefit whatsoever to those victims—not a single jot. These people are not stupid.

I have been here 17 years and I can tell you that minister after minister has come through here saying, 'We have the answer to this. We are going to have a registration process. We are going to have a new licensing scheme. We are going to have a list and we are going to monitor you.' I can remember a bill we did on the lists of registration of people who operate in the hydroponics business. I met with the police and asked, 'What's this about?' They said, 'We want to have a registered list of people who operate in hydroponics.'

This was pre the period, member for Reynell, of the methamphetamine ice epidemic when growing marijuana hydroponically was seen as a vast improvement in the productivity of the drug and less requirement to have a garden or soil to grow it in. You just stuck it in a house, under lights, in a test tube, and you grew it hydroponically, and you would get 20-size in half the time.

Ms Hildyard: I wouldn't know, Vickie.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, it is an education for you. What happened in that new registration process was: 'We need, Ms Chapman, the support of the opposition for a registration process of people who are in the hydroponics business.' I said, 'What? The tomato growers out at Virginia?' 'Yes.' 'Anyone else who might be not growing tomatoes?' 'Yes, we want to capture them and we are going to require them to be registered.' They came to me and I said, 'How many of these people are there?' They said, 'We estimate that there are, say, 96.' I said, 'Okay.'

They introduced this big regime. I did not think it was necessary, frankly, for it to have to be managed by SAPOL. I said to them at the time, 'Isn't this a Consumer and Business Services process?' They said, 'No, this is a bit like the registration of guns. This is pretty serious. It involves drug people and drug operators and we need to manage it.' I said, 'Okay, whatever. The government of the day wants to push this through.' So they came back to me to say, 'Do you know what happened? We have introduced this law, Ms Chapman, and only 60 or 70 people have registered.'

They took that as being that 20 or 30 people who were in the drug business did not register and that they would therefore have been no longer growing hydroponically operated marijuana. I said, 'Let me give you another interpretation. Another interpretation is that 72 honest tomato-growing operators in hydroponics had gone in and paid the fee and the registration, put their address down at such-and-such road in Virginia, or wherever they were operating their glasshouses from, and the other 22 were still out there growing whatever they wanted to grow in test tubes; they had not registered and they were still out there growing marijuana.' They said, 'That's possible, but we think it is because we have scared them off by this new registration scheme.'

I thought some people have to get in the real world. There are unscrupulous people out there. There are people out there who operate in illegal practices and there are certain protections we need to ensure for employment but also for the service or product they produce. Obviously, we do not want teachers or nurses, or lawyers for that matter, going out there trying to practise a particular discipline unless they are registered because they have to attain certain standards of qualification, and sometimes experience they have to document, to be entitled to be registered.

I see this for what it is and it should be seen for what it is: a backdoor attempt by the Labor Party to try to have something as close as possible to industrial manslaughter in this, and there are now serious imprisonment penalties in this legislation. They could not get it through the front door so they have tried it through the back door. All it does is give them a list of a number of people their Labor unions can harass to join the membership. If the unions really cared about protecting these workers, they would be down there on the dock or at the airport when these people arrive, offering to support them with membership.

Ms HILDYARD: Chair, I think this might be digressing.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you asked a broad-ranging question and you had a very fulsome answer, I think.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes	23
Noes	21
Majority	2

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Tarzia, V.A.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Teague, J.B.
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.

Clause thus passed.

Title.

The committee divided on the title:

Ayes	23
Noes	21
Majority	2

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	McBride, N.	Murray, S.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Power, C.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.
Tarzia, V.A.	Teague, J.B.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.
Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.	

NOES

Bedford, F.E.	Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.
Boyer, B.I.	Brock, G.G.	Brown, M.E. (teller)
Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.	Gee, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.
Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.	Wortley, D.

Title thus passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:09): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:10): I would like to make a contribution to this debate, particularly as a result of not only what I have heard through the committee stage but also what I have heard over the last few days about workers' rights, particularly around insecure employment.

As I understand it—and I would say this is my understanding of the Liberal Party's position in terms of repealing this bill—the Liberal Party's argument is that there are some technical defects in the bill, that there are existing agencies and existing laws which cover it, and that certainly the repeal of this bill will actually make some contribution to workers' rights, which is quite a bizarre

argument. That is essentially my understanding of the Liberal Party's view or rationale behind this bill.

That is their view, but I would say that I reject that interpretation on the basis—certainly from my own experience of people I have known who have been affected by people who work for labour hire firms and also from the arguments put forward through committee—that there are not enough sufficient case studies to warrant the support of this bill.

One of the most important things the bill does is to create, for the want of better terminology, a chain of responsibility. It makes sure that somebody is actually in the chain of responsibility for people's employment, that someone is responsible for an employee, responsible for their occupational health and safety and responsible for their working conditions, their pay, etc. The committee, which I and other members sat on, found that one of the major problems of the existing laws is that there is lack of clarity about who is actually responsible at what point in time. I say that bad employers—not all employers—and those bad labour hire firms get away with blue murder, and usually the worker is the one who pays the price.

Who are the workers who are going to be affected by this proposed repeal law? It is an area of highly casualised work. It is actually insecure employment, and one of the greatest problems in our society today is insecure work in terms of people trying to make decisions about their future, making investments for their children and families, or just their own futures.

The people who are affected by this law, if it was kept, who would be helped by those who want to repeal it, those who will be hurt by this law, are as follows. Essentially, these people are employed on an ad hoc basis in a whole range of industries. They are migrants—people who have recently arrived in Australia who perhaps do not have language skills or an understanding of our laws and what their rights are. They are, generally speaking, lower paid people—people who work in a whole range of industries that have lower pay.

They are young people. A lot of young people are often employed through this. There are visa holders—people who come here under some sort of visa. I know for a fact that a number of visa holders are exploited by labour hire firms and bad employers. I am aware, through my association with the national Italian association, of the young people who visit our country on work visas and who are exploited horribly by some of these bad practices. Women are also affected.

By repealing this law we say that it is okay to exploit these people. That is the message the Liberal Party is giving to these bad employers and to these bad people who work in labour hire firms. It is saying that it is okay to exploit these people. You should be ashamed of what you are doing here by repealing this bill. If there were some federal difficulties, you could amend it. You could actually make it better. It is also a highly non-unionised area, so there are not people to advocate on people's behalf. You are exploiting those people who are already vulnerable for a range of reasons but do not have an advocate next to them.

The importance of this legislation is that it acts as a deterrent. No law is perfect, but these laws would act as a deterrent. We could lead the country by passing these laws. Another bill this party opposed was the franchise law reform, which became the Small Business Commissioner Act in this state. Through this parliament, we enacted the best laws to protect small franchisees, small mum-and-dad owners, which then forced the commonwealth to act.

If we keep these laws, we would force the commonwealth to act, and we would have national laws to protect these workers. It is a sad day when this Liberal Party says that, by repealing this act, we are making the worker better off. Shame on you!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (17:15): I think we have all been surprised by the faux rage about the bill that we have heard from the other side of the chamber. We know that the Labor Party are experts at creating an illusion of action. Rather than actually doing something, they create an illusion of action.

They do it by additional regulation, they do it by a specific amendment to a bill, they do it by an inquiry and they do it by a royal commission. Whatever it is, it is about creating an illusion of action rather than actioning themselves. They know there is no outcome; there is no benefit for workers. As a matter of fact, this just makes it much harder for workers to get jobs in key industries in South

Australia that are growing and that need to grow because there are hungry export markets to our north.

There was a retrenched workers program from which two labour hire companies received money from those opposite when they were running the program. One must ask the question: what was the due diligence done on those companies? I suspect there was due diligence. Did they find that they were legitimate companies running legitimate businesses under the current law? They must have found that; otherwise, why would they hand over taxpayers' money? Either that or they did not do the due diligence. Either way, it shows the faux rage coming from that side of the chamber, and that the typical Labor Party solution is to set up an illusion that they are actually doing something.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (17:17): Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I thank you for the opportunity to say a few words in regard to the bill because, as yet, I have not had an opportunity to contribute. This bill is particularly important because it speaks quite genuinely to the substantial policy and ideological difference that we see between the two sides of the chamber. On more than one occasion, I have made remarks about where there are points of commonality between the two sides of the house, but clearly on this one there is a genuine point of difference.

I think it is worth exploring because, at this particular point in time in the world, when we are seeing extraordinary disruption globally, what we are seeing on show here in our own way, in our own parliament, is how conservative governments and parties are doing everything they possibly can to hurt the most disengaged people in our community. It is now becoming increasingly accepted that a whole segment of our community feels increasingly economically disengaged. That leads to a greater degree of social disengagement and, in turn, a greater degree of political disengagement. All of that amounts to an erosion of our social fabric in a way that is fundamentally unhealthy to a decent and fair society and that fundamentally undermines our economy.

When we contemplate what the Labour Hire Licensing Repeal Bill seeks to achieve, one would have thought they were admirable goals that would be shared by the Liberal Party because we know that the overwhelming majority of people in our economy who employ others are making a positive contribution. The overwhelming majority of employers do the right thing. I speak to employers on a frequent basis and there is one thing they often point out to me: they are looking for people who are doing the wrong thing to be punished because they undermine the work that they are trying to engage in.

Think of two small business owners. One is doing the right thing by paying their employees fairly, paying them at least award rates, paying them on time and paying their superannuation. They are not engaging in wage theft and they provide secure forms of employment. That business is out there doing the right thing and making a valuable contribution to our society by employing people.

Then think of another business that is doing the wrong thing. They are not providing secure work or paying superannuation. They are seeking to exploit someone because English might be their second language or seeking to exploit someone because they might be young and not know their rights. These are two competing businesses. These are two businesses with vastly different ideologies and business models.

The person doing the right thing, I would have thought, would want a degree of confidence that there is a government regulator seeking to punish the one that does the wrong thing because that business undermines the ability for the business doing the right thing to be able to compete in the marketplace. One would have thought that the Liberal Party, which is constantly espousing the virtues of wanting to look after small businesses, would have been seeking to look after those small businesses that do the right thing.

The Labour Hire Licensing Repeal Bill does not seek to punish employers or even labour hire companies; it seeks only to punish those who do the wrong thing. Why would the Liberal Party want to find themselves on the side of an argument trying to protect those employers who do the wrong thing? That is not the Liberal Party that I understand, and it certainly is not the Labor Party because on this side of the house we will always have a predisposition to not just look after those

employers that do the right thing but also add a degree of protection for those workers who would otherwise be robbed. We should think about who those people actually are. The member for Light rightly started to touch on this point.

I have to say that I know people in my electorate from lower socio-economic communities, a high proportion of people who speak English as a second language and people who came to this nation only wanting to find an opportunity, who end up finding themselves exploited in a workplace, often by labour hire companies that are doing the wrong thing. They find themselves being marginalised because they might be more vulnerable or in a smaller community. What sort of nation are we or what sort of parliament is this or what sort of government do we now have in charge that seeks to have those people exploited for the sake of employers doing the wrong thing? It is utterly extraordinary.

People who vote on this bill decide to make a conscious decision to not just put other people in our community who are already vulnerable at greater risk but also undermine those businesses that do the right thing and those employers who do the right thing. Why is it that we have not heard from any of the speakers on the other side of this chamber espousing the virtues of those employers who do the right thing who have their business models undermined by labour hire companies that do not act fairly within the marketplace? We have heard nothing from them.

We have heard nothing from them in that regard because, if members opposite, including the member for Heysen, were genuinely serious about making sure that employers could compete fairly within the marketplace, there would be no reason for the member for Heysen, or anyone else for that matter, to support this legislation.

Understand the power of the decision that you are making because today, when we vote on this bill in this place, we too are making a contribution to this fundamentally important question that we now have as a society about whether or not we want to exacerbate the problem of income and equality. I know that we, on this side of the house, think that is a problem. Where we see rising income inequality, we start to make a contribution to the erosion of a decent and fair society. I thought we all had a common interest in that, but clearly not.

This is an important vote because it lays bare the stark difference that exists between those opposite on the conservative side of politics and us on the Labor, moderate side of politics. The side of politics that once espoused moderate views is now on the extreme right when it comes to questions of employment, and we, on this side of the chamber, are on the side of common sense. We are on the side of those employers doing the right thing. We are on the side of those marginalised workers who would otherwise find themselves at risk. That is what this bill seeks to represent: the best interests of fair industrial relations in this nation. Those who vote against it should, quite frankly, hang their heads in shame.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (17:25): I rise to provide the assurance that the Leader of the Opposition was looking for in his third reading speech just then. The defence of why those businesses in the labour hire industry that currently do the right thing do not want this piece of legislation is that those businesses are the ones that get punished by this legislation.

Those who understand and have worked in small business will understand what red tape does to small business. It makes them less competitive and it wastes their time filling out forms as opposed to getting on, innovating and creating the jobs that we need them to create. What this bill and this act do is punish the 90-plus per cent of businesses that do the right thing. The way we know it punishes them is that they told us. They wrote to us and said, 'Do not give us extra red-tape burden because all it's going to do is have us sitting at our desks and filling out paperwork, as opposed to getting on and doing what we need to do.'

What is also very interesting is that this measure is supposedly somehow going to stop those who are undertaking illegal activity from undertaking illegal activity. Again, I put this example on the table: the fact that somebody has to have a driver's licence does not make them stop speeding in and of itself. The way that you enforce behaviour on our roads is by having a police officer enforcing the law.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Minister, could you hold it for a minute?

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Silence! Order! Leader of the Opposition, you were the previous speaker and you were heard in silence.

Mr Malinauskas: No, I wasn't.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You were. The minister will continue and he will be heard in silence. Minister, you have the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: This is when those opposite suggest they are on the side of common sense, when they believe a piece of paper is going to change behaviour. What changes behaviour and what changes illegal behaviour is enforcement. There are a whole multitude of agencies in this space that can enforce the existing law. Again, nothing that the Leader of the Opposition said says that there is behaviour that is legal that should be illegal. All of the behaviour and all of the exploitation that you are currently talking about is already illegal. Instead of more paperwork, what we actually need is more enforcement. That is what is missing in this debate. Whether it be the Australian Taxation Office, whether it be RevenueSA, whether it be the great work that ReturnToWorkSA is able to do in enforcement in this space, whether it be the federal immigration department—

Mr Malinauskas: ReturnToWork suggested this.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sure. Anyway. Hang on. I am not sure that ReturnToWorkSA did recommend this. What they came in and actually gave us evidence on was how they use existing law and enforce it. What they showed us was that they can go in and look at dodgy operators who have a history of phoenixing and, using data analytics methods, they can find businesses that are potentially under-reporting revenue or potentially not paying their employees enough money by looking at the percentage of the wages as a total of their revenue turnover. They can use those data analytics to enforce the current law.

It is what they do. They require these businesses to pay an up-front payment for their premiums in order to allow them to operate. They do not need a labour hire licensing act to do that. They enforce the existing law. This is what I find so frustrating—that you punish and create more red tape for the businesses that are doing the right thing, and those that already operate outside the law will continue to operate outside the law.

This is the central fallacy of the idea that a regulatory system is in and of itself going to change behaviour. It will not. What we actually need is the existing enforcement agencies—and the report suggested there are upwards of eight to 10 agencies that have jurisdiction in this area—to go and do their job. Instead, that is not the answer the Labor Party put forward. Their answer, as it is with everything, is more bureaucracy.

What is worse is that they do this in a unilateral situation to only South Australian businesses. As opposed to the primary recommendation of the report, which is to actually work together on a national solution, they punish South Australian labour hire firms and interstate labour hire firms get off scot-free, according to their argument. What happens is that we create a higher red-tape burden here in South Australia, we encourage business to go interstate, where they have a lower red-tape burden, and in the end it is South Australian jobs that lose.

It is the Labor Party's mantra to say that they stand up for the workingman. I understand that. That makes perfect sense. Once again, what we see is the fact that we have a Labor Party that do not stand up for common sense: they stand up for tokenism. They do this, as on a whole host of other measures, instead of doing what is actually going to work. In their time in office, did we see increased money, for instance, going to SafeWork SA? No. Did we see increased money going to ReturnToWorkSA? No. Was there any sort of task force by RevenueSA to go and investigate labour hire firms? No.

What they did was come into this place with a piece of red tape that will do nothing to change the behaviour of labour hire businesses that are doing the wrong thing. Instead of giving us the bleeding heart story, over 16 years why did they not come up with a solution that was actually going to change someone's behaviour?

Mr Malinauskas: And you're getting rid of it.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Of course we are getting rid of it. Of course we want to get rid of it. Red tape does not work. It does not, in and of itself, change behaviour. To suggest that it does is completely wrong. If you were right, why have a police force? There are rules there. Everybody has a driver's licence. Everybody who has a driver's licence, according to the Labor Party, will not break the law. This is the problem. Everybody in South Australia does have a driver's licence. Do all of them abide by every road rule? No. That is why you have to have a police force to enforce the law on our roads.

The enforcement is what works. You have a system of law that creates offences. You have a police force that enforces that. That is how you change behaviour. The act of having a driver's licence does not do that. That is why in this instance having a labour hire licence is not going to change illegal behaviour.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, could you just hold that thought. Members on my left have all had the opportunity during this debate. Some may still want to take up an opportunity, but you will have that opportunity to make a contribution, as the minister has right now. This is a debate in the House of Assembly. There will be different points of view. The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Light is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Once again, we on this side of the house will stand up for a practical solution and ideas that work, and the other side will stand up for tokenism to make it look like they are doing something. I think it is one of the fundamental reasons why there was a change of government at this election—because they wanted a government that got on and delivered as opposed to a government that delivered by press release,

It was a government that, for instance, would stand up and say, 'We're going to deliver a skate park,' and then do nothing about it, a government that said they would never close the Repat and then closed the Repat. We now have a government with practical common sense that is willing to stand up and do what works, rather than what makes the government feel and look good, and actually delivers proper outcomes for the people of South Australia.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:34): I rise to make a third reading contribution on this important bill. As the Leader of the Opposition has pointed out, no other issue so far in this session of parliament has more clearly delineated the difference between our two political parties. What I find really disturbing about the contributions from those opposite is the deliberate obfuscation, the deliberate misrepresentation, of what this issue is about—that is, the purpose of the licensing regime we are currently debating.

We have had speaker after speaker, particularly those on the front bench and particularly the members for Unley and Bragg, take every opportunity to falsely label this as some ideological battle about this act having been put in place by the former Labor government as some gesture towards the union movement. It is not a gesture for the union movement, but it is a gesture. It is a gesture for workers. It is a gesture for those people in our community who need the greatest level of protection from their government. It is a gesture for those people who are being exploited and continue to be exploited.

I gave examples in my second reading contribution about the levels of exploitation we are currently seeing across the country, including in this state: workers being paid less than \$4 an hour, workers being forced to work shifts of more than 20 hours at a stretch and workers being forced to sleep in dog beds between those shifts. It is clearly unacceptable.

The solution from the member for Schubert is apparently that RevenueSA should be doing more. Apparently RevenueSA is populated by revenue agents of the ilk of Eliot Ness, with their

special agent badges and their pump-action shotguns, who are meant to be battering down the doors of these companies, issuing notices, conducting inspections, arresting people and pulling them before the courts. That is not the purpose of RevenueSA. That has never been the purpose of RevenueSA.

The purpose of RevenueSA and compliance is to make sure that people are paying the taxes they are meant to pay—in this case, for example, payroll tax. The role of RevenueSA and payroll tax compliance is an interesting point to contemplate. One of the reasons that we have seen the growth of the labour hire industry here in South Australia is that some people engage in labour hire businesses to assist other businesses to avoid paying payroll tax.

I made it clear in my second reading contribution that I believe that there is a legitimate role for labour hire businesses to operate in this state. There are types of work—for example, seasonal work—for which employers require labour to be provided. We have even had those members opposite give very valid and strong examples of why labour hire companies are well placed to suit the provision of labour for their businesses in those sorts of circumstances. I think we can all agree that is not only necessary but likely to continue to be necessary into the future.

But there is a cohort of businesses in operation that are deliberately engaged in practices seeking to subvert the laws of this state and subvert the laws of the country. In doing so, they are not only exploiting workers in the manner for which I have already provided examples but, in the case of the member for Schubert's instance of the Eliot Nesses of RevenueSA, they are seeking to subvert the laws of this state when it comes to payroll tax liabilities.

That is not the role of RevenueSA and that is not the role of ReturnToWorkSA. ReturnToWorkSA does not proactively run out to every business in South Australia, all 140,000 of them, and make sure that nobody is about to be at risk of workplace injury or death. They are there at the tail end. They are there when the problem has already emerged. This is not the role of these agencies.

To say that there are already options available to the state to prevent this from happening and to cite those two is completely disingenuous. It puts the lie to the member for Schubert's argument when he says that this was unnecessary. Of course it is necessary. It is absolutely imperative. If we move aside from the ideological argument that this is just some stitch up from a former Labor government for the union movement and go to the next ideological argument, which is posited principally by the member for Schubert, the one about red tape, what a joke—what an absolute joke.

The minister, herself responsible for bringing this bill into this place, is at the very same time charging her very same department with establishing a red-tape regime for the registration of property managers. I wonder what grievous ills that is going to settle for the South Australian community. Are there not enough white gloves being pulled on and run along windowsills to make sure the inspections are being done properly? How many workers are being paid \$4 an hour in that industry? How many workers are currently being forced to work 20-hour shifts or being forced to sleep on dog beds in the property management industry?

Of course, red tape is an argument which is selected only when convenient for this Liberal government. It is convenient, of course, for property managers because they are shaking them down for \$3.5 million over four years in the process. They are happy to shake down an industry for more money to create a red-tape regime to create a registration and licensing regime when it is good for the government coffers. But they are happy to abolish a registration and licensing regime when it is going to affect the livelihoods, including the safe working conditions and remuneration, of workers in this state.

We have already heard in this place and the other place that there has been work done at the officer level—of course, not by the actual executive—to try to come up with some solutions which would ameliorate some of the concerns which have legitimately been placed by some operators in this industry. How does the government respond? Does it engage in a genuine dialogue with the community about what ills need to be fixed? Of course not. Does it engage in some dialogue with the other side here about whether there could be an amendment bill to this act which would seek to fine-tune, improve or make better those provisions? Of course not.

It is the immediate jump back to that ideology of deliberately putting workers' needs last and, in place, making sure that there is yet another opportunity for needless union bashing and needless opportunities to put the livelihoods of workers at risk. It is just extraordinary that in this day and age, as we learn more about the harmful and terrible negative impacts that some of the ways our economy is mutating and impacting workers here in South Australia, that we could honestly have a cohort of over half of the parliament that does not honestly take those concerns seriously, or seriously enough, not to want to contemplate having an improvement to this licensing regime. Instead, it is just going to throw it out.

At the same time, all those workers who risked being placed in those unsafe conditions or being placed in a situation where they are not being properly remunerated according to law or who are having their wages or their superannuation stolen, as well as the regulatory regime being thrown out, they get thrown to the wolves. Well, shame on those opposite. Shame on those opposite!

I certainly did not come into this place to make sure that those people who are interested in exploiting workers and exploiting the law, and getting a leg up over their competitors, are placed first and foremost and beyond the reach of everybody else. But that seems to be the approach of the government. I hope those opposite think long and hard about the decision that they are making to provide the interests of a small number of businesses that are doing the wrong thing with a pedestal so that they can stand at some great height above the rights of workers. It is a disgrace.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:43): The government has considered this matter at length. We consider this current act to be superfluous and not a genuine attempt to protect the interests of vulnerable workers. We are satisfied that SafeWork SA, which frankly had fallen into major disrepair under the previous government, has been strengthened into a state of competence to be able to properly protect workers in that workplace as the principal agency in South Australia, together with the Fair Work Commission and the good work done by SAET, as I said earlier, particularly commissioners, to protect those in those circumstances.

All those arms of enforcement are necessary. They are going to be and will continue to be high functioning under this government. We expect them to be. We will not support or tolerate legislation which is superficial, which introduces a backdoor attempt to have imprisonment for employers because they cannot pass industrial manslaughter through the courts. I saw the presentation.

Memos were going around the Labor administration prior to the last election to push through these labour hire laws. I listened to the debates in other states that were prosecuting via then Labor administrations and could see the futile attempt by them to pretend and masquerade this type of legislation under the guise of caring for vulnerable workers. For all these reasons, we have considered these matters. We will give real protection to employees in these circumstances and not this fake envelope or veil of protection that has been presented. I commend the bill to the house.

The house divided on the third reading:

Ayes	23
Noes	21
Majority.....	2

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.

Boyer, B.I.

Close, S.E.

Hildyard, K.A.

Malinauskas, P.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.

Brock, G.G.

Cook, N.F.

Hughes, E.J.

Michaels, A.

Piccolo, A.

Szakacs, J.K.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Brown, M.E. (teller)

Gee, J.P.

Koutsantonis, A.

Mullighan, S.C.

Picton, C.J.

Wortley, D.

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

At 17:51 the house adjourned until Thursday 28 February 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***STRATHMONT POOL**

In reply to **Ms WORTLEY (Torrens)** (5 December 2018).

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): The Minister for Human Services has advised—

Autism SA has relocated to another facility and under advisement from the Department for Human Services (DHS) I will not be publicising the new arrangement.

Tea Tree Gully Swim Club has replaced its Strathmont times with two sessions at two new locations.

Swim Safe Enterprises Pty Inc. reached agreement with SA Health to use a pool at Modbury Hospital, and activities have already begun at that location.

The Department for Education has secured locations for all affected students.

DHS has also provided assistance in locating alternative pools to any users who contacted the department.