

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY****Wednesday, 30 May 2018****The SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

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

*Bills***ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 May 2018.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:32):** I move:

That the order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 21  
 Noes ..... 20  
 Majority ..... 1

**AYES**

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

**NOES**

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

**PAIRS**

Gardner, J.A.W.	Gee, J.P.
-----------------	-----------

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Motions***WORLD NO TOBACCO DAY**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (10:39):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 31 May is the UN World No Tobacco Day;
- (b) recognises the thousands of South Australian families impacted by the damage caused by smoking every year;
- (c) continues to support measures to reduce the smoking rate, especially those designed to prevent young people from becoming smokers; and
- (d) notes the significant policy progress made to reduce South Australian smoking rates over the past decade, including smoke-free outdoor dining areas.

I rise to speak on the important matter of UN World No Tobacco Day, which is being held tomorrow. This is, of course, a very important day on which we acknowledge the harm that is caused by tobacco smoking. This is something where we have taken tremendous action over the past 30 to 40 years in South Australia and indeed across Australia and much of the Western world in terms of combating the dangerous health effects of tobacco smoking.

The latest South Australian data, for 2016-17, from the South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute shows us that smoking rates are now at the lowest ever level recorded for this state. However, there is still 14.9 per cent of South Australians aged 15 and over who are smoking. We know the significant health effects smoking has in terms of cancer, heart disease and a whole range of other health effects, which result in thousands of Australians dying each year from tobacco-related illnesses.

We must be doing everything we can as a parliament and as the government to ensure that we reduce that number even further to prevent many more people from being susceptible to tobacco-related diseases. The statistics also show that in 2016 there were still 12.3 per cent of young people aged 15 to 29 smoking, so there are obviously a significant number of people in the younger age demographic we need to target as well. While we have had great success in the past decade or so in reducing that rate, there is still much more that we can do to reduce it even further.

The devastating effects of smoking are of course felt not just by the individuals themselves but also by their loved ones. The loss of a family member to smoking and tobacco-related diseases is very heartbreaking, as is the knowledge particularly that this loss could have been prevented. Of course, we know that smoking impacts our health system more broadly. In particular we have increased pressure on our hospital system and the rest of our health system because of the pressures of tobacco-related disease. Also, all of those incidents and admissions to our hospitals would be preventable.

Prevention is better than cure in this regard. We must continue to do everything we can to take on the terribly addictive habit of smoking. This is something that I have long had an interest in. I spoke about in my maiden speech and have worked previously, before entering this house, in the area of tobacco-related disease. In particular I worked for a number of years on the introduction of tobacco plain packaging. We now see this across Australia, and also countries around the world are implementing this reform. It was a very difficult reform to implement but is one which was so important in reducing the ability of the last vestige of tobacco companies to advertise their products and create glamour associated with the brands of smoking.

I am also proud that over the course of the Labor government that we had in this state for 16 years we did so much to reduce smoking in this state, whether it was campaigns that we ran or the laws that we implemented to take further action in regard to tobacco smoking. We saw significant steps over that period of time in terms of limiting the areas of smoking, particularly in licensed venues. The most recent of those reforms were in terms of limiting smoking in outdoor dining areas; that has been implemented in this state. We also saw reforms such as limiting smoking in cars where children are present. Those reforms led the country as well. They were designed to prevent vulnerable people—children—from being susceptible to second-hand smoke in the confined space of a vehicle.

We believe that in those areas, such as a car, or a meal space in terms of a licensed venue, people should be free from second-hand smoke. It also sent the message that smoking is becoming less and less acceptable by community standards in our community. We must continue to progress this view. I think another area that needs to be progressed, that we have debated at length over the past couple of years in this parliament, is in relation to e-cigarettes. We had a select committee of the parliament that you, Mr Speaker, were a member of, as well as myself and the member for Hurtle Vale, the now member for Black, and the former member for Elder, in which we recommended a series of reforms that our state needs to implement into what is the largely unregulated field of e-cigarettes.

That select committee produced a bill which the government introduced, which passed this house but was stalled in the other place. We have not seen those reforms implemented because that bill lapsed before the election. In my new role as the shadow minister for health, I have been calling upon the health minister to reintroduce that legislation. I hope that he will do that very rapidly because it is an important piece of legislation to ensure that there is regulation in place covering that field of e-cigarettes, firstly because we know that in that field, while some people claim they are perfectly healthy, there is a lot of evidence that that is not the case and that these products could potentially be dangerous for people.

Secondly, we know that there is currently a risk of people under the age of 18 being exposed to these products. There is currently no age limit restrictions upon their sale in South Australia, so we need to limit that. We need to limit the potential advertising of these products so as not to be a gateway back into smoking tobacco as well. We know that there are a number of tobacco companies that now have e-cigarette lines, and the risk, that they are promoting these e-cigarettes as a way of therefore promoting the glamour of smoking again, is a real and dangerous one and one that we should be seeking to prevent in South Australia. I think that those regulations are very important and I call upon the government to reintroduce the legislation as soon as possible in this house.

Another area that I will be calling upon the government to ensure that action is taken on, and something that was started under the previous government as well in my time as Corrections minister, is the implementation of a ban on smoking in our Corrections facilities. We have implemented this already in the Adelaide Remand Centre, but it is not currently in place in other Corrections facilities across South Australia, yet it is in place in most of the facilities across the country. We think that is something that the government needs to implement. We said that we would do so by the end of next year, and I hope that the government is working towards that goal and continuing to implement that goal and we certainly, together with the member for Elizabeth and I, will be seeking to make sure that the government is working towards that.

We know when we look at that 14.9 per cent of South Australians that do smoke still, a lot of them are in vulnerable population groups, whether it be prisoners or people who have been involved in the criminal justice system. People who have mental health issues are another significant segment of that 14.9 per cent. We know that the rate of smoking amongst Aboriginal people is a lot higher. We know that smoking amongst lower-income people is higher as well.

We must continue to strive towards reductions in terms of all of those high-risk groups where we do see higher rates of smoking. In a lot of those areas it is more difficult to implement measures to reduce the smoking rate, but it is very important that we continue to drive down that rate of smoking, because we know what damage it is going to cause, not only to those people themselves, not only to their families, but also to our health system and the community more broadly.

I hope that the government takes this message seriously on World No Tobacco Day. I hope that they will continue to take measures, those important measures that I have mentioned, that reduce the smoking rate in South Australia. We also know the importance of social media and advertising campaigns that really drive home that message continually to people and get home those messages about the importance of quitting. We hope that we do not see any reductions in those efforts across South Australia. I ask all members and the whole community to pay close attention to this World No Tobacco Day and let's all work together to try to drive down the rates of smoking even further in South Australia.

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (10:49):** I am pleased to rise today to speak in support of the private member's motion moved by the member for Kaurua to acknowledge UN World No Tobacco Day, which is on 31 May each year. This day highlights the health risks associated with tobacco use, promotes effective policies to reduce tobacco consumption and supports smokers to quit. The focus for World No Tobacco Day this year is tobacco and heart disease, which is really to highlight the significant links between smoking and cardiovascular disease.

Smoking is responsible for the hospitalisation of almost 150,000 Australians each year, 15,000 deaths across the country and 1,140 fatalities in South Australia each year. Smoking is also estimated to cost the South Australian economy around \$2.3 billion each year. Moreover, a 2016 report from the Australian Institute for Health and Welfare found that smoking was the leading risk factor contributing to death and disease in Australia, responsible for 80 per cent of the burden of lung cancer and 75 per cent of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to encouraging South Australians to make healthy choices, and not smoking is an example of a healthy choice. The government certainly supports investments in effective prevention strategies to reduce the total number of people who smoke and also to reduce the number of those who have the greatest risk of taking up the habit in the first place. Over recent decades, there has been a significant reduction in smoking rates in South Australia. Smoking rates have halved over the last 20 years and dropped by almost 5 per cent since 2013. Importantly, a significant drop has also been seen in the number of South Australian high school students who have ever smoked, and now 86 per cent of high school students are reported never to have smoked.

Despite these recent successes, there still remains much more work to do to see further reductions in smoking rates, particularly amongst high prevalence groups. These measures should include strong mass media campaign strategies encouraging smokers to quit; robust legislation around the sale, marketing and use of tobacco products; and smoking cessation support services such as the Quitline counselling service, a service that is run by Cancer Council SA and funded by the state government.

The government has a number of policies designed to continue to see reductions in smoking rates and to reduce the negative health effects of smoking in general, in particular passive smoking. A focus on the creation of smoke-free public areas to protect nonsmokers from passive smoking will reduce the visibility to children, so that children do not see people smoking as often, and assist recent quitters to sustain their efforts, which will ultimately help to reduce the rates of tobacco-related disease and the associated impacts on the health system as a whole.

The government will also undertake a review of the effectiveness and scope of current legislation restricting smoking in outdoor dining areas to address any loopholes that may exist in the current legislation. The government will also implement plans to make all South Australian prisons smoke free by 2019 and this will, of course, be undertaken ensuring that there is appropriate support for both prisoners and staff.

The government will also work with other jurisdictions to ensure that tobacco control legislation in South Australia and nationally is properly enforced. Tobacco control is an important part of the government's broader agenda and plans for preventative health care to reduce pressure on our hospitals and health systems, which will ultimately improve the health outcomes for all South Australians.

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (10:54):** I also rise to speak to the motion put forward by the member for Kaurua. Every year on 31 May, the World Health Organisation and partners mark World No Tobacco Day, highlighting the health and other risks associated with tobacco use and advocating for effective policies to reduce tobacco consumption.

World No Tobacco Day 2018 will focus on the impact tobacco has on the cardiovascular health of people worldwide. It will highlight the links between the use of tobacco products and heart and other cardiovascular diseases, increase awareness within the broader public of the impact tobacco use and exposure to second-hand smoke has on these health issues, and provide opportunities for the public, governments and others to make commitments to promote heart health by protecting people from the use of tobacco products.

Tobacco use is an important risk factor in the development of coronary heart disease and strokes as well as cardiovascular disease (CVD). Despite the known harms of tobacco to heart health and the availability of solutions to reduce related death and disease, knowledge among large sections of the public that tobacco is one of the leading causes of CVD is very low. Tobacco use is one of the largest causes of preventable, non-communicable diseases including cancers, heart and lung disease.

The legislation of plain packaging for tobacco products entails restricting or prohibiting the use of logos, colours, brand images or any other promotional information other than brand and product names displayed in a standard colour and font, thus preventing the display and temptation to people and making it more difficult to tempt people to take up smoking. Previously, the packaging of various brands of tobacco was one of the main reasons that many people started to take up smoking. This was seen a long time ago in commercials in cinemas, etc., especially commercials like the 'Marlborough Man' advertisements, which made it look as though this was the great new thing to do.

Tobacco also diverts valuable household income. It has been proven that plain packaging reduces the attractiveness of tobacco products, restricts tobacco advertising and promotion, limits misleading labelling and increases the effectiveness of health warnings. I have known many people who actually spend more money on tobacco and cigarettes than they do on feeding their own children. Over and over again we have seen how industry, fuelled by its deep pockets, has been able to develop new strategies in an attempt to protect profits generated from its deadly products. In the case of plain packaging, that has been the target of a massive tobacco industry misinformation campaign dating as far back as 1993.

CVD kills more people than any other cause of death worldwide, and tobacco use and second-hand smoke exposure contribute to approximately 12 per cent of all heart disease deaths. Tobacco use is the second leading cause of CVD after high blood pressure. The global tobacco epidemic kills more than seven million people each year, of which close to 900,000 are nonsmokers who are dying from breathing second-hand smoke. Nearly 80 per cent of the more than one billion smokers worldwide live in low and middle-income countries, where the burden of tobacco-related illness and death is heaviest.

In 2014, lung cancer was the leading cause of cancer deaths in Australia, and it is estimated that it will remain the most common cause of death from cancer in 2018. In 2014, the age-standardised mortality rate was 31 deaths per 100,000 people (40 for males and 23 for females). The mortality rate of lung cancer will generally increase with age for both males and females. In 2017, it is estimated that the risk of an individual dying from lung cancer by their 85<sup>th</sup> birthday will be one in 23 (one in 18 males and one in 29 females).

The number of deaths from lung cancer increased from 2,883 in 1968 to 8,251 in 2014. Over the same period the age standardisation mortality rate increased from 32 deaths per 100,000 in 1968 to a high of 43 per 100,000 in 1989, before decreasing to 31 deaths per 100,000 in 2014. The decrease in mortality largely has been seen in males, while age standardisation rates for lung cancer in females has been lower than in most males. The age standardisation has increased in females to 23 per 100,000.

From a personal point of view, my first exposure to smoking was in my early days. Both my parents were smokers, my dad being a heavier smoker than my mother. However, I can vividly remember travelling in our car with both parents smoking. Bear in mind that in those days there were no air conditioners in cars and the windows were always up. At that point, because of the movies, etc., and the portrayal of men smoking, it appeared to me that this was the thing to do. How wrong I was.

My first attempt at having a smoke was at the local football game while I was working on the scoreboard. I was 14 years of age and my mates lit up an Alpine cigarette, which was in a green packet. They beckoned me to have a puff with them, saying how great it was. Well, I coughed, spluttered, turned green and looked similar to the Alpine packet, and that was my last attempt at smoking.

As my dad got older his lungs were deteriorating, and he was then getting emphysema and at times had to have an oxygen bottle for breathing. When he was told of the damage that had been caused to his lungs over the many years, and was finally accepting the truth, he was advised to give up smoking. However, my dad being very stubborn, asked, 'Will it make any difference to me?' and when the doctor answered, 'No it won't,' he then stated, 'Well, I may as well have some sort of enjoyment until my dying days.'

This was very traumatic because seeing my dad go through that, and seeing other people's loss of lifestyle, etc., and the impact on the family, is just one of those things I will never forget. Whilst there may have been some enjoyment for him, it certainly was not enjoyable for his family to watch him, especially his grandchildren. I strongly urge people to look at the facts and the dramatic photos of the lung cancers and the affected lungs and give it up. I commend this motion to the house.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:02):** The motion before us asks the house to acknowledge UN World No Tobacco Day, the focus of which this year concentrates on the impact that tobacco has on the cardiovascular health of people. Smoking is a major cause of heart disease. Smokers are up to four times more likely to die from coronary heart disease than are nonsmokers. Unfortunately, knowledge amongst large sections of the public that tobacco is one of the leading causes of cardiovascular disease is low. While many people know that a diet high in saturated fat leads to atherosclerosis, or hardening of the arteries, rarely do they consider that smoking will play a leading role, along with diet, in causing cardiovascular disease.

It is not just tobacco users who are directly affected but also second-hand smokers, with estimates that tobacco use and second-hand smoke exposure contribute to about 12 per cent of deaths from heart disease. Overall, smoking is responsible for an estimated 15,000 deaths in Australia each year; approximately 1,150 of those deaths are in South Australia. Close to two in three long-term smokers will die prematurely due to smoking, and, additionally, it is estimated that \$2.4 billion is lost to the state's economy each year in health costs and loss of productivity related to smoking.

Therefore, the Marshall Liberal government supports and will seek to implement policies that encourage and enable individuals and communities to make healthy choices. As part of this, the government also supports investment in effective prevention strategies to help reduce the number of South Australians who smoke or who are at risk of becoming smokers. This will have an effect on reducing pressure on hospitals and also health services and will result in better outcomes for all South Australians.

A key consideration of this is to reduce the effects of second-hand smoking, and so the member for Kaurana will be pleased to hear that we will move to protect both prisoners and staff from the harms of passive smoking, as the government will ensure that all South Australian prisons are smoke free by the end of 2019. Appropriate support will be provided for both prisoners and staff as this important preventative health measure is implemented. At the same time, the Marshall Liberal government also has a focus on the creation of smoke-free public areas designed to protect nonsmokers from passive smoking. It will also help to reduce the visibility of smoking to children, and will assist recent quitters to sustain their efforts.

Reducing exposure to tobacco smoking will contribute to the reducing rates of tobacco-related disease and, therefore, the reducing health service costs associated with those diseases. As part of this work, the government will undertake a review of the effectiveness and scope of the current legislation restricting smoking in outdoor dining areas. This review will address any loopholes in the existing legislation. One such public area in the electorate of Morphett is the popular Moseley Square in the tourism precinct of Glenelg, where a ban on smoking has been in place since September 2013.

Those who have frequented Moseley Square will notice, especially in the summer months, that there are a lot of children playing either in the fountain or on other attractions, and congregating in groups. Because of this, passive smoking is one area that we need to continue to try to eliminate, especially for these young people. While fines are in place for those caught smoking in this smoke-free zone, to a large extent it is self-regulating and has seen both residents and visitors alike enjoy the benefits of clean sea air.

Initially, this trial was run for 12 months. Based on feedback from businesses, police officers and positive community feedback, including a survey where results showed that over 95 per cent of people who took part in that survey voted in support to continue this area as a nonsmoking zone, I then moved in 2014 that the Holdfast Bay council enact the Moseley Square smoking exclusion zone into parliament regulations.

By reducing the visibility of smoking to children in not only this public place but others like it, the effect will be that children further denormalise smoking, reducing the number who take up the habit in their youth. In fact, figures show that more people are choosing not to smoke now than over the last 10 years. However, this figure remains at approximately one in eight young people who are smoking, and so it is a figure that we need to continue to reduce.

In summary, if World Tobacco Day helps to reduce the number of people taking up the habit while at the same time encouraging those who currently smoke to quit, that can only have a positive effect on the health and wellbeing of South Australia.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:07):** I rise to support the motion:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges that 31 May is the UN World Tobacco Day;
- (b) recognises the thousands of South Australian families impacted by the damage caused by smoking every year;
- (c) continues to support measures to reduce the smoking rate, especially those designed to prevent young people from becoming smokers; and
- (d) notes the significant policy progress made to reduce South Australian smoking rates over the past decade, including smoke-free outdoor dining areas.

As already stated, the global theme for World No Tobacco Day this year is tobacco and heart disease. Obviously, this highlights the fact that smoking is a major cause of heart disease and smokers are up to four times more likely to die from coronary heart disease than nonsmokers.

Smoking is responsible for an estimated 15,000 deaths in Australia each year, and approximately 1,140 deaths per year in South Australia. As catastrophic as our road toll is, at somewhere around 100 deaths per year in recent times, compared with this figure of 11 times more it shows the impact on the individual directly, obviously, and the loss to their families as well. Close to two in three long-term smokers will die prematurely due to smoking. It is estimated that close to \$2.4 billion is lost to the state's economy each year in health costs and lost productivity related to smoking.

The Marshall Liberal government supports and will be implementing policies that encourage and enable individuals and communities to make healthy choices. As part of this, we on this side of the house also support investment in effective prevention strategies to reduce the number of South Australians who smoke or who are at risk of becoming smokers. Despite the decline in smoking in South Australia, evidence shows that driving further reductions, particularly among high-prevalence groups, requires a continuous effort.

Efforts focus on a strong mass media campaign with a strategy encouraging smokers to quit, and robust legislation around the sale, marketing and use of tobacco products. Quite frankly, I am not sure how people can afford to smoke. I think it is about \$35 a packet or, as someone calculated recently, about a \$1.04 a cigarette. I do not care what salary you are on; it is expensive for a habit. Obviously, there is a legislative framework around the pricing for that very reason. There is quite a high taxation regime around the sale of tobacco and cigarettes. Part of the continuous effort is about having smoking cessation support services such as the Quitline counselling service.

The Marshall Liberal government has a focus on the creation of smoke-free public areas that are designed to protect nonsmokers from passive smoking, reducing the visibility of smoking to children and assisting recent quitters to sustain their efforts. Reducing exposure to tobacco smoking will contribute to reducing rates of tobacco-related disease and reducing health service costs associated with those diseases.

Having grown up in an earlier time, I know it was quite prevalent to have cigarette smoking in bars. I think one of the initial cases was where a barperson took action against their employer about the risk—not just the risk—of contracting cancer in the workplace, so it is significant. For those of us who have been here a little while on this earth, it is how things were in the early days. I can remember when you were out socially there were a lot more people smoking. At work, if you had someone assisting on a farm, they might have been a smoker. Certainly, in the shearing teams I operated in smoking was quite prevalent. As part of the work, we will undertake a review of the effectiveness and scope of current legislation restricting smoking in outdoor dining areas. This review will address any loopholes in the existing legislation.

In regard to prisoners—and I acknowledge that I have Mobilong Prison in my electorate at Murray Bridge—to protect both prisoners and staff from the harms of passive smoking the government will also ensure that all South Australian prisons are smoke free by the end of 2019. So if there are any smokers out there who are keen to break the law, you might want to look at that because you will not be able to have a cigarette when you are inside. Appropriate support will be provided for both prisoners and staff as this important preventative health measure is implemented. I am sure that it will take some work, some counselling and other measures to make sure that gets through.

There will also be robust and consistent enforcement, which will be important to ensure that the effectiveness of tobacco control legislation in South Australia is maintained. This is in combination with strategies at the national level. The Marshall Liberal government does have a strong commitment to initiatives targeting preventative health care, such as tobacco control, which will reduce the pressure on hospitals and health services and will result in better health outcomes for all South Australians. Certainly in my lifetime I have noticed a marked difference in smoking rates wherever you are. In a social setting, we have seen hotels adjust, with more outdoor areas, beer gardens and, even with that, they might have separate smoking areas as well.

Let's face it: smoking is legal, it is highly taxed, but it is a severe health risk, which, as I have indicated, has a massive impost of multiple billions of dollars per year on the South Australian budget. It has to be managed through a health system that—quite frankly, we inherited it—is flat out. It has so much effect on not just the people in South Australia who are directly affected and die from smoking, the over 1,100 who lose their lives, but also the families who are missing out on that loved one who has gone too early.

In some of the advertising campaigns, especially those on television, there is a lady who has to work out how she is going to tell her children that basically she has a death sentence. It is the same for a man who suddenly realises that he has let it go too long and has to tell his wife and family that it is too late and that he should have given it up long before. I think those programs are very effective, as is the advertising on cigarette packets. It is not that I look at cigarette packets very often, but you can see some quite grotesque pictures of what your lungs or heart could look like if you keep up the habit of smoking.

Some people are lucky, but only a few can smoke all their lives. I had a grandfather who died at 86, and he smoked roll-your-own, but I think they are very rare. I do not think it was smoking that killed him in the end. There are a few, but they are very much a minority in that category. As I said in the speech, two out of three people who smoke die prematurely, and that is backed up by statistics. The more we can do to make sure that we do not have those poor outcomes the better, not just for the families, whose lives are significantly impacted, but also for the health system and everyone else who is impacted by the poor choice of smoking cigarettes.

**Mr PICTON (Karna) (11:17):** I thank all the members for their contributions to this debate. As I said in my opening remarks, hopefully this is something about which we continue to see more action taken and we continue to see the government leading what was a strong agenda under the previous government to take more action. I hope we see that in a number of areas I have outlined, in particular e-cigarettes, where we are looking forward to the minister reintroducing the reforms and that bill into the parliament, but also in terms of smoking in our Corrections facilities. Hopefully, we will be seeing action on that as well.



I hope that all the community can note this day, pay attention to this day and encourage as many people as possible who are still smoking to give up and lead a healthier life not just for them but for the entire community.

Motion carried.

### **MENINGOCOCCAL B STRAIN VACCINATION**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:18):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the high rates of South Australians affected by the meningococcal B strain;
- (b) establish a committee to investigate the effectiveness of the meningococcal B strain vaccination as a state government-funded vaccination program; and
- (c) calls on the state government to implement a vaccination program against the meningococcal B strain for all South Australians.

It is very pleasing to see bipartisan support for the previous motion tabled here today, and I am hopeful that this will continue into this motion because this motion is about saving lives. I find it unconscionable that meningococcal B is a preventable disease. There is a vaccine but cost and awareness are factors that need to be addressed by this house. Meningococcal B can strike with very little warning and the impact of contracting this disease can range from the loss of limbs, such as fingers and toes, through to sight and hearing problems and, in the most severe cases, the loss of life. Those who are most at risk are babies and children up to the age of five, followed by teenagers and young adults from 15 to 24 years; however, this disease does not discriminate and can strike at any age.

Meningococcal B is an acute bacterial infection that, if the symptoms are not recognised and acted on immediately, can cause death within hours. Imagine your cheeky and adorable baby playing happily and within hours you are in hospital with your precious baby struggling to survive. This was the terrifying reality of parents, Nathan Braddock and Emma Smith of Mount Gambier earlier this year. Their six-month-old son, Jordan Braddock, had a fever and his mother, Emma, gave him Panadol. Concerned that Jordan did not drink his morning bottle, Emma made the decision to take him to a local medical clinic. By the time she arrived at the clinic, a rash had broken out on his face and Emma was advised that she should immediately proceed to hospital. In Emma's words, 'Everything just happened so quickly.'

The Royal Flying Doctor Service with specialist paediatric MedSTAR staff and equipment were dispatched to Mount Gambier. Tragically, Jordan lost his life due to this insidious disease while the retrieval team was on its way to Mount Gambier, despite the best efforts of staff at the Mount Gambier hospital. Within two weeks, Mount Gambier had its second case of meningococcal B diagnosed this year with a 15-year-old teenager falling victim to this disease. SA Health and the department for education and child development worked together with the high school where the teenager attended, informing students and their families of the recent case of meningococcal and provided advice as to what precautions should be taken. Once again, the Mount Gambier community were alarmed that the disease would spread throughout the community and more residents would fall victim to it. Thankfully, to date, no further cases have been diagnosed.

So far in 2018, there have been at least six confirmed cases of meningococcal B disease in South Australia. At this time last year, there had been only one case of meningococcal B diagnosed. To give insight into the prevalence of this disease, in South Australia in 2004 there were 11 reported cases of meningococcal B, and this number has steadily been rising ever since; in 2013, there were 20 cases; in 2014, there were 32 cases; and in 2017, there were 36 cases. A number of other states within Australia have also seen a rise in the number of meningococcal cases diagnosed. Victoria had 26 cases in 2014, and this rose to 50 in 2016. Similarly, New South Wales had 35 cases in 2014, and this number rose to 43 in 2016.

Symptoms of the disease include fever, nausea or vomiting, drowsiness, dizziness, lack of energy, confusion and the distinctive rash which indicates bleeding into the skin. A rash may start with a few spots or blisters and then spread very quickly and develop into purple bruise-like blotches. If any of these symptoms are present and you have the slightest concern, presentation at the nearest

medical clinic or hospital is highly recommended. Two vaccines have been launched to combat the meningococcal B strain, the first in Australia in March 2014, and the second in April 2018.

Neither of these vaccines are subsidised by the government. During the recent election, the Labor government made a pledge that vaccinations would be free for all children under the age of two. I must say that the previous Labor government has certainly led the way in this area. This was a saving of up to \$500 per child. It was estimated that this election pledge would cost \$24.5 million over four years. To some, that might seem a lot of money; however, when one of your children or someone in your community is inflicted with this disease, it is a small price to pay.

The state Liberal government are currently reviewing the meningococcal B vaccine, with health minister, Stephen Wade, noting that:

...while meningococcal disease is rare, B-strain is the most prevalent in the state and the Government is committed to developing a targeted, local response to have the maximum impact on the disease.

I would argue to the minister that there is already a policy out there that could be implemented. Minister Wade said:

There is significant community concern at the need to protect from meningococcal disease and we will act to lift protection in the most effective way...

Part of my motion is to encourage the state Liberal government to establish a committee, report back to the parliament on the cost of funding this vaccination and report on the effectiveness of the vaccine currently available. This committee would need to identify the age groups that are most at risk and how they will implement vaccination programs for those age groups. Again going to an initiative from the previous Labor government, South Australia led the nation with Australia's first meningococcal B study. A quote from the press release:

Sixty thousand eligible teenagers and young adults from across South Australia who are enrolled in Years 10, 11 and 12 in 2017 will be offered free of charge vaccinations against Meningococcal B as part of a state wide study into the impact of immunising large community groups against the disease.

The study—B Part of It—is being led by the University of Adelaide in partnership with SA Health and has been approved by the Women's and Children's Health Network Human Research Ethics Committee. Vaccinations [are] available to students in participating schools across South Australia during 2017 and 2018.

'South Australia has had the highest rate of meningococcal disease in Australia since 2012, with more cases [occurring every year]

I have highlighted that before.

...Associate Professor Helen Marshall, Director of the Vaccinology and Immunology Research Trials Unit at the Women's and Children's Hospital and the University of Adelaide's Robinson Research Institute [said] 'It is vital we learn more about the disease and the benefits of vaccinating against Meningococcal...

Whilst it is important that vaccination programs are implemented to protect our community, we are also beholden to ensure that the vaccine introduced will offer the required protection. That is where we need the committee to be doing that work.

I also encourage the government to undertake an education program for the community, as currently many families are not aware that there are a number of strains of meningococcal and that routine childhood vaccinations, as covered by the PBS, do not immunise against the meningococcal B strain. As I said right at the start, that awareness is very important to make sure that parents are aware—and certainly, as the local member, I was not aware—that the B strain is not covered under the national immunisation scheme.

We need to provide reassurance to the families that, as elected members of the Parliament of South Australia, we are concerned about the prevalence of meningococcal B in South Australia and that we are going to take strong action against it. This concern has been no more evident than in a petition, which I will table today, which carries 4,544 signatures from residents of Mount Gambier and districts. This was undertaken by Alli Schleef, who is the driving force behind the petition, and also the Justice for Jordan brand, seeking to have the meningococcal B vaccine funded for all South Australian children. It reads:

The Petition of the undersigned residents of Mount Gambier & Surrounding Districts, respectfully express their concern that the B strain of the Meningococcal disease is not covered by the National Immunisation Program.

Your Petitioners [the people of that area] therefore request that your Honourable House will call on the State Government to fund the B Strain vaccination of Meningococcal for South Australian children to prevent any further deaths from this preventable disease.

In a very short period of time—a matter of eight weeks, I believe—that petition gained 4,544 signatures. I will table it just before question time today. I would like to thank Alli for the time she has taken to deliver this petition to over 36 locations around Mount Gambier, encouraging residents to sign the petition; the organisations that house it in their businesses; the wonderful work that Alli has done to keep the awareness of this alive; and, of course, the people from my community who would like to see this heartache and preventable disease eradicated from South Australia. With that, I commend the motion to the house.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (11:32):** I rise in support of the motion put forward by the member for Mount Gambier and I congratulate him on his advocacy in this incredibly important area. I know this is an issue which is close to the member for Mount Gambier's heart as a local member who I know is close to his constituents and familiar with issues that are in the minds of the residents of Mount Gambier. I know this is one that is important to him, and he is right to advocate for this important cause.

As the member for Mount Gambier outlined, meningococcal B is a horrible condition that results in very severe consequences for those members of our community who are inflicted with it. Meningococcal B is indeed deadly. For those people who contract meningococcal B, they are highly vulnerable to suffering the most severe of consequences that any medical condition can present, that being death. For those people who survive meningococcal B, they are too often left with other severe consequences, albeit with their life intact. It is a killer. It is a deadly disease.

But the thing about meningococcal B that is so significant is that it is entirely preventable. The member for Newland, as someone with a scientific background, would well appreciate that vaccinations are incredibly empowering achievements on behalf of the medical and scientific profession. Meningococcal B has a vaccine that can quite literally save lives. I cannot begin to imagine how utterly painful it would be for a parent of a child who was lost to meningococcal B, suffering unimaginable pain, in the knowledge that it is preventable.

We live in a First World nation. We live in a state with an incredible standard of living on any global measure. It is within our capacity as a parliament, as a state, as it is within the capacity of this government to see to a far greater uptake of the meningococcal B vaccine.

Meningococcal B vaccine, despite being readily available in terms of supply, is not readily available to most South Australian families as a consequence of its cost. As the member for Mount Gambier outlined earlier, the cost of meningococcal B vaccine can be up to \$500 per person or child vaccinated. In the real world, this is a cost that is often beyond the reach of too many South Australians. Those South Australians who enjoy higher incomes—a group that everyone in this chamber is a member of—may well have it within their capacity or disposable income to provide for their children to be vaccinated. For too many South Australians that is not the case.

I would hope that everybody in this place—I certainly know it is the case for the member for Mount Gambier and everyone on this side of the chamber—sees that there is a value proposition that goes to where we see ourselves as a society. I would have thought that all of us would share the ideal that anybody and everybody should get access to life-saving vaccinations, particularly for our children, regardless of their income. I passionately believe that when it comes to the provision of health care, one segment of our community should not be deprived of life-saving treatments simply because they earn less money than another. Yet that is exactly the situation that we, as a state, find ourselves in with meningococcal B, and we are capable of fixing this.

At the last state election, the Labor Party took to the election a fully costed policy: \$24.5 million dollars to provide children under the age of two access to the meningococcal B vaccine. Is this the 100 per cent result? No. We would like every child in this state to have access to the meningococcal B vaccine. Providing it to all children under the age of two is eminently affordable. It was something that we as a party prioritised at the last election, and it is something that this resolution calls on the new government to prioritise. It is an eminently reasonable proposition.

I am not going to stand up here and be unnecessarily partisan on this. I do not think the members opposite want to see children under the age of two succumb to meningococcal B disease for the sake of \$24.5 million dollars. I do not think they want that, which is why they should support this resolution in an unamended form. The health minister has decided to put together a committee to review a way forward on this matter. If the government decides to pick up the former government's policy, the Labor Party's policy, of a \$24.5 million dollar investment to provide every child under the age of two this vaccine, I will be the first to applaud it. We as an opposition would welcome that. It would be a progressive step forward.

If indeed the government wants to go further than that, we would welcome and applaud that. But why the delay? The policy is there to be picked up and run with. The policy is fully costed. Had Labor won the last election, the policy would be in place this week: 1 June was what our policy was. So I call on the government to run with the member for Mount Gambier's motion. Its intention is good. It is utterly practical. It is affordable and it will literally save lives. We are capable of achieving this as a parliament. The government is capable of delivering this. I call on the government to support the motion unamended. It would be a very good day for many South Australian families.

Too many parents at the moment are going to bed at night concerned that meningococcal B will be inflicted on their child but that they are largely helpless to do anything about it because of the vaccine's exorbitant cost. This government can solve that problem. I call on them to do that. We can work on this together, and we can get a good outcome for many South Australian families.

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (11:38):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Replace the second two paragraphs, (b) and (c), with:

- (b) notes that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing has established an expert working group, consisting of experts in the field of meningococcal disease and immunisation; and
- (c) notes the expert working group is developing recommendations on the optimal response to meningococcal B for South Australia.

We are all in agreement that invasive meningococcal disease is a rare but devastating disease. The meningococcus, which is the causative agent of this disease, is most commonly carried in the back of the nose by otherwise healthy people, but for reasons that are largely unclear the organism can invade from there into places like the bloodstream to cause systemic disease and can progress further still to cause meningitis.

The most common serotypes responsible for invasive meningococcal disease are types A, B, C, W and Y, and vaccines against these types are serotype specific; that is, a vaccine protecting against serotype C, for example, does not protect against serotype B. The scary thing about this disease is that frequently it commences with little more than flu-like symptoms, but within a matter of hours it can progress very quickly to cause fatal disease and permanent disability.

All deaths, including those recently in the member for Mount Gambier's electorate, are a tragedy, and this is the reason that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing is working hard to explore all options to ensure that an appropriate evidence-based, effective and safe response to the disease is implemented to reduce the likelihood of similar tragedies occurring again in the future.

Nationally, the incidence of invasive meningococcal disease is increasing, mostly from the W strain in other states, and the state government is working with the federal government to implement, as of 1 July 2018, a statewide program to vaccinate against the A, C, W and Y types of disease. Currently, though, the serotype B vaccine is not included on this schedule, despite the fact that there is one available. It is a relatively recent vaccine in terms of its licence, and in fact it was quite a tricky vaccine to develop in the first place.

It is true that the vaccine is expensive, and this clearly makes it difficult for many to be vaccinated. The Marshall Liberal government recognises that the serotype B strain is more prevalent in South Australia than in other states and territories and is the leading cause of meningococcal disease in South Australia. Again, this is why the government is committed to developing a targeted local response—in order to have the maximum impact on the disease in South Australia.

The Minister for Health and Wellbeing established a multisectorial expert group on 26 April this year that consists of SA Health clinicians and immunologists as well as independent experts in

the field of meningococcal disease and immunisation more broadly. The working group is currently developing a set of recommendations on the optimal response to this disease for the state of South Australia.

In its current review of recommendations relating to the serotype B meningococcal disease vaccine, the peak national clinical advisory group on immunisation, ATAGI, has highlighted the need to optimise vaccination against a range of target groups. There are a number of groups that are at risk of meningococcal disease. They include children under the age of two. They also include Indigenous children under the age of five, adolescents in their teens and 20s and, of course, those of any age who may have an underlying illness. The working group will look at this review being undertaken by ATAGI but will not necessarily wait for their final findings.

I would add that understanding the interaction between these different risk groups is very important. Particularly when you are talking about an organism such as this that is predominantly passed around the community without people even knowing it is there, it is important to understand which groups are transmitting it versus those who are getting sick. They are not always the same group. I know that in other cases the children can be responsible for passing it around but it is in fact the elderly who will get sick. It is important to consider all this when determining how best to deal with the problem.

It is also incredibly common, right around the world, for different vaccination programs to be employed in different jurisdictions in order to best meet local conditions. The current statewide study that the member for Mount Gambier referred to, 'B Part of It', which is led by Associate Professor Helen Marshall, looking at around 60,000 South Australians, is looking at a very important part of how this vaccine can impact on herd immunity in our community. This is why it is so important that the work be done to identify the best plan for South Australia to deal with the particular situation that we find ourselves in in this state. The working group will consider all options for a community vaccination program.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I go ahead, the amendment is in order. I call on the member for Kurna.

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (11:45):** The amendment may be in order but it is a horrible, hopeless amendment. The opposition wholeheartedly supports the original motion from the member for Mount Gambier and completely disagrees with this amendment being moved by the government—this amendment to delay, this amendment to sit on their hands, this amendment to push things to a committee, rather than take action on this very serious public health risk that is facing the community in South Australia now.

We know that there is the ability for the government to take action. We did the work. We have come up with the plan. We took the plan to the election. There is a \$24.5 million plan that has been costed by the parliamentary budget office. We have given all those details to the government and they are able to implement that plan now.

If we had been elected, that plan would have been coming in from 1 June, this Friday. That would have meant that families across South Australia would have been able to access vaccines for kids zero to two years old to cover themselves for meningococcal B. Families across South Australia know the concern of this disease. They have seen the devastating effects across the state, whether it is in Adelaide, or particularly the effects that have happened down in the South-East and in the member for Mount Gambier's community, where I know he has been in touch with a number of the families affected.

We know that this is a disease that is affecting South Australia more than other states, which highlights the need for our state government to take action and to take action swiftly. We know that families are not able to afford this vaccine on their own. We know that it can cost up to \$500 for a family to be vaccinated against meningococcal B, and that is a cost that most families cannot afford. This is something where the government should be taking action. The government has a role to provide that support and coverage for families across South Australia to ensure that they are covered.

We have seen already this week some new statistics from National Pharmacies showing that the rate they have been selling the meningococcal B vaccine has gone through the roof already this

financial year—at least 40 per cent higher than last year. We know that there is a very significant demand, but in South Australia and in Australia it should not be dependent on how much money your parents have as to whether or not you can get coverage for a serious life-threatening disease for kids. That is not the sort of health system that we should have in this country and we think that it is something where the state government has a role.

We have pushed the issue time and time again with the federal government to cover this vaccine across the country. It has not got approval from the federal government to do that, largely because we see meningococcal B impact this state more than other states; therefore, this is something where the state government has the ability to take action. They have the information available to them, but what have they done? They have sent it to a working group, a work task group or whatever they have called it. It is really just a complete delaying tactic from the government to do that.

This was established over a month ago, but we have seen no evidence of what its outputs have been and no recommendations have come out. We think this task group has had more than enough time to investigate the issue and provide some reports and recommendations to the government to take action. Every day, every week, every month that this is further delayed puts more kids at risk.

We are calling upon the government to stop delaying this matter and take action. If they want to look at the broader issue of people over the age of two being vaccinated—of course, we need to look at catch-up programs for the community for that—then that is something the committee and the task group could look into at length to develop another model. However, there is no need to delay vaccinations for the zero to two-year-old cohort because we have the plan and we have the costings. We could be taking action right now to procure those vaccines and distribute them throughout the community to ensure that family members across South Australia are able to vaccinate their kids.

We know that the demand for that is very high and we know that families want to do this. The member for Mount Gambier, the Leader of the Opposition and I have spoken to a number of victims and people who have had family members struck by this horrible disease. We do not want to see that happen to anybody else. We do not want to see any other families going through that torment. So many of us in this house have children ourselves and have been able to vaccinate our kids because we can afford it, but that is not the case for so many families in South Australia who cannot afford this vaccine.

For the government to come into this house and take what is a very well thought through and heartfelt motion from the member for Mount Gambier—who used to be in their party—representing his community on this very important public health issue, and seek to amend that in this house to make it a delaying, nothing motion that basically just pats the government on the back for setting up a committee is disgraceful. I think this is something on which this house should have a strong view. A vaccine program is needed and we should be implementing a vaccine program for kids in South Australia. I am very disappointed that the government will not be supporting that, and that they will be opposing a motion whereby we are supporting a vaccine program for South Australia.

Any number of experts will tell you that that is exactly what is needed. Any number of experts will tell you that South Australia needs this vaccine for kids in this state. It is confusing for parents in terms of how to get coverage and the number of different vaccines. A number of people think that their children are covered by the existing National Immunisation Program for meningococcal B, but, sadly, that is not on the National Immunisation Program. We have seen studies showing a high level of confusion amongst parents as to what exactly their kids are covered for and whether or not they need to procure other vaccines and what the costs of doing that are.

I believe that the state government have the responsibility and the ability to take action, and they could be doing that very quickly. If they had taken that up from day one, we would be seeing that program coming in from this Friday. Families across South Australia would be able to access that vaccine, our immunisation rate would go through the roof and many more families would be protected from what is a horrible case of this B strain vaccine. We saw 22 of those cases occur in South Australia last year, and already we have seen nine cases of the B vaccine in South Australia this year, which is a significant increase.

This is a disease that is on the increase in South Australia. I hope that we do not see more cases between now and the end of the year and that we can get as many kids as possible vaccinated to prevent that from happening. However, that is going to require the government taking some action, supporting this motion from the member for Mount Gambier and not continuing to delay what is very clear—what all the experts believe is something that should be happening in South Australia and that can be happening in South Australia. It just needs the government actually to support it.

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (11:53):** I am pleased to rise today to support this motion from the member for Mount Gambier, which supports state efforts to combat the devastating meningococcal B strain, the most predominant strain of this invasive, quick-onset, deadly disease. Most importantly, I note the amendments which I wholeheartedly support, which were outlined previously and moved by the member for Newland and which do acknowledge the fantastic work that has been done and is being done by the new government and the new Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

In rising, I recognise the efforts of the recently established expert working group by the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in the other place, which has been charged with developing a set of recommendations for the best response to beating this disease. It is with particular interest that I feel moved to support this motion and its amendments and to commend the member for Mount Gambier for raising it, noting that his community has also been directly impacted by recent deaths from meningococcal B, and for his efforts to recognise the prevalence of this particular strain.

For many years in the Narungga electorate and particularly in the Copper Coast area, meningococcal and its devastating impact on families has been highlighted by the Paige Weatherspoon Foundation, set up by Nicky and Dwayne Weatherspoon upon the death of their 22-month-old daughter Paige in 2000. In the 18 years since, Nicky and Dwayne and foundation helpers and volunteers have held Violet Day on 1 August—which was Paige's birthday—every year. They have raised nearly \$500,000 and have done much to shine a light on the symptoms and devastation of meningococcal disease, which was virtually unheard of in my district prior to the death of young Paige Weatherspoon.

It is how quickly the disease spreads and kills that is so disturbing—that and the fact that its symptoms are common to minor illnesses. Nicky and Dwayne have told the story many times over the years of how Paige had looked tired and had a temperature, but it was taken as just a typical childhood virus. Her mother had given her a Panadol and tucked her into bed as part of their solution.

Paige slept until lunchtime and laid on the couch in the afternoon. She still had a temperature but nothing appeared out of the ordinary. By 10.30pm that night Paige had complained of sore legs, and Nicky noticed bruise-like spots on them. She rang the doctor, but the advice came back that it was likely just a respiratory virus and to bring her in the next day if things had not improved. By 2am that night the rash had become significantly worse, and she was rushed to hospital, but, agonisingly, Paige passed away.

Common symptoms such as feeling tired, vomiting a couple of times and having a temperature can all be attributed to a simple virus, which is what makes meningococcal so difficult to recognise and in turn so dangerous. All children will inevitably have symptoms of this sort at various times throughout their childhood, which makes it even more difficult to determine. Other symptoms to look out for with meningococcal include headache, neck stiffness and tiny red and purple spots, but these are not always prevalent or evident. And when the spots come on, it is often too late, which is evidence of how quickly this disease takes hold. That is why awareness of the signs are so vitally important and early detection so key. Prompt diagnosis of meningococcal can be lifesaving.

Every year on Paige's birthday, the Paige Weatherspoon Foundation celebrates Violet Day, chosen because purple was Paige's favourite colour. Trading stalls sell all sorts of purple items, including wristbands and pens, and many local schools mark the occasion, often with a wear-something-purple day. The trading stalls are held not just on the Copper Coast. Schools, kindergartens, care groups, aged-care homes and hospitals from around the state, as far away as Port Lincoln and Roxby Downs, have all been involved in the past, holding morning teas or sausage sizzles—anything to highlight the disease and to educate people about how it is spread and its symptoms.

This disease is a severe infection that can infect anyone anywhere, but most at risk are children under five like Paige, teenagers and young adults and, of course, older people. Most cases are isolated and not related to another case or to an outbreak. Sadly, the B strain has a higher prevalence in South Australia than in other states, hence minister Wade's action on this issue. The government and the new Minister for Health and Wellbeing are fully committed to creating a targeted, localised response, which will ensure that the disease feels the maximum impact of that response.

The minister has already established a multisectoral expert working group, which has been alluded to previously. That occurred on 26 April this year. The group consists of SA Health clinicians and immunologists as well as independent experts in the field of meningococcal disease and immunisation more broadly. This working group has already started work on a set of recommendations for the optimal response to combat this disease—this strain of the disease—for the state of South Australia's betterment.

In its current review of recommendations relating to the meningococcal B vaccination, the peak national clinical advisory group has highlighted the need to optimise vaccination amongst a range of priority target groups, including young children under the age of two, Indigenous children up to five, adolescents, young adults and those who are at a higher risk of the disease due to pre-existing medical conditions.

Due to clinical concern about the greater proportion of B-strain cases in South Australia as well as increasing community concern, the expert working group will consider all options for a community vaccination program. The B strain is the last to have a vaccination available, hence the expert working group recently established by this government involving the aforementioned clinicians and immunologists, and the urgency for developing a set of recommendations as the best response to this disease.

I support the member for Mount Gambier's motion, with the amendments outlined by the member for Newland to reflect the action already taken by this government and the ongoing efforts to combat meningococcal disease, and I urge the support of all members of this house for the amendments.

**Mr BROCK (Frome) (12:00):** I would like to express my utter disgust at this amendment, which seeks to change the motion put forward by the member for Mount Gambier. The amendment basically is to the part establishing a committee. The amendment notes that the Minister for Health has established it. However, the third part of the member for Mount Gambier's motion calls on the Marshall Liberal government to implement a vaccination program. There are no time frames in this amendment—there are no time frames whatsoever—and I am very, very disappointed that it appears to be political and that there is not bipartisan support for a great motion by the member for Mount Gambier.

We look at our children and our grandchildren and see their lively faces, their innocence, their growing to young adults and then them achieving some direction in their adult lives. However, for many parents this scenario does not eventuate due to some illnesses that these young people contract. For many years, Australia has had various immunisation programs and there are immunisation programs that are getting better; however, at the same time, there are emerging new diseases coming to light every day.

One of these diseases is meningococcal B, which is emerging in addition to other strains of this very drastic and disastrous disease. As we are aware, these diseases are an intense bacterial infection that can cause death within hours if not treated. This situation was reflected in the speech by the member for Mount Gambier about the two children and the families that have already experienced these incidents.

All Australian children are vaccinated against the C strain through the immunisation program, but not the B strain. My information is there are five main strains of this disease in Australia and vaccines for all of them, but only the C strain is on the PBS and given free to children up to two years of age. The B strain is available from GPs but, as the Leader of the Opposition and others have indicated, it costs around \$500 for the vaccination period.

When I was a child, we were immunised against polio, which at that particular time had a very devastating effect. Over the years, we have also been immunising young infants against tetanus



and other diseases. It is now time to look at the same process for this new disease. Australia is now participating on a world stage and, although our hygiene controls are excellent, there is always every chance that our young children will contract a new strain of any disease.

To lose a child is every parent's nightmare. I can talk from personal experience as we lost our grandson over eight years ago by drowning at 18 months of age. Whilst every precaution was taken that day, the accident still happened. The effect on my daughter, my family and our friends is still being felt to this very day. I ask the members on the other side to think very seriously about this amendment which has no time frame on it. The motion coming from the member for Mount Gambier asked the Marshall Liberal government to implement the vaccination program now.

I ask them how they would feel seeing their child or their grandchild being held by the mother and the mother saying, 'Dad, I cannot wake the child up. The child is not responding.' That is what may happen if this vaccination program is deferred. This motion by the member for Mount Gambier is just common sense and needs to be endorsed by the Liberal government straightaway.

As the member for Hammond mentioned earlier, the Marshall Liberal government supports the previous motion of No Tobacco Day, where only policies and promotions can be undertaken. This motion by the member for Mount Gambier asks the Marshall Liberal government to implement a vaccination program and establish a committee. The amendment already says that they are going to establish a committee, but it does not give any time frames about the immunisation program. Starting an immunisation program straightaway reduces the chances of contracting this disease and will allow a child to have a life.

As has been mentioned earlier, this has already been costed at about \$24½ million over four years. That is \$6 million per year. What is the value of a child's life, to allow them to grow up and enjoy? What is the value of not having a parent worry about trying to wake up a deceased child? What is the value for some people out there who cannot afford to have this immunisation? A cost of \$500 for four immunisations for this disease is out of the reach of a lot of people in South Australia.

In my view, the Liberal government should implement the meningococcal B vaccination program. This program would dramatically reduce the risk of a child contracting this devastating disease. This would result in prevention, increasing the opportunity for a child to have a life. If there is another death due to a vaccination program not being in place, I ask members to look at their soul and ask very seriously: if that program had been implemented straightaway, could that have saved that child? I ask members to ask themselves: if the motion by the member for Mount Gambier had been agreed to then, would the risk of that child dying have been reduced?

I ask everyone here to seriously consider the amendment put forward by the member for Newland, and to defeat that amendment and allow the motion by the member for Mount Gambier to go through unaltered and allow this program to be implemented immediately. I commend the motion from the member for Mount Gambier to the house.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:08):** I thank all members for their contribution on this very important motion. I indicate that I do not support the amendment by the member for Newland because I do not think it actually adds anything to the motion. In fact, I think it is hollow in many aspects.

First of all, it does not call on the government to do anything. It simply acknowledges work that, at face value, has been undertaken. It does not address any of the concerns highlighted by the community. There is no awareness. There could have been an amendment to strengthen aspects of awareness of meningococcal B not being on the National Immunisation Program and the fact that the state government does not offer an immunisation program for the meningococcal B strain.

As the member for Frome quite rightly pointed out, there is no time frame on the amendment by the member for Newland. There is actually no commitment to do anything. There is no commitment to implement a vaccination program for the meningococcal B strain and, of course, it does not address the cost of the vaccine, which currently sits close to \$500.

I will conclude my remarks with what I started with, and that is that it is unconscionable that this is a preventable disease, that due to awareness and cost young people in South Australia are not being vaccinated, and we have the ability in this house to do something about it. However, it is

not just my words or my motion: just before question time today I will table 4,544 signatures on a petition, as follows:

Your petitioners...request that your honourable house will call on the state government to fund the B strain vaccination of meningococcal for South Australian children to prevent any further deaths from this preventable disease.

I will finish with part of a statement released by the heartbroken family of Jordan Braddock from Mount Gambier where they describe the heartache of losing their beloved son:

Jordan was cruelly snatched away from his family. It took just two hours for this insipid disease to ravage his little body—

a family spokesman said.

His bereft and grieving parents are still coming to terms with his sudden loss. You always hear the horror stories, but you never think this can happen to you. But it can. And it does. And it did.

The spokesman said, 'If only Jordan's parents had known there was a vaccine available to immunise against this deadly disease.' With that, I commend the original motion to the house.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes ..... 23  
Noes ..... 21  
Majority..... 2

#### AYES

Basham, D.K.B.  
Cregan, D.  
Habib, C.  
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.  
Sanderson, R.  
Treloar, P.A.  
Wingard, C.L.

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

#### NOES

Bedford, F.E.  
Bignell, L.W.K.  
Brown, M.E. (teller)  
Hildyard, K.A.  
Malinauskas, P.  
Piccolo, A.  
Stinson, J.M.

Bell, T.S.  
Boyer, B.I.  
Close, S.E.  
Hughes, E.J.  
Mullighan, S.C.  
Picton, C.J.  
Weatherill, J.W.

Bettison, Z.L.  
Brock, G.G.  
Cook, N.F.  
Koutsantonis, A.  
Odenwalder, L.K.  
Rau, J.R.  
Wortley, D.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

### SKILLING SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:18):** I move:

That this house:

- (a) acknowledges the state government's commitment to significantly increase training participation in South Australia, specifically through the Skilling South Australia initiative;
- (b) recognises the state government's investment of \$100 million to secure matched commonwealth funding through the Skilling Australians Fund to create an additional 20,815 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia over the next four years; and
- (c) acknowledges the state government's reforms giving industry a stronger voice in South Australia's training system and supporting young people by implementing flexible apprenticeship pathways.

Our new Liberal government supports this great South Australian initiative. I am so proud to be part of a government focused on delivering what our community is asking for, which is a future for our young people to build the capacity of South Australia and strong foundations for our future generations. We have a steadfast commitment to significantly increase training participation in South Australia, specifically through this initiative.

Our commitment to this initiative is so strong because South Australia's unemployment during Labor's 16 years in government was the highest of the mainland states for almost half that time. As I discussed in my maiden speech, so many people told me what they most wanted to see was more jobs for our young people in South Australia. We care very deeply about this. Despite our sad unemployment outcomes in the past 16 years, South Australia has also faced skills shortages in some key industries, with the number of South Australians in apprenticeships and traineeships more than halving over the past four years.

In a rapidly changing world, government investment in training must be connected to delivering on the broader needs of our economy and lead to real jobs and better investment outcomes. Training participation rates over the past five years under Labor are damning. Of particular concern is the drastic fall in youth participation in VET (aged 15 to 24 years), which fell by 14,700, or 34.9 per cent, to 27,400 students.

Critically, our state needs to better prepare for the naval shipbuilding job boom by reinvesting in the skilled jobs training sector to guarantee that our lion's share of the new shipbuilding jobs goes to South Australians. Our government will invest \$100 million to create more than 20,000 new places in the vocational education and training system to provide South Australians with more opportunities to secure an apprenticeship or traineeship and a future career in South Australia. Young South Australians need a range of pathways to the jobs of the future, and this investment in apprenticeships and traineeships is a central feature of our jobs policy.

The initiative will include providing \$100 million to secure matched funding from the federal government to create the additional 20,815 apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia over the next four years. The federal government has established the Skilling Australians Fund to provide ongoing funding for vocational education and training. The fund was announced in the 2017 federal budget, but the South Australian Labor government failed to demonstrate any interest in securing money from this fund to secure benefits for our state and our young people. We care about our young people, and we want to keep them here in South Australia.

A Marshall Liberal government will commit to providing \$100 million over four years to secure matched funding. Joint state-federal spending of over \$200 million over the next four years will support 20,815 new apprenticeships and traineeships. This will include apprentices and trainees for occupations in demand including, in particular, in the defence sector, industries and sectors of future growth, industry areas struggling with current skills shortages, trade apprenticeships and rural and regional areas. This is a major investment in skills development that will lead to real job outcomes.

In addition, it will help us establish at least one new technical college in Adelaide's north-western suburbs with a focus on encouraging students to prepare for work in the defence sector, maintaining financial support for the crucial role of group training organisations in the training sector, implementing a major multifaceted program to encourage more young people to consider pursuing a career through a technical qualification as a first option, rather than as a fallback plan, and encouraging flexible apprenticeship pathways, enabling more young people to be learning and earning at the same time.

We want many more students to have the opportunity to undertake their first year of apprenticeship at the end of year 11, rather than waiting until after the end of year 12. We would like to see 1,000 students benefit from taking up a flexible apprenticeship at the end of year 11. Achieving the SACE while undertaking an apprenticeship is currently possible, but very few students are encouraged down this path today.

Currently, many students are staying on at school to achieve their SACE despite intending to go down vocational pathways. These students who remain in school are in some cases becoming disengaged and would rather be out in the workforce earning money. The community expectation to complete year 12 and SACE can delay these students from entering the workforce. By commencing

their apprenticeship a year early, in effect these apprentices would gain their qualifications a full year ahead of students undertaking a standard route or a regular school-based apprenticeship, while attaining their SACE qualification along the way. It is also attractive for businesses to engage apprentices before they turn 18 so that their training is complete when they are 20.

While I was doorknocking in King, both business owners and parents told me they wished our young people had more opportunity to start apprenticeships earlier. We are listening to our community, which is a great segue to the additional benefits of this party's focus on listening to South Australians and businesses. Our state government reforms will give industry a stronger voice in our training system. I am proud to say that our Marshall Liberal government will re-establish the industry skills councils to ensure that industry has a stronger voice in TAFE, in VET schools and on the Training and Skills Commission, and they will directly have input into the highest level of government decision-making, including the minister and cabinet.

In addition, I have been fortunate in my career on boards and in council and working in Service SA to see firsthand the difference we can make by providing additional pre-employment, pre-vocational programs and training opportunities for our youth and to people in our community who may be facing challenges of having English as a second language or being long-term unemployed or disengaged.

Recently, I spoke with the CEO of the North East Development Agency, Joanne Munn, to ask how their programs and apprenticeship numbers are going. She told me the number of people in their apprenticeships are indeed growing. In fact, they have had to hire four more full-time trainers to keep up with the new apprentices. With a lift in confidence, more businesses are contacting NEDA to inquire whether there are people who have finished the pre-vocational courses and are ready for apprenticeships. Confidence is lifting.

In addition, she told me there have been fewer cancellations of apprenticeships, which is a great sign. She was also very supportive of our Liberal government commitment to pilot a program to help young people get their licence more easily. We have discussed this in the past. At one time when she came to speak to me about this, there were 10 vacancies in apprenticeships due to young people not having the support they needed to be able to get their driver's licence.

When I was working at Service SA, a number of concerned training providers and community members raised the issue of young people keen for an apprenticeship but not being able to get their licence. Sometimes because of the cost, time and limitations in family support, there is a growing challenge for young apprentices and trainees in relation to the difficulty in obtaining their provisional driver's licence and the right to drive without supervision. Many apprenticeship jobs, whether directly working for a business or through a training provider, require that the apprentice be able to drive to worksites as part of the job.

However, through a series of the previous government's policies, it has become so much harder for young people to obtain their driver's licence by the age of 17. Our Marshall Liberal government will undertake a 12-month trial of expediting this stage for students who are engaged in a contract of training. As trainees or apprentices who are required to drive for their employment, the time required on L-plates will be reduced from 12 months to six months. All other requirements, including the compulsory driving hours and the hazard perception test, will still be required.

I have seen firsthand the outcomes for participants engaged in pre-employment, pre-vocational and apprenticeship programs. I have seen the excellent enthusiasm and attendance rates of participants who were previously lacking confidence or disengaged in our community. These job and training opportunities will change lives. These opportunities could stop our youth leaving South Australia or becoming disengaged, and we all know the problems in our community that arise from that.

We are here to represent our community's best interest. We are focused on building capacity in South Australia. We are focused on the wellbeing of every South Australian. Our community voted us into government because of our platform to create jobs and deliver better services. This government will ensure that South Australia's training budget is targeted effectively at delivering skill outcomes that lead to real jobs and real careers right here in South Australia. I truly believe our

Skilling South Australia initiative will build our capacity and at the same time give our people, businesses and industry confidence and more hope for the future.

**Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:30):** Jobs, jobs, jobs. If you do not have a job, you do not have choices in life. In fact, it was my interest in the participation of the economy that drove my interest in politics. If you have a spare moment and wish to read my first speech to the house, you will note that that is what I talked about. I talked about the importance of jobs, and not only in my own life. When I was young and finished school and university, it was very difficult to get a job. Of course, I had great mentors in my life: my parents. I reflected on the fact that both of them studied post-secondary education and, in fact, they studied when I was a child and showed me that great role.

Let me say at the outset that the opposition supports the motion being put forward by the member for King. I think it is her first motion to the house, and I congratulate her on it. The opposition believes skilling our workforce is critical, but we will be watching and making sure that the Marshall Liberal government delivers on its election commitment to deliver 20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships over the next four years.

Our own election commitment focused on \$100 million to create 18,000 new accredited training places. As part of that \$100 million package, Labor proposed \$90 million towards accredited training places to support apprentices, trainees and job-related training in key growth industries. This also included retraining and reskilling workers who had been injured on the job. There was \$6 million over five years for 1,000 school-based traineeships in the disability sector, training students for over 6,000 jobs being created by the National Disability Insurance Scheme. There was \$2.35 million over three years to Community Centres SA to build skills and increase participation in training, volunteering and employment among disengaged young people and adults.

Let me reflect upon Community Centres South Australia, particularly their delivery of adult community education. I was part of the Economic and Finance Committee a few years back when they came to talk to us about skills and training. I have to say I changed my mind about the role of adult community education. For many people, their experience of education was not positive and was not encouraged. In fact, they were told that it was something they had to do but, as soon as they were old enough, they could leave. When they entered the workforce they found that they were very limited and had a lot of barriers to what they could do.

Yet often adult community education gave them that confidence, maybe to improve numeracy and literacy, maybe to improve their ICT abilities, or maybe just to build that confidence, particularly for those who had been out of the workforce for some time or may have worked in retail and hospitality but wanted to convert to administration roles and understand modern-day workplaces. I think that is incredibly important, so it is something that I will be watching in terms of money and support for adult community education as we go forward.

Part of our package also pledged \$1 million for the four years for the training of Auslan interpreters and \$650,000 over three years to the Council of the Ageing to trial a midcareer check and planning for people aged 50 and over, focused on planning ahead, upskilling and retraining. As a former minister for ageing that is one of the things that was a surprise to me because 45-plus is a really challenging time. Once you hit 45, it is harder to get a job.

As someone who has recently achieved that goal, that was a surprise to me because I feel like I have just got going and, if we are expected to work until the age of 70, then we have a cultural issue here. If we think that grey hair means that you cannot do a job, or we think that if you put your birth date on a resume you will not be interviewed, that is an issue. We need to have an understanding about people's skills and experiences. I have a lot of interest in multigenerational workplaces and the benefits they can provide for all people who work there. I am not sure that that has been picked up by the Marshall Liberal government to support COTA in their trial of a mid-career check, but I encourage them to look at that and, as the Minister for Industry and Skills is here, he might take that on notice.

In our election commitment, the Labor government also committed to a review of the industry skills advisory arrangements to ensure that training aligns with industry needs. Whilst this motion seeks to acknowledge the state government's apparent commitment to increase training and

participation in South Australia, and recognise the state government's investment of \$100 million to create these new apprenticeships, the fact is, actions speak louder than words.

Since coming to government, the Marshall Liberal government have not detailed how they are going to achieve this. The industry and skills minister put out a press release last month stating that they are working closely with the federal government, aiming to be the first state to leverage off the \$100 million investment; however, the minister is yet to detail when we will know if the state government have been successful in securing this money. The minister has failed to provide a time line for how many new apprenticeships and traineeships will be created this year and over each of the following four years. There are no milestones in place to measure the success of this proposed initiative.

More concerning to me is what will happen if this Marshall Liberal government is not successful in attracting the other \$100 million from the federal Liberal government. What if there is an election and a change of federal government? What are you going to put in place? When we look at this and we look at the federal Liberal government, we saw the recent budget, and one week before the budget the federal Liberals promised \$1.4 billion for the north-south corridor but, come budget night, no new money had been allocated in the four-year forward estimates.

Then we saw the federal defence industries minister put out a media release on 20 April: 'SA defence industry even stronger under a Marshall government'. Then, only three days later, we saw shipbuilder ASC announce a loss of 197 manufacturing jobs and 26 administrative jobs. We on this side of the house know that you cannot trust Malcolm Turnbull and the federal Liberal government.

Yesterday, in Senate estimates reference was made to documents released under FOI that showed that French builder Naval Group's Australian industry plan, explaining how the company planned to utilise ASC staff, listed 1,700 employees as part of anticipated employment outcomes, yet the original promise in April 2016 was that 2,800 direct jobs would be secured. What happened to the missing 1,100? When it comes to the delivery of the Skilling South Australia initiative, it is important that the Marshall Liberal government secures the \$100 million from the federal government. The opposition is keen to ensure that this project is successful.

Let me reflect on our term in government. We delivered training to an estimated 45,300 people in 2016-17 alone, which equates to around 8.7 million hours of training. When it comes to VET training, in 2016-17 the department invested \$26.1 million in subsidies for more than 6,400 unique school-enrolled students. Roughly 42 per cent of SACE completions incorporate VET units of competence.

We all want the same thing: we want our economy to grow, and we want people to develop their skills, to use their training towards pathways to employment and to upskill in order to create opportunities for them in new industries or to increase their wage. How we get this is important, but we are all on the same page and we want to achieve this. I commend the motion to the house.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (12:40):** I am very pleased to hear that the opposition will be supporting this motion from the member for King. I have to say that when out on the road doorknocking with the member for King I really did get a strong understanding of how connected she is with her community. She identified that a future for their children was an important requirement of any government they were going to support in the lead-up to the election, and she correctly identified that many of those aspirational families who live in King saw apprenticeships as a key progress, if you like, into careers that can go a very long way once they are complete.

I listened with interest to the member for Ramsay saying in her opening lines that she will be watching the government's apprenticeship numbers. I can understand why she will be doing that—because that is all they did when they were in office, when they had their hands on the levers and they could move those levers to achieve the things we want. I agree with the member for Ramsay: we all want the same thing, but we debate about how we achieve it. The former Labor government, the government she was a member of, sat there and watched as the numbers of traineeships and apprenticeships dwindled year after year in South Australia.

In 2012, there were 24,570 traineeships and apprenticeships in South Australia. In 2017, there were 15,200. I understand that is the largest drop per capita in the country, and it was under

her watch. That is all she did. She watched it happen. So she is certainly welcome to watch what the Marshall Liberal government will be doing with our commitment to deliver more than 20,000 new traineeships and apprenticeships over the next four years. We are committed to doing this by lifting the profile and prestige of apprenticeships. Apprenticeships should be seen as another entry point into a career, not just a job but a career.

For many people as they pass their 20s and move into their 30s and 40s, lots of different opportunities can come their way if they are prepared for them and they can identify them when they come. I think it is pretty easy to argue that a trade background is a very good all-round grounding for those who want to move into other roles or more important roles where they started their working life, whether they want to be the manager or supervisor of the business they are working for, whether they want to cut ties with the business they are working for altogether and, as I did, start their own business or whether they want to use those skills on the farm, which is what the member for MacKillop did after doing his apprenticeship in fitting and turning and then returning to the farm. The trade-based entry into the workforce is very versatile, and unfortunately, after 16 years of Labor, we saw it deteriorate to crisis levels at a time when we needed high skills for the high-paying jobs coming our way in the defence and defence-related industries.

The fact is we do not have enough people in the welding area, the boiler making area or the electrical and electronics areas. A whole new area is developing in digital technology for which we only have two entry points at the moment. We have an entry point through a university degree or we have on-the-job training, no other entry point. We are very keen to see additional entry points into digital technology and cyberspace, and that is why in the latest round of subsidised training lists we have funded Certificate IV in Cyber Security. There will be more coming as we develop and improve the options for vocational education into careers.

Also of note in the member for Ramsay's contribution is that everything for the Labor Party is about the input, the money: 'We put money in this, we put money in that.' They never talk about the outcomes. We know why they do not talk about the outcomes. We all remember that famous promise of 100,000 extra jobs in South Australia from 2010 over a six-year period. I think they ended up reaching about 8,000 jobs. They did not want to talk about the outcome but they kept wanting to talk about the input.

When they introduced Skills for All, they talked about how much money they were putting in the system, not about the outcomes the system was developing. What we saw under Skills for All was an influx of training providers from interstate, pushing out established training providers here who were actually making a living from fee-for-service without any government money at all. They had lost their businesses overnight because those who were able to come in from interstate grabbed those customers, students and businesses that were hiring these businesses for a fee-for-service and took their business away because they were getting a subsidy. It was the most poorly managed bit of public expenditure that we have witnessed for a very long time.

You will not see that over the next four years with our plan to have more apprentices and more trainees in South Australia because the funding will be linked to job outcomes; it will be linked to jobs. We have started this by consulting 125 industry organisations and vocational education organisations before we have even started adjusting the list. It has been the first time ever.

It was terrific to get this feedback for my department after I had initiated this consultation process. The people who are in the industries that provide these skills were so pleased to be asked: what does the government need to do to make this work? Never have they had that question asked by the previous government because the previous government were only interested in how much money they were spending. They were not the slightest bit interested in talking about the outcomes that they were achieving.

They were happy to talk about outcomes that people might see in the distant future. There were promises or targets, but they were not happy to talk about the outcomes they were actually achieving because they were an embarrassment. They were going backwards. Those training figures I read out earlier are an indication of that.

It is also very concerning to hear the member for Ramsay now flagging that if there were a change of government in Canberra, and Bill Shorten or Anthony Albanese would become the Prime

Minister of South Australia, there would be a cut in funding for apprenticeships. That is what we all heard. We all heard that from the member for Ramsay. It is just extraordinary that a party that is supposed to be there to support the workers of Australia is going to be cutting the very training they need to participate in the workforce. This will affect South Australia more so than the other states because we have a skills shortage in South Australia because of the record—

**Ms BETTISON:** Point of order: this is a misrepresentation of what I said, and I ask the minister to withdraw it.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** She can make a personal explanation. If she believes that I have misrepresented her, she can make a personal explanation to explain it. But we are all here in the chamber. We all heard this, and those in our offices all heard this.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Minister, I will call you back to the motion itself. I will listen carefully, and please ensure that you stick to the topic of the day.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Certainly, sir. I will wind up by congratulating the member for King. She is very passionate about jobs and careers in South Australia, for our young people in particular. I think it is fair to say that the seat of King has disproportionately more younger people than, say, a seat like mine in Unley. She is switched on with what is important to those residents in her electorate of King. They want opportunities for their young people, and they are going to get them.

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:50):** I want to make a few comments on the motion moved by the member for King and congratulate her on her hard work and advocacy for her people in the north-east. I note this is her first motion. As the member for Unley concluded in his comments, skills, apprenticeships and jobs are a huge issue, not just in the member for King's electorate but, of course, in my electorate and across all of South Australia.

As I said, I support the motion and the Skilling South Australia initiative. It is a really important policy of the new Marshall Liberal government, one that formed the basis of our policy manifesto that we took to the last election. Our Strong Plan for Real Change is indeed a very comprehensive plan that we took to the electorate on key items in so many areas, but particularly in the area of skills, training and apprenticeships.

In the last 16 years of Labor, in particular the last four, we have seen the Labor government decimating skills, training and confidence in the VET sector, and the way the member for Port Adelaide, when she was the minister, treated that sector. It led to confusion, a loss of confidence and TAFE South Australia losing accreditation and having the embarrassment that goes with that. Essentially, under the former government, trade and apprenticeships reduced in South Australia from about 33,300 in 2013 to 15,700 in 2017—that was Labor's legacy for young South Australians looking for skill-based training and apprenticeships. That is about an 18,200 reduction in three or four years. That needs to change, and it will under a Liberal government and its policy framework, which is so important.

We need to give our tradespeople—plumbers, apprentices, draughtsmen, cabinetmakers, mechanics and the like—the right skills and the right training so that they can make a contribution to South Australia. I think it is important, in the context of this motion, that we support the language and the narrative around skills and training. I commend the minister for his work in that. Not everyone needs to go to university, and I think we need to change that narrative because university is not for everybody. It certainly has been the Labor way, since Whitlam in the 1970s, that if you did not go to university you were somehow missing out or not doing something right.

We need to really value work and we need to ensure that those who do not go to university have the skill set that they need going forward. This is one way to deal with the high youth unemployment that we have here in South Australia, which, unfortunately, has not been tackled by the former government. Once again, I know that this government will work hard to tackle youth unemployment. We recognise the need for that, and that is why we are providing \$100 million to secure matched funding from the Skilling Australians Fund.

The member for Ramsay noted in her contribution that there might be a threat to this fund if there is a change of government at the federal level. I do not know why there would be a problem. I would like to see the South Australian Liberal Party, and perhaps the member for Ramsay herself,



come out and guarantee that, should there be the unfortunate circumstance of a change of government federally one day, this funding will be guaranteed for South Australia. That would be quite a nice thing.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** One day—one day soon, sooner than later.

**Mr DULUK:** I would be really keen to see the member for Light write to the member for Grayndler, minister Albanese, to confirm that when he is leader of the Labor Party he will guarantee this funding for South Australia. We on this side are committed to working with the federal government to ensure that South Australia receives this funding, to ensure that our kids, our young South Australians, have the funding for the training they need, whether it is in the TAFE sector or with private providers.

*The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:*

**Mr DULUK:** The member for Schubert knows the importance of private providers to the skilling of the workforce in South Australia. I think it is really important that we on this side of the house note the role that TAFE SA plays—and does and should and will continue to play—and also the role that private providers play in the mix in South Australia for apprenticeships, traineeships and the like.

As I said, the Marshall government is committed to matching the federal funding, and hopefully with that right injection we can create up to 20,000 new apprenticeships over the coming years. We will maintain funding to support group training organisations because, as I said, we believe there is an important role to play. I commend the member for King for putting this debate on the *Notice Paper* today so that we can actually talk about skills, and I look forward to working with her and the government to ensure the best for South Australians.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:56):** In closing, I would like to say what a great day it is when there is so much support in the house for South Australians and for our youth to be able to be skilled and have jobs in South Australia. I am sure that the community at large will be incredibly happy to hear that this is absolutely our focus. I thank the member for Waite, minister Pisoni and the member for Ramsay for getting behind this skills and apprenticeship initiative for South Australia.

Motion carried.

*Sitting suspended from 12:57 to 13:59.*

#### *Petitions*

### **MENINGOCOCCAL B STRAIN VACCINATION**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier):** Presented a petition signed by 4,544 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to fund the B strain vaccination of meningococcal for South Australian children to prevent any further deaths from this preventable disease.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

#### *Ministerial Statement*

### **ABORIGINAL VETERANS COMMEMORATIVE SERVICE**

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:01):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As Premier with responsibility for Veterans Affairs and Aboriginal affairs, I wish to advise the house of an important Reconciliation Week event and encourage the public and all members of this parliament to attend.

This Friday, 1 June, at 10.30am Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander veterans will be honoured at the 12<sup>th</sup> annual Aboriginal Veterans Commemorative Service. The service will be held at the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial on the Torrens Parade Ground. It commemorates the distinguished military service of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders in every conflict and peacekeeping mission in which Australia has participated, from the Boer War to the ongoing engagements in Iraq and Afghanistan.

This commemorative service originated in 2007, as part of Reconciliation Week, to acknowledge the 40<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the granting of full rights of citizenship to our Aboriginal peoples. The broad acceptance given to the event has ensured that it has become a permanent fixture on South Australia's commemorative calendar. The keynote address at this year's service will be delivered by Jeremy Last, a 2017 Kokoda track reconciliation trekker. Jeremy and a number of other year 10 and 11 students took part in the Kokoda Track Reconciliation Trek organised by Reconciliation SA.

This experience provided students from different backgrounds with the opportunity to walk and talk together while learning about those who served, including 11 South Australian Aboriginal servicemen. With this week marking National Reconciliation Week, it is a time for all Australians to acknowledge the culture and history of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders. This commemorative service allows South Australians to pay tribute to the courage and tenacity of those who have served in the armed forces over the past century.

Members will recall that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial was dedicated in 2013 by the then governor-general, Quentin Bryce, and the late Ms Marjorie Tripp AO. Marjorie was an influential Aboriginal rights campaigner who passionately fought for greater recognition of Indigenous service men and women. She was the chair of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial Committee and the driving force behind its construction. It was fitting that Marjorie was made an Officer of the Order of Australia in the 2014 Queen's Birthday Honours List for her:

...distinguished service to the indigenous community through the promotion of improved aged care and health outcomes and recognition of indigenous Australians in the Armed Forces.

Marjorie passed away in May 2016, and the much-loved Ramindjeri elder and Women's Royal Australian Naval Service veteran was given full military honours at her memorial service held in the Drill Hall at the Torrens Parade Ground. Marjorie will be in the thoughts of many this Friday as we gather to pay respects to Aboriginal service men and women who served our nation in times of war but had to wait a long time for the appropriate recognition of their deeds.

Our Aboriginal War Memorial recognises South Australian-born servicemen like private Gordon Charles Naley. He took part in the landing at Anzac Cove on 25 April 1915 and later fought in the Battle of Mouquet Farm and the First Battle of Bullecourt, where he was wounded and taken prisoner by the Germans. Gordon was repatriated to England at the end of the war and married Cecilia Karsh, whom he had met during his recovery from enteric fever in 1916. They returned to Adelaide in July 1919 and had six children. Gordon passed away in 1928 at the age of 44.

To date, the Aboriginal Veterans of South Australia group has compiled a register of almost 500 Aboriginal service men and women from the Boer War to the present day. On Friday, we pay special tribute and honour the service and sacrifice of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander veterans like Gordon Naley. We will remember them.

**Honourable members:** Hear, hear!

*Question Time*

#### **POLICE, REWARDS FOR INFORMATION**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the offering of rewards assist with catching offenders and solving crimes?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:05):** I only just heard the

tail end of that question, so I am presuming it is about rewards, and he is talking about the southern suburbs, of course, and the rock-throwing incidents that have been reported to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order! Would you like to repeat the question?

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Sure. Sorry. My question is to the Minister for Police. Does the offering of rewards assist in catching offenders or solving crimes?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I thank the leader for his question, and again he is referring to the matter that I mentioned before. I would like to say that our police are doing a fantastic job in their response to the rock-throwing incidents, and that they have been working their trigger response plan and that is working very, very well. They have, in fact, apprehended a number of offenders and, as far as this program is concerned, they are increasing their police presence in the local area and they are working with interagency—

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. The minister will be seated.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** The question isn't about Operation Trigger. The question is about whether rewards assist in the capture of criminals.

**The SPEAKER:** So the point of order is for relevance. If I am not mistaken, the question was regarding whether the offering of some kind of reward helps to solve crimes. I think that the minister is entitled to articulate an answer with some relevant background information, but then, minister, could you please address the substance of the question.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Thank you, Mr Speaker—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order! Members will cease interjecting. Minister.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and you are right: there are a number of ways that police can go about solving crimes and doing this in the local area, and I am just outlining what the police are doing and what they have looked at.

I back our police. Those on the other side may not, but I back them and the operations they are doing, and that's why I point out the fantastic job they are doing and the fact that their trigger response plan is working. They have increased their police presence in the local area through, as I said, foot patrols, mounted police, bicycles and motorbikes, and they are getting good outcomes.

There are number of ways you can deal with solving crime, and this is what the police are doing, and they are doing a mighty good job, especially down in the south. Again, we value our police on this side of the house. I mention rewards being one method that can be used, but this interagency approach that police are taking I back. I back what they are doing, and I back the results they are getting. As I said, they have already made some arrests around this.

The Minister for Transport pointed out yesterday in this place what DPTI is doing, and that is part of this interagency approach: SAPOL working with the other agencies, looking at the bigger picture and getting outcomes for people of the south. As I said, the Minister for Transport outlined what DPTI is doing, and SAPOL is continuing to work with all these agencies to get good outcomes, and they are the actions they are taking and I back them in.

*The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the leader again, the Premier is called to order. Leader.

#### **POLICE, REWARDS FOR INFORMATION**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08):** Thanks, Mr Speaker. Given that the minister is in constant communication with the police commissioner—

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** Just get to your question.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** —has he discussed—

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** The Premier has continually interjected every day since the election.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my right will remain silent. Is the point of order interjections whilst—

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Disorderly behaviour, sir. The Premier is continually interjecting.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I remind members that all members are entitled to have their question—

*The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is warned.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond is called order. All members are entitled to ask their questions in silence and the answers—

**An honourable member:** Hear, hear!

**The SPEAKER:** —I haven't finished yet—and the answers are also expected to be delivered in silence. Leader, please continue.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Has the police minister had discussions with the police commissioner, offering the option of rewards regarding rock throwing in the southern suburbs?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:09):** As I said before, I have confidence in SAPOL's strategies on this issue, and I think that people on the other side of the house should have confidence in SAPOL as well.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Is there a supplementary?

#### **POLICE, REWARDS FOR INFORMATION**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** Yes. Has the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Unley is called to order.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Has the police minister offered any additional resources to the police commissioner to deal with the southern suburbs rock-throwing issue?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is called to order. The Minister for Energy is called to order. The member for Kaurna is called to order. The leader is called to order. The Minister for Energy is warned. The member the Chaffey is called to order. Minister.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:10):** Thank you,

Mr Speaker. As I pointed out in my previous answer, the police have increased their police presence in the area. They have increased their patrols. They have increased their mounted police, bicycle police, motorbike police, traffic patrols. They have increased their presence, and they are doing an outstanding job. We back the police on this side; those on that side clearly don't.

#### ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL SITE REDEVELOPMENT

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:11):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on what action the government is taking to create a new innovation hub at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site and how this will revitalise the East End?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I would like to know, too. Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11):** Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. It is with great pleasure that I rise to talk about our plans for the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. This is a very exciting precinct—in fact seven hectares right in the very centre of the city. I think it is unequivocally the most attractive space within any capital city around Australia that is ready for redevelopment at the moment, and that is exactly and precisely what we will be doing. We are looking forward to outlining in real detail our plans for that site.

One major component of that site will be the adaptive re-use of the heritage buildings on the south-west corner. We very much value the heritage properties on that site. There are four buildings across the front, on North Terrace—the Bice Building, the McEwin Building, the Allied Health Services Building and the Women's Health Centre—which will all be refurbished. We will do that as quickly as possible. We will turn those buildings and the two behind that run down Frome Road—the Eleanor Harrald and the Margaret Graham buildings—into the most exciting precinct for start-up and entrepreneurship and innovation and acceleration that exists anywhere in Australia, maybe anywhere in the world.

I was delighted the other day to learn from Mr Hanlon, who is the head of Renewal SA, that the total square metreage constitutes 23,500 square metres of new space that we can dedicate to creating jobs in South Australia. And we want to create jobs in South Australia because we want to give our young people a future here in South Australia. Too many of our young people are finishing school or university, and they have a very good qualification, but they are not finding work in the South Australian economy.

If we look at the statistics in recent years, sir, I think you will be concerned to know, and the parliament should be extraordinarily concerned to know, that the net interstate migration for 18 to 34 year olds in South Australia has been more than 12,000 out of South Australia over the last five years. This is not only a massive blow to the economy in the short term but a disaster in the longer term, so we've got to turn that around and we've got to do that as quickly as possible. That is why we will be investing significant dollars into the adaptive re-use of those buildings. We will be looking to activate that site as quickly as possible.

This is a partnership. It is a partnership between the work that Renewal SA are doing on that site, with the demolition of some of the buildings that are no longer required on that site, and then the refurbishment of those buildings plus the work of the Department for Industry and Skills, led by the minister, who is doing an outstanding job, pulling together exactly how we are going to direct and populate that site. We have decided to go with a chief entrepreneur and not have a university-led precinct or a government-led precinct but a precinct that is curated, if you like, by the private sector around new business start-up, entrepreneurship and innovation. I for one am very, very excited about this.

You might ask the question, sir—those opposite wouldn't—but you might ask the question, sir, and I would be happy to answer it in anticipation: when is this going to occur? I am delighted to answer that question, sir, thank you very much. The answer to that question is: as soon as possible. In fact, we will have people on that site by the end of this financial year in relation to the redevelopments that are occurring with the Margaret Graham Building and the Eleanor Harrald Building. Then, by the end of this year, we should have people into the Allied Health Building, which will be refurbished. I am excited, you should be excited, every single person in this parliament and,

indeed, every person in this state should be excited about the possibilities that we will be able to derive from this wonderful site.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today Ms Gay Thompson, the previous member for Reynell, who is the guest of the member for Hurtle Vale. Welcome.

*Question Time*

**HUMPHRYS, MR C.C.**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Has convicted sex predator, Colin Humphrys, commenced any prerelease program, normally provided to prisoners who receive a court-ordered release?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:15):** I thank the member for his question. I know that he asked me about this yesterday and, as you can appreciate, I can't go into any detail about the prerelease conditions. They are conversations I have in confidence with the appropriate agencies and I will keep that in confidence. What I can say is that I have every confidence in the police and Corrections to put in place the protocols that are needed, and through the offender management plan working group they put that in place and, for anyone who is released, they are accommodated.

**HUMPHRYS, MR C.C.**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** Supplementary: has Colin Humphrys participated in any accompanied or unaccompanied family leave, education, work release or community work program?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:16):** I thank the leader for his question. I am not going to go into detail on every prisoner who is in the system. That is something that will be kept in confidence.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I appreciate the question but I am not going to go into the detail of all prisoners and what programs they are in and what programs they are running.

**HUMPHRYS, MR C.C.**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** New question to the Minister for Police: is the minister aware of what measures have been put in place as a result of SAPOL's publicly announced risk assessment of Mr Humphrys?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:16):** I thank the leader for his question. As I said in the previous answer, I have had conversations and briefings with SAPOL and with Corrections and I am very comfortable with what they have in place. I have had those briefings and I have had those conversations.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The minister will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** And I stress the point I made before—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order! The minister will be heard in silence. This is your question time. The clock is ticking. Minister.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank you for your indulgence. I have had those conversations—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and they were in confidence. They are conversations I have had in confidence and I back the departments for the work they have been doing.

### COAST PROTECTION POLICY

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:17):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Will the minister update the house on the government's commitment to both invest in and protect our precious coastline?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:18):** I thank the member for Colton for his question. I know that he is a passionate advocate for the part of Adelaide's metropolitan coastline that he represents. It has been a pleasure to go down to his electorate on a number of occasions to work with him on strategies that the new government has to protect our city's precious coastline. Our state has 5,067 kilometres of coastline, much of which is under unique pressure but we know that, because of the population of metropolitan Adelaide and the fact that it is a coastal city, we have particular pressures along metropolitan Adelaide's coastline, no more so than in the member for Colton's electorate and specifically in West Beach.

The coast protection policy that the Liberal Party released in the lead-up to the 2018 state election had five key platforms. One was on replenishment, increasing the replenishment of sand deposits on Adelaide's beaches. In particular, a lot of this will be focused on West Beach. We know that that is a particular weak point in our metropolitan coastline and there is a need to dramatically increase the amount of sand on that beach. We will be investing in replenishment at a number of sites along the metropolitan coastline, but particularly at West Beach because we know the vulnerabilities of that part of our coastline.

The new government is also very keen to set up a research and development fund when it comes to coastal protection, specifically looking at opportunities to protect our beaches against storm events and against increasing erosion, and looking at ways that we can retain sand on our beaches—not just dumping sand on our beaches and reticulating it around our beaches. That's part of the process of maintaining Adelaide's beaches, but we do need to do things differently. We need to be continually innovating when it comes to coastal protection. Setting up a research and development fund will enable us to partner with universities, in particular, and look for new opportunities to do this work well.

The new government is incredibly interested in seagrass restoration. We know that not only do seagrasses provide critical habitat for marine life but they also can protect our coastline from storm events and erosion. They can also become a very useful carbon sequestration device, which I'm particularly interested in. I had the opportunity to speak to the Premier's Climate Change Council recently about the opportunities to trigger a blue carbon industry here in South Australia through re-establishing seagrasses. We can get multiple benefits from that approach, including that potential new industry.

We are very keen to develop a system of metropolitan wetlands, which look at filtering water before that water enters Gulf St Vincent. We are looking for opportunities to remove sediments, nutrients and pollutants from our watercourses prior to water entering the gulf, and that would have significant benefit to our natural marine environment.

Finally, we are very keen to look at developing artificial reefs in our marine environment. When it comes to artificial reefs, there are many options but, in particular, we are interested in looking at shellfish reefs. I know there is one in the member for Narungga's electorate, at Ardrossan, which has been developed in partnership with the federal government, the state government and the not-for-profit sector. The habitat, the jobs that can be recreated around that—both in fishing and in the construction—is something we are very keen to take a look at. I thank the member for his interest

in coastal protection in South Australia and look forward to working with him as this government drives forward this reform.

#### POLICE AIR WING

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Who is responsible for the running of the fixed-wing division of SAPOL's aircraft?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:22):** You mean apart from SAPOL who is responsible—you want the name of the person in charge? SAPOL are in charge of running that operation.

#### POLICE AIR WING

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22):** Supplementary question: given the minister yesterday ruled out outsourcing SAPOL's fixed-wing aircraft, has the minister now advised the police commissioner of his decision?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:22):** I have a number of conversations, as I have outlined in this place a million times, with the police commissioner. We talk about all elements of policing. I don't know what the Leader of the Opposition did when he was police minister. He maybe directed the police commissioner at every turn, but we have a very healthy, very happy relationship with the police commissioner, and we will continue to work in that manner.

*Mr Bignell interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson is called to order.

#### POLICE AIR WING

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:23):** Has the police commissioner acknowledged your decision to rule out outsourcing the fixed-wing division of SAPOL?

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** Same question, same answer.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:23):** It is the same question, and I'm not sure where the leader is going with this line of questioning, but—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is warned, the member for Hammond is also warned, the Minister for Transport is called to order and the member for West Torrens is warned.

**An honourable member:** Chuck him out, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** I might do that. Minister.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. As I outlined yesterday, the fixed-wing aircraft is an issue before ICAC. We know that. Whilst this is going on, the police commissioner has got a private company in to run the fixed-wing aircraft. He is very happy and satisfied with that. I will continue to have conversations with him, but that's how it is working.



**POLICE AIR WING**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** Supplementary: why has the minister ruled out the outsourcing of the police fixed-wing aircraft?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:24):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. This—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The question was very clear. The minister is on his feet and he will be heard in silence or members will be departing the chamber today.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The police commissioner has made a decision with the situation that's before him. As I mentioned, it is progressing through ICAC, and we have not made any decision that we are going to outsource, as the leader suggests. We will keep—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —delivering services as required, as requested. The police, again, are doing an outstanding job.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier and the leader are warned for a second and final time. The Premier will stop interjecting or he will be leaving the chamber. The member for Devonport.

**ELECTRICITY PRICES**

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:25):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Will the minister please update the house on how the government's energy solution will help drive new opportunities for mining in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:25):** Thank you very much to the member for Davenport, and I acknowledge his deep interest on behalf of his community with regard to electricity prices. Mr Speaker, you would know from your own electorate how important every single household finds electricity prices—

**The SPEAKER:** Indeed.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —and how they have suffered over the last several years. But it is not only the small households; it is actually the medium-sized businesses, the small businesses and the very large businesses. The member for Devonport asked me specifically about the mining industry.

In South Australia, our largest employers are also our largest electricity consumers, and many of them are also in the energy and resources business and so incredibly important. Nobody in this place would be able to forget the former Labor government's statewide electricity blackout on 28 September a couple of years ago. One of the impacts of that was that, at Nyrstar in Port Pirie, at Arrium (as it was then) in Whyalla and at BHP's production facilities up at Olympic Dam near Roxby Downs, all three of those were under extraordinary stress.

It is not only about electricity prices—and we will make electricity more affordable and more reliable and more environmentally responsible for all households and businesses—but it is also about that reliability so that the large businesses, particularly in our energy sector, have some security of supply. These are businesses that cannot just shut the doors and come back tomorrow; as big an impost as that would be on a small business, at least they might be able to do that.

In the resources sector, they don't get to do that. It can be tens of millions of dollars or more in cost to those businesses if they don't have a reliable energy source, if they have an unexpected blackout, such as the one that the former Labor government delivered to them. It is also very

important with regard to new and potential businesses. I know that those opposite have often talked about their desire for new resources projects in South Australia. Well, we are going to help deliver them. The new government is going to help deliver those projects, and we need more affordable electricity—

*Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is now on two warnings.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —for those businesses to thrive. We have all heard of Mr Sanjeev Gupta and his organisation taking over the Whyalla steelworks and his very regular and very sensible comments about needing cheaper electricity for his businesses to thrive, cheaper electricity so that the people of Whyalla and the broader district can have secure employment. He is also talking about green industry and green steel, and that is the sort of conversation, the sort of direction and the sort of aspiration that we share with Mr Sanjeev Gupta and other industry leaders: more affordable, more reliable and more environmentally responsible.

If we don't have reliable and affordable electricity, new companies won't start up new operations in South Australia. They just won't do it, and they won't be able to do it. We want that to happen. Very unfortunately, the previous government had a lot of strategies, laid out all sorts of things that they wanted to do, but they didn't actually deliver the nuts and bolts platforms that the companies actually need so that the companies can deliver on those strategies.

Mr Speaker, it didn't escape you, and it didn't escape us, and I'm sure it didn't escape nearly everybody on the other side, that when the previous government laid out all these strategies there wasn't much more behind them. They need a delivery mechanism along with that cheaper electricity, and we are going to do those things so that industry can deliver. We are going to help industry deliver. We are not going to take credit for what industry delivers the way the previous government loved to do.

*The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the next question, the Minister for Transport is called to order. The member for Elizabeth.

#### POLICE STAFFING

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:29):** A good decision, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister guarantee there will be no reduction in the number of police officers as a result of the government's 1.7 per cent efficiency dividend on SAPOL?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:30):** Yes. We have made the commitment to 4,713.

#### POLICE STAFFING

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:30):** Supplementary: given the minister's answer, has the minister discussed with the police commissioner where such cuts might take place within SAPOL?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:30):** As we roll into the budget process, I have conversations about all elements of the budget, and they will all be outlined when the budget is revealed.

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** Wait for budget estimates.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley is warned.

**PRISON STAFF DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:30):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. When will the minister implement his policy of random drug testing of prison officers and contractors in South Australian prisons?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:30):** We are working on all of our plans, and you will be the first to know.

**The SPEAKER:** Me? Thank you.

**FISHING SECTOR COMPLIANCE**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:31):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister please update the house on what work the state government is doing to enhance compliance efforts in the fishing sector?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:31):** I am very happy to respond to the question from the member for MacKillop. He has some of South Australia's great pristine coastline for both recreational and commercial fishers. The Marshall government is committed to supporting our fishing sector in South Australia. We know the commercial sector generates some \$908 million for South Australia's economy. The 277,000 recreational fishers that South Australia currently hosts in the rec sector are reliant on people doing the right thing, so the state government have played many important roles in supporting a vibrant fishing industry, both commercial and recreational.

What I can say is that our commitment to strong compliance in both the commercial and recreational fishing sectors is second to none. My agencies are doing an outstanding job, along with the compliance officers and the Fishcare volunteers, who give out regular information about compliance, allowing particularly the recreational fishers to understand what bag and boat limits are and what species are available, particularly in reference to spatial closures. Last year, fisheries officers interviewed more than 16,000 fishers and had interactions with both boat and land-based anglers.

The work resulted in 500 offenders being fined and 35 prosecutions for very serious breaches. We have had the tough cop on the job. For less serious breaches, officers have also issued a number of fishers with cautions and advice that they need to comply with. There have been some adjustments in the recreational fishing sector with the reduction in bag and boat limits and the spatial closures that were introduced late last year. I can say that fisheries officers now have a new tool to enhance and enforce compliance.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** It is something they have in their tool belt that will address poachers and the people doing the wrong thing, and that is that fisheries officers are now trialling drones to keep compliance one step in front of those people who are doing the wrong thing—the poachers and the people who are exceeding their bag limits. I think it is critical to understand that we don't just target recreational fishers: we target the commercial sector, and we target them from a land base and we target them from boats.

It is important to understand that these officers have undergone training at the Civil Aviation Safety Authority to ensure that they comply with the regulations about drone operation. I think it is also critically important that people understand that there is a privacy issue with drones, and they are trained to make sure they do not intervene on private property.

In the member for MacKillop's electorate the use of drones has also proven effective along the Coorong, particularly for the pipi industry. They have seen people being noncompliant, doing the wrong thing. These drones are another way that our great fisheries officers and volunteers will uphold compliance within the fisheries sector here in South Australia.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the next question, the member for Mawson is warned and the member for Reynell is called to order. The member for Elizabeth.

#### **PRISON STAFF DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:35):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. What types of serious incidents will result in prison staff being drug and alcohol tested under your policy?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:35):** Sorry, can I have that again?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Which types of serious incidents will trigger the testing?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I appreciate the question. We have a policy to test staff, as you point out. That policy will be rolled out in full and we will be testing staff as needed and as wanted—

**Mr Odenwalder:** But when? What type of incidents will trigger it?

**The SPEAKER:** I think the question was clear.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** It will be a random test. Sorry, I did miss the question. It will be a random test and people will be tested accordingly.

**The SPEAKER:** Is there a supplementary? The leader.

#### **PRISON STAFF DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** A supplementary: given the minister's policy is for serious incidents to prompt the testing, can the minister outline one example of such an incident?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:36):** It is the same as the Police Act. That will be outlined as we release the policy and all the details—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** As we release the legislation, I should say.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the next question, several members are on two warnings. They will cease interjections or they will be departing the chamber under 137A(1). The leader.

#### **PRISON STAFF DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36):** A supplementary question: can the minister provide one example of where his policy—

**The SPEAKER:** That is exactly the same question. Would you—

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** No, it is—

**The SPEAKER:** Well, let's hear it first.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader will be heard in silence. Let's hear the question in its full form.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Can the minister outline any example where his policy would be implemented?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:36):** It is the same question and, as I said in my answer, it is the same as the Police Act.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Is there a supplementary?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Elizabeth.

#### **PRISON STAFF DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Regarding the drug testing policy, has the minister commenced consultation with the Public Service Association, with prison officers and with the department?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:37):** Yes. They support the testing. I think you guys had the same consultation with them when you were in government.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** It was part of your bill last year.

**The SPEAKER** Order! The Minister for Transport is warned. The member for Narungga.

#### **ROAD TRAINS**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the important recent approval for the 36½-metre road trains to travel on the Yorke Highway?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:37):** I thank the member for Narungga for his question. I don't mind pointing out that we on this side of the house continue to and will always support ways to deregulate our economy to help drive efficiency in our economy. I am happy to say that this is a continuation of a policy that has been in place for some time.

The reason I think I need this opportunity—and I thank the member for Narungga for his question—is that it seems that those opposite seem to forget what happened when they were in government, so maybe we need to remind them of even the good news from time to time. The Yorke Peninsula and the Mid-North region is extremely important to South Australia: \$3.2 billion of gross regional product, \$766 million of that in agriculture.

As we see a very clear trend away from using trains towards using trucks as a way to get agricultural produce around South Australia, our roadwork needs to keep up. So I was extremely pleased to be able to announce that 36½-metre road trains will be able to travel down the Yorke Highway and essentially provide that missing link between Ardrossan and Port Wakefield to really help unlock that part of South Australia being able to have bigger trucks taking loads of grain and other exports down to our ports. This productive efficiency has delivered tens of—

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** A point of order. The minister will be seated. Let's hear the point of order.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** In the interests of the tradition of the member for Schubert, I believe this information is publicly available in the *Gazette*.

**The SPEAKER:** I would like to see that.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order while I rule on the point of order! The point of order has been about publicly available information being quoted. As the member for Schubert and I were reminded by the former Speaker, if there is additional information that the member speaks about, in addition to the available information, the answer will be allowed, but I remind the minister that he must reply to the substance of the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I would invite members opposite, if they have a copy of the speech that I don't have in front of me, then they can feel free to give that to the Speaker. It was something that I had to do on many occasions over the last four years, but interestingly I stand up here speaking off the cuff, not from a series of pre-prepared notes.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** If I am allowed to continue on—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —to talk about the great work that the new government is doing, can I say that this is one step in what we are going to see is a radical deregulation agenda here in South Australia. Those of us who listened to the Premier on many occasions over the course of the election campaign would know this phrase well. We are not here to just nibble at the edges of reform: we are here for wholesale deregulation.

Whilst I am extremely proud to be able to allow this road train access for this very important part of Yorke Peninsula, what I am even more proud about is the ongoing work and the initial work being done within the department to help change the way we deliver services and reduce the regulatory burden for South Australian businesses. I am also excited that on 1 June, when the road traffic amendment act changes come into effect, we manage to scrap a whole heap of new bureaucracy that the former government was trying to put in place, charging millions of dollars' worth of new permit fees on poor unsuspecting people trying to do roadworks and just fix up our road network.

I was extremely excited that, in the same way that we have seen people within the road transport industry excited about the increased access and deregulated nature of improving road train access to Yorke Peninsula, we are also seeing the same people get really excited about the fact that we are committed, and showing that we are committed, to stripping out regulation right across the transport sector and right across the infrastructure sector as well.

I look forward to these announcements becoming commonplace and regular. More and more, as the productive components of our economy see the whites of this government's eyes and the fact that radical deregulation is not just a phrase, a slogan that is used during a campaign—it is something that we put into practice in government—I think we will start to see the benefits of that, the millions of dollars' worth—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —of benefits delivered to our economy, resulting in new jobs, more investment and a better and more productive South Australia.

#### **PRISON STAFF DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:42):** My question is again to the Minister for Correctional Services. Minister, who will conduct the drug testing of prison officers, and what method will be used?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:42):** That will all be sorted out in time. The drugs that will be tested will be put in through the regulations.

**FESTIVAL OF RACING**

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:42):** My question is to the Minister for Racing. Will the minister commit to extending the previous government's additional \$6 million investment in the Festival of Racing?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:43):** That's a budget question, and that will be dealt with at budget time.

**FESTIVAL OF RACING**

**Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:43):** Has the minister advised the SAJC and Thoroughbred Racing SA of their intentions in relation to the additional funding?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:43):** I'm sorry, but you didn't hear the answer. The answer is: that will be discussed at budget time.

**SURF LIFE SAVING SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:43):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister outline the improved services this new government is providing to our surf lifesaving clubs?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:43):** This is an election commitment we made that is outlined in the budget, and you can read about that. That was a commitment we took to the election. Those opposite will remember March 2017, when we won the election and they lost. Now we are the government and we get to make those decisions. I would like to thank the member for Morphett for the question and note his commitment to surf lifesaving. He is a very active member of the Glenelg Surf Life Saving Club, along with his family. I thank him for his service and thank all the surf lifesaving volunteers out there.

We took an important commitment to the election to improve the safety of beachgoers and to equip surf lifesaving clubs with the resources they need to perform their very important role. I am focused on ensuring our surf lifesaving clubs have access to the best possible equipment and technology. Hearing the Minister for Agriculture talk about the drone technology, I am very pleased about our commitment to drones for surf lifesaving clubs as well. This is going to be a great asset to our surf lifesaving clubs because it will give them a modern technological resource to help them do their jobs.

We know that the rubber ducky goes out to rescue people or someone goes out on a board. In fact, if there is, heaven forbid, a shark in the area, the rubber ducky goes out and the shark is obviously below the water and they can't see where it is. The great thing these drones are going to be able to do is relay and talk to the people in the rubber ducky and tell them where it is. When the shark is under the water, they can't see it, but the people in the drone will be able to see it and talk to the rubber ducky and help shoo the shark away and keep our beaches safer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** We are very excited about this, and I have had a number of constructive conversations with Surf Life Saving SA who are excited about the use of these drones at surf clubs and who acknowledge that they will be a great asset.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Unlike those on the other side, who I don't think spoke to anyone in their time in government but just told people what to do, we are having proactive conversations, which is absolutely outstanding.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Surf Life Saving SA undertake crucial preventative action to keep our South Australian beaches safe, including helicopter patrols for the purposes, as I said, of shark spotting and patrols and rescue efforts. Again, in my local area I have a number of surf lifesaving clubs. I know that the environment minister is a member of the Brighton Surf Lifesaving Club, and I have an association with the Somerton Surf Life Saving Club—great surf lifesaving clubs in our area.

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** I was a little nipper.

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The Premier was a Semaphore nipper. It is wonderful to see what these people do. They do an absolutely outstanding job—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —in our community, as do all our volunteers across so many sectors, such as sport, the community and emergency services. Again, our surf lifesavers, I dip my cap to. They do an absolutely outstanding job.

**The Hon. T.J. Whetstone:** And they are volunteers, too.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** They are volunteers, as the agriculture minister points out, and they do an outstanding job in our community.

In 2016, Surf Life Saving SA patrolling members performed—wait for it—a total of 74,717 volunteer hours. That is absolutely outstanding, Mr Speaker, and I know that you will agree that is absolutely superb. They performed 122 rescues, 912 first-aid treatments and 16,900 preventative actions. They are doing work right across the board. These statistics include 139 shark alarms, and we mentioned the ability that drones are going to have to work with the rubber duckies to make our beaches safer and to help our surf lifesaving clubs.

They performed searches for 94 missing people and 57 lost children. That is a common problem on the beaches: people lose their kids and the surf lifesavers are always there to help out. The value the surf lifesaving community brings to the wider society is immense and their efforts need to be fully supported. On this side of the house, we are very proud to be doing that, and I think that our drone policy will keep our beaches safer and really help our surf lifesaving community. We are very proud to deliver it and it is in the budget.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens, who is on two warnings still.

### **SOUTH ROAD**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:47):** Thank you for the reminder, sir. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the minister stand by his answer to the house yesterday that he has previously publicly stated that the Regency Road to Pym Street section of South Road will take longer to complete than the 2020 timetable he initially announced?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:48):** Yes, I think that's what I said yesterday. Again, maybe I will explain now for the fourth or fifth time. I think I have been pretty clear about the fact that, yes, there was one suggestion on radio where I said it would be finished in 2020, and I think I have said three times subsequently that it is going to take longer than that as we prove up the profile of how this construction project is going to go ahead.

So, yes, it will start construction in 2019; yes, it will continue through 2020; yes, it will go longer than 2020 into 2021. But, in terms of what the final profile is going to look like, they are discussions we are currently having with the federal government. They are discussions that we are



currently having in the department and, potentially, with members opposite—and if they had done their homework on more projects we would be a bit further along in these discussions.

We are picking up the pieces to make sure that we do that work diligently and progress it as fast as possible, with an understanding that we have three major projects on the go at the moment, with Darlington, the Northern Connector and Torrens to Torrens. We want to make sure that with this Pym to Regency section, as those projects scale off and become completed, we can develop a proper productive pipeline of infrastructure so that workers in that sector can have confidence that they can move from job to job to job as we develop the remaining sections of the north-south corridor.

### TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:49):** My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister provide details on the occasions, other than yesterday and today, when he has made public remarks stating that the Regency Road to Pym Street sections of South Road will take longer than 2020 to complete? On 9 May, in an answer to a question from the Leader of the Opposition as to whether it would be completed by 2020, the minister said yes. He went on to say, 'We expect to deliver this project on time, but this is the easy project to do it on.'

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:50):** Yes, and if I can read back, maybe, the next sentence of what I would have said in that answer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —was the fact that the reason—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —that this is the easier project to be able to deliver on is because this is one of the few projects that did actually have a stage 4 business case, but the other projects in relation to the Joy Baluch Bridge and the remaining sections of the north-south corridor did not have any work done on business case. So there are many ways to deliver—

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. The minister will be seated.

*Members interjecting:*

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Relevance. Sir, the question was: on what occasions—

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Relevance, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Relevance, okay.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** On what occasions? When did you say? When?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will be seated. I will listen carefully. Minister, could you please direct your answer directly relevant to the question.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Energy will not assist the minister; he will be heard in silence. Minister, please continue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I am trying to find a way maybe to enlighten the member for West Torrens—

**The SPEAKER:** Don't do that. Answer the question, please.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —about how it is that we got here and answer the question that he asked.

**The SPEAKER:** Answer the question.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The direct answer is: I don't remember every word that I have said and the day on which I said it since 17 March. What I do know is the fact that, with regard to infrastructure projects, there are a number of ways to deliver an infrastructure project across different time frames depending on whether you bunch that work up and do it in a more concentrated fashion, and maybe the member for Lee would be able to inform the member for West Torrens what he tried to do with the tram extension project and to try to compress a construction time frame.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: relevance. The question is about when did he inform the house—

**The SPEAKER:** The minister is—

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** —at any other time that it will take longer than 2020 to complete?

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** When? When did you say it?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens will not use points of order to deliver speeches and, if he does, he will be exiting the chamber. The minister is attempting to answer the question, and I am sure he will bring it very soon back to the substance of the question. Minister.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Thank you. As members did try to do, and unsuccessfully tried to do in relation to the tram extension project, that is, to compress a construction time frame, there are ways when you develop infrastructure time frames and profiles for infrastructure funding, on which we are currently negotiating with the federal government, to essentially work out what is the best construction profile for a given project.

I said in the house five minutes ago that this will take longer than 2020 to complete. We are looking at a more elongated profile to this construction project, and when we have more updated answers in relation to how the negotiations are going with the federal government we will do so.

#### TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:52):** Supplementary: on what occasions did you inform the house that it will take longer than 2020, other than today and yesterday? When?

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:52):** Please refer to my answer from two minutes ago.

**The SPEAKER:** Okay, the minister has given the answer. The member for Finniss.

#### ECOTOURISM

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:53):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Will the minister update the house on the government's support for ecotourism and the opportunities that this presents to promote active engagement with our natural environment?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:53):** I thank the member for Finniss for his question and recognise his advocacy for a topic which is of such importance to his own electorate, with sites such as the Murray Mouth, the surf beaches at Middleton and Basham Beach, through to Granite Island and the various conservation parks that extend along the Heysen Trail.

Ecotourism tourism and nature-based tourism is a critical part of his electorate, and it is an important industry in many of the electorates represented across our parliament, but particularly in regional areas. The value of nature-based tourism and heritage-based tourism—because the two can be linked very closely—should not be underestimated.

It was a great pleasure to be able to attend this morning the South Australian Tourism Industry Council breakfast with the member for Finniss and the Hon. Mr Ridgway, the Minister for Tourism, in the other place. It was great to be able to attend that breakfast and meet with over 150 tourism operators who have an increasing focus on nature-based and heritage-based tourism opportunities.

The previous government undertook a very good body of work—and we have to give credit where credit is due—in partnership with the industry and working through my department, looking at how nature-based tourism can be maximised in South Australia. We are blessed in South Australia with phenomenal natural assets, many of those under the stewardship of the environment department and the ministry I hold. Those natural assets can be such a drawcard for local, interstate and international tourists to visit our state. To capitalise on the natural assets we have is therefore a very important part of our government's economic growth agenda. We know that we are focused very much on growing exports, and one of those exports is actually exporting the idea of coming to Australia and South Australia and the idea of what can be enjoyed here.

So there is a great body of work to be undertaken, as I said, in partnership with the private sector to identify opportunities in our natural landscape as to how those areas can be enjoyed. My department has been working since the previous government—and we have ramped that work up now—to identify places which can be activated, whether those are heritage buildings or conservation and national parks that could lend themselves to accommodation opportunities.

We know that our state requires more high-end accommodation in our regions. We know that when people spend extra nights in our regions they spend more money, and the visitor economy is maximised when people spend a night or two nights or more than that in a particular region. So high-end accommodation is important. We are going through a process of identifying sites where that can be developed in a sensitive way.

The balance between conservation and economic development has to be struck very carefully, and that is something I have been talking extensively with my department about—how we get that balance effectively coordinated. I look forward to updating the member for Finniss and members of this house on the real opportunities we have to reinvigorate our tourist economy as a result of opportunities around nature-based and heritage-based tourism and particularly it happening in the assets my department has stewardship of.

#### MEMBER FOR DUNSTAN

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Has the minister ever mentioned or discussed with anyone the offer of a motor vehicle as a gift to the member for Dunstan?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:57):** No.

#### MEMBER FOR DUNSTAN

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:57):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier ever been offered a motor vehicle as a gift?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:57):** No, sir.

#### DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

**Ms HABIB (Elder) (14:57):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. What multi-agency services are available to assist with tackling domestic and family violence?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:57):** I thank the member for her question. I know she is very passionate in this area and, as the assistant minister in this area, she has been doing some outstanding work. She is a big advocate for this in her local community as well. It has been a pleasure, in her short time in this place, to work with her in this area.

The fight against domestic violence is a cause that I would like to think we are all very passionate about in this place. As Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, it is something I am extremely passionate about. My agencies are working very hard to protect our most vulnerable and are leading the way in the fight against domestic violence. The Multi-Agency Protection Service, or MAPS as it is known, is an interagency information-sharing model to manage domestic violence and child protection matters for the whole of South Australia.

MAPS commenced operation in July 2014 and is a great piece of operation for South Australia. On Friday 25 May, I visited MAPS with the assistant minister, the member for Elder, to see firsthand the innovative response to individual cases of domestic violence and child protection matters. Inspector Peter Worth, the officer in charge of MAPS, and Assistant Commissioner Scott Duval, accompanied us on the visit and provided a comprehensive overview of the MAPS operation.

This is based on a model in operation throughout the United Kingdom, and MAPS co-locates representatives from particular government agencies, including SAPOL, the Department for Correctional Services, the Department for Education, the Department of Human Services, and the Department for Child Protection, incorporating Families SA, and SA Health. The way these people work together is absolutely outstanding.

The ability to share this information between these agencies to red flag issues and incidents that need to be followed up was just great to see. The set-up there is a lovely office, a lovely building and a great working environment, and the way that these departments work together is exceptional. I know that the MAPS people here in South Australia went to Tasmania because they have set up something similar down there. They went to see how it was working in Tasmania and perhaps pick up a couple of tricks they could bring back to make MAPS even better here.

They were a little bit surprised because they actually ended up giving more information to the people in Tasmania and telling them what they were doing and how well they were going here in South Australia. Whilst the effort to go to try to pick up some extra tips was worthwhile, the fact that they got down there and saw how well they were doing it was very reassuring, that here in South Australia we are leading the way. One of the key benefits of MAPS is that ability, as I said, to get the complete picture of our victims, working across those agencies, and having them all in that one location.

Forty to 45 high-risk cases per week are assessed by MAPS, yet high-risk cases comprise only 10 per cent of the statewide reported domestic violence cases. As we look at this, it is a great opportunity to look forward at the opportunities through a data-sharing framework and how we can maybe take this from a manual system and roll it over to the digital world. There are some great opportunities there that I really look forward to exploring further.

On this trip, we also got to the Women's Safety Services South Australia, where we met Maria and Ginny, and again the member for Elder and I were very warmly welcomed. This is the first co-located women's service in Australia, with the presence of a sworn police officer, staff from the Department for Correctional Services, social workers, counsellors and, of course, the domestic violence crisis hotline and the 1800 RESPECT call rooms.

Maria and Ginny were thrilled that the Marshall Liberal government will be providing funding to expand the Women's Safety Services crisis hotline to enable it to operate 24 hours a day, and genuinely they were elated with the fact that the Marshall Liberal government has made a commitment. I do recommend these services to everyone. They are a great part of our state, and on this side of the house we are very excited to be supporting them.

**DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE**

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:02):** Supplementary to the minister's answer: when will the trial of the domestic violence disclosure scheme commence, as promised by your government, and what role will MAPS play?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:02):** Thank you for the question. Those things are being worked through, and we actually had a round table earlier this year and discussed a lot of these principles.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I have mentioned already the fact that we are going to the 24-hour crisis line, which I think is a great achievement. The member for Elder was at the round table and the Hon. Michelle Lensink from the other place ran it. I think the Deputy Premier was there as well. The Premier may have even called through, but I was lucky enough to be there and meet with a number of those stakeholders. It was just fantastic to be in this forum, listening and engaging with these people and talking through all the great initiatives we have put on the table and hearing what they had to say as well.

Again, it is this engagement and this working with these communities and these sectors to make sure we are delivering what they want. We put our commitments out there at the election and I have outlined those, and we will be delivering those in due course.

**SMALL BUSINESS**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills. Will the minister update the house on the plans to reduce the cost of doing business for small businesses in South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister will be heard in silence.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (15:03):** Thank you, member for Kavel. I know how interested he is in businesses being successful here in South Australia. The state government's priority is to grow business, reduce costs and increase employment in South Australia. Our plan for real change will support 147,000 small businesses in our state, representing a significant 98 per cent of all businesses in South Australia. We will exempt all businesses with an annual payroll of up to \$1.5 million from payroll tax. The exemption will apply from 1 January 2019. This will benefit more than 3,500 South Australian small businesses from paying payroll tax.

Not only is it the money they will save but it is also the monthly paperwork they need to do that gets in the way of them generating income for their business. We will provide a 50 per cent reduction in the emergency services levy, returning \$90 million a year into the pockets of businesses and households from 1 July 2018 to spend in the economy. That's real money spent in the economy generating more customers for business.

The Marshall government will soon introduce rate-capping legislation—a mechanism to ensure that businesses and households are not crippled by escalating council rates and keep more of their own money to spend in the economy in the way in which they choose. These initiatives not only support the vital small business sector in this state but, importantly, put money back into the pockets of South Australian business owners and their customers, which in turn creates further investment and employment opportunities as we see confidence grow here in South Australia.

Providing more South Australians with a chance to work and earn a stable income is significant in driving down cost-of-living pressures here in South Australia. The Liberal state government is serious about easing cost-of-living pressures and reducing the cost of doing business here in South Australia so that there is more opportunity for more South Australians.

*Grievance Debate***ST GEORGE'S DAY**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:05):** Again, I am very pleased to rise in this house to talk about my local community. Of course, a very important event that occurred in my electorate just a few weeks ago that the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister for Industry and Skills were both present at was the celebration of St George's Day at Rose Street, Mile End. Thousands of people flocked to Thebarton to partake in what was a wonderful celebration of community and, most importantly, a celebration of their faith.

I was pleased that the minister would attend on his birthday and make remarks to the crowd. He was very generous with his time, as was the Leader of the Opposition. Most importantly, we were blessed that day to have present with us representatives of the Presidential Guard from the Hellenic Republic. This was the second year that those young men had visited South Australia; the first two years were funded by the state Labor government.

It was the first time that an Australian war memorial had allowed a foreign nation to stand guard over its memorials which was a very moving moment for not only the Australian Army but of course for the Greek community here in South Australia. There is a very long connection between Greek Australians and Australians, not only through migration but, importantly, through our roles in both major world wars and Korea.

During World War I, before the Gallipoli landing, Australians staged on the island of Lemnos. To this day, you can go to Lemnos and see where the Australians staged before the famous Gallipoli landing. The Greek community there keep that site with reverence. Indeed, some of the largest commonwealth war graves anywhere in the world are in the Hellenic Republic, and they are cared for quite deeply by locals and often maintained by the local communities.

Then of course there is Crete. In 1941, when the Axis powers parachuted into Crete a lot of Australian soldiers were stranded on that island. They were hidden by partisans, and of course by ordinary families on that island, who often suffered greatly at the hands of the occupiers because they were hiding allied soldiers. That connection runs very, very deep and has lasted through until today.

I was very impressed to see laying wreaths at the war memorial representatives of our armed services, our police force, the Governor and the Chief Justice. The Premier laid a wreath, as did I with my daughter. It was a very moving occasion. Importantly, in the crowd were representatives of members of the South Australian community whose family members had died or served in Crete and who came along to pay their respects to the Hellenic Guard.

The Hellenic Guard are called Evzones, an elite group of young men who serve the President of the Hellenic Republic. It is their task to guard the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. They very rarely leave the Hellenic Republic. When they do, they do so for official occasions. They have come out twice to Australia for St. George's Day, and St George is the patron saint of the Hellenic Republic. Indeed, they have also been out to celebrate Greek Independence Day, which is celebrated by many Greek Australians here in Adelaide.

Those celebrations cannot occur without the hard work and dedication of volunteers. I want to pay tribute to the Foundation for Hellenic Studies for their work, headed up by Mr Greg Crafter, Mr Harry Patsouris and all the volunteers. Indeed, I want to thank the Very Reverend Father Patsouris OAM, the parish priest of St George. He and his volunteers, ably assisted by my two staff who are on the volunteer committee, were able to feed and help run a festival that over 5,000 people attended.

That event was, I think, one of the largest events outside Glendi in terms of ethnic festivals in the Greek community, and it was a huge success. The volunteers make it special. The volunteers turn up. They put all their time and their own money into making the food, supplying drinks and alcohol, making delicacies—Greek sweets. All the money they raise does not go into the pockets of a business; it goes back into the local community to pay for the maintenance of our culture, our identity and our language.

### REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:10):** Today, I would like to speak about the future of the Repat. Many on this side of the house know that it is an issue I have been talking about for a long time. When I did a bit of a search, I found that I had mentioned the Repat about 35 times in the last two years in the house in questions and speeches. It is such an important asset to my community and the people of southern Adelaide and South Australia more broadly.

My community certainly knows that the former Labor premier Mike Rann said the Labor Party would never, ever sell the Repat. However, in the last term of government, when those opposite were in charge, they did want to sell the Repat, much to the disappointment, anger and hurt of my community. Closing the Repat was part of Labor's disastrous 2015 Transforming Health policy. They did not care about the community and they did not care about what the community wanted. They had their ideological agenda and they pursued it.

The people of South Australia were pretty outraged about it. Veterans slept on the steps and tens of thousands of signatures were received in a petition presented to this house. One of the largest petitions ever presented to the house was from South Australians who did not support the closure of the Repat. The people of South Australia, at the 17 March election, knew that if they wanted the Repat to stay open they had to vote for a change of government, and vote for a change of government they did. In my community, they knew that if they wanted to keep the Repat open, they had to vote for a new member for Waite who cared about the Repat, and they did that as well.

Last year, the Labor government went right up to the election negotiating with ACH Group to have the Repat site sold for about \$20 million and turned into a mixed-use site. They pretty much explicitly ruled out providing SA Health services on the site. Just imagine: three years ago we had a hospital, with about 110 patients and 675 staff and 200 volunteers providing fantastic services to the people in the southern community, and then two years later being told by the then Labor government, 'Well, we don't need your services anymore. There is no role for you in southern health.' That was the attitude of the Labor Party, and it was absolutely disgraceful.

However, as I said, we have a commitment to renew the Repat. The new Marshall Liberal government has a commitment to ensuring that SA Health services are still provided on that Daw Park site to ensure that the people of my community, the member for Elder's community and the member for Davenport's community have the services they so need. On Thursday 17 May, the member for Elder, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing (Hon Stephen Wade in the other place) and the member for Boothby (Nicole Flynn MP) and I coordinated a community forum at the Colonel Light Gardens RSL.

Almost 200 people of all ages rolled up to this community forum, and there were representatives from the City of Mitcham as well, and they wanted to hear about our positive plan to renew the Repat. They wanted to know when we were reopening the hydrotherapy pool, such an important service for our community. The hydrotherapy pool reopened this week. In fact, this morning I got an email from a constituent in Glenalta that said, 'Thank you for reopening the hydrotherapy pool. My wife can now use the services again,' which is fantastic.

We want to see Ward 18 used as an older persons mental health facility to provide extra accommodation, and we want to establish a new older persons mental health facility at the Repat site. We want the community to come along with us in an engagement process to let us know what other services they would like at the Daw Park site. I really do thank my community, people like Professor Warren Jones and the Save the Repat group, for working with this new government proactively in ensuring that we have the best mix of services at the Repat site going forward.

We understand the importance of having health assets that are used by the community. We want that core to remain, and we want the community to be involved. Over the coming weeks and months, there will be an opportunity for community consultation on this site because, together, we know that we can renew the Repat. Together, we know that by renewing the Repat we will be delivering on our electoral commitments. Together, we know that the Liberal Party will always be committed to the future of the Repat and the Daw Park site.

### MINING INVESTMENT

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:15):** I rise today to talk about the Hydrogen Roadmap that was developed by the previous government. I will go into detail on that and call upon the current government to commit to the Hydrogen Roadmap as it has been an incredibly good initiative, especially for regional South Australia. Before touching on that, once again the Minister for Energy and Mining has reflected upon the previous government and the impact he says it had on investment decisions in this state.

He mentioned this in the context of the blackout that occurred and a number of our big companies: Nyrstar, Arrium—as it was at the time; in fact, it was in administration at the time—and, of course, Olympic Dam. Very shortly after the blackout, I was at the Arrium site up in Whyalla. Indeed, I was there with the then treasurer because of the crisis they were facing. What bothers me is this constant rewriting of history, referring to the blackout as 'the Labor blackout' when, in fact, it was the result of a very particular set of weather conditions that knocked out major transmission assets in this state. It was pretty disgraceful—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr HUGHES:** —on the part of the Liberals, especially the federal Liberals, without the benefit of any analysis, to just come out and attack South Australia the way they did. We did not see any of those at Arrium, we did not see any of those up at Olympic Dam—

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Hammond!

**Mr HUGHES:** —and we did not see any of those down at Nyrstar. It is interesting to reflect on the comments made today by the Minister for Energy and Mining that suddenly everything is going to be okay now. He seems to forget that a lot of major investment going on in this state predated, and predated by a long way, the new government. I take a very keen interest in the investment in my area. In the context of a state Labor government, we saw major investment on the part of OZ Minerals in Carrapateena, with a more than \$900 million commitment to that particular development.

It was a development that, I will say once again, required a little bit of state Labor initiative in terms of support for exploration to discover that resource in partnership with Rudy Gomez through the PACE program. Olympic Dam, a \$650 million investment, was also committed to during the term of the last government and set the groundwork, we hope, for what might well be a \$2.3 billion investment. Of course, during the course of the previous Labor government, we had a number of companies going through the bidding process to acquire Arrium.

We know that Sanjeev Gupta and his company won that particular bid, and he has flagged the potential for major investment in this state. All this happened under the previous government. I said, on the previous occasion I got up to hammer this theme, that it would actually be beneficial to us as a state if we could acknowledge and give credit where credit is due. That is largely with the private sector, but also with the framework and some of the initiatives that were pursued by the previous Labor government.

I am sure that this new government will do some things that are good, and I have said that previously. When they do, we should give credit because I think the public is sick of the argy-bargy, the pointscore and the rest of it. We are all going to do some good. I happen to believe that on this side we will end up doing more good over the long run than those on the other side. That is a difference in opinion, and it is a difference in the sorts of principles we pursue and those opposite pursue, but clearly there is a significant overlap.

I did not get to the Hydrogen Roadmap, but I did think it was important to correct the record to a degree, given the comments from the Minister for Energy and Mining. Come my next grievance, I will speak lyrically about the fantastic Hydrogen Roadmap, and I hope that this state government commits to that particular road map.



### KING ELECTORATE

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:20):** I would love to take this opportunity to acknowledge some of the fantastic community groups in King. First, I am going to touch on the One Tree Hill Progress Association, the One Tree Hill Institute, *The Grapevine*, and Fred Riley.

Thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity to speak about the great community work the One Tree Hill Progress Association does in our community. The One Tree Hill Progress Association meets regularly at the One Tree Hill Institute, which is located on Black Top Road in One Tree Hill. According to the progress association, the institute they meet in was built in 1906 and fully completed in February 1907. It is a beautiful old building.

Although the institute is owned by the City of Playford, it is managed by the progress association. The progress association regularly hires out the institute for special occasions, which include weddings, engagements, birthdays, children's parties, reunions and group meetings. On the first Saturday of each month, the famous One Tree Hill markets are held at the institute and they are very popular with the locals. Indeed, I have had stalls at this market and made new friends there.

According to the progress association, One Tree Hill has a population of approximately 1,200 people. The town was named after a single large gum tree—which was burnt down in 1890—that was situated three kilometres from the centre of town near the original One Tree Hill inn. The institute can hold functions for 200 seated guests and more if people are standing.

The progress association not only runs the institute but also produces a monthly newsletter, called *The Grapevine*, which is distributed to all locals. About 900 copies are printed off and it is now also accessed widely by soft copy. It also has a Facebook page where people can have a look at it. Current and all previous editions of *The Grapevine*, which has been going for many years now, can be found on the One Tree Hill Progress Association website at [www.onetreehill.com.au](http://www.onetreehill.com.au). It is a fantastic way to be able to access history, at a very much grassroots level, for many years.

*The Grapevine* community newsletter provides an excellent variety of local content, which includes details of coming activities and events, fire safety alerts, local crime updates, council information and activities, reports from the president and the rate payers' subcommittee group, real estate available and profiles of lots of local businesses.

On Saturday 5 May, I attended the One Tree Hill markets. It was a vibrant event and it just highlighted to me how all the locals get behind and support each other. On Tuesday 22 May, I attended a senior citizens club indoor bowls and afternoon tea event at the institute. The group was very welcoming and friendly and I enjoyed playing a game of bowls. I was told at my last visit that most of the members there are in their 90s. That is quite remarkable, and they have some amazing stories to tell. The youngest person there was 75.

I would like to highlight one example of someone who exemplifies excellent community spirit and whom I have had the pleasure of meeting through both the One Tree Hill Senior Citizens Club and the last two dawn services that I have attended in One Tree Hill. This person is 99-year-old Fred Riley. Fred was one of the first to welcome me to the group with open arms. I was so amazed to hear Fred's story of serving the country during World War II.

Fred did National Service training in the Army, then applied for and was successful in getting a transfer to the Air Force. During World War II, Fred was a Spitfire pilot. He moved to South Australia in 1947 after marrying Dot and moved to One Tree Hill in the 1970s. Not only was Fred a Spitfire pilot but he spent many years on the farm. He has a love for horses, studied accountancy at night school and has two daughters.

Fred has been actively involved in the local One Tree Hill Senior Citizens Club for many years. He is famous in the club for his cooking, especially for baking for each meeting his famous recipe for delicious Anzac biscuits, which I got to try. Fred also provides his biscuits for the One Tree Hill ANZAC Day service. That is just a little bit of insight into one of the very special institutes, groups and people at One Tree Hill.

### NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:26):** I rise to speak about volunteers. More specifically, many members in this place will know that last week was National Volunteer Week, which is a very special occasion when we all get a chance to acknowledge the work that volunteers do in our areas. I think as members of this place we are privileged in the sense that we get to see in great detail and up close just how important volunteers are to a range of community groups in our areas. There are a few in particular in the seat of Wright and the surrounds I would like to mention today.

National Volunteer Week kicked off for me with a morning tea for volunteers at The Heights School. I should acknowledge that we have the member for Florey in the chamber at the moment, who has long been a very strong supporter of The Heights School in many regards, including the observatory and Pedal Prix, I think, as well.

**Ms Bedford:** And my children went there.

**Mr BOYER:** Her children went there as well, she reminds me. I am certainly reminded every time I go to The Heights of how popular the member for Florey is there, and I am doing my best to offer the same kind of support and advocacy that the member for Florey gave them over all those years.

There are a few special things that The Heights School does that are actually quite different from things that are done in other schools around South Australia. One that came into very close focus for us last week was a *Stargazing Live* event that was held at The Heights School, which has an observatory on site, in conjunction with the Astronomical Society of South Australia, the Australian National University and the ABC.

I was fortunate enough to go along with my eldest daughter, Evelyn, who is four years of age. She was very excited. The staff there took us into the observatory, and it was pretty magical to watch the look on my daughter's face when the roof automatically moved back and the big telescope was there. She had a chance to look at the moon through the telescope. It really brought home to me how important something like this is at our educational institutions and our high schools. It provides kids who go to our public high schools opportunities that they would not ordinarily have.

The stargazing event, for those who did not see it in the media, was a huge success. It was organised in an attempt to break a Guinness World Record for the most people continually watching the moon through a telescope for a period of 10 minutes. The previous record, I am informed, was 7,960 people at the same time watching the moon through a telescope. The exact number this time has not been confirmed yet, but it has been confirmed that it is a new world record because there were over 40,000 people this time, around Australia, all watching the moon through a telescope at the same time. I thought it was fantastic.

There was a range of people with different skill sets and experience levels in terms of astronomy. There were some very large telescopes with people who are professionals in this matter right down to some very small, cheap telescopes that people had brought along to give their children an opportunity to use one for the first time. Earlier, I briefly mentioned Pedal Prix. The Heights School competes in the Pedal Prix super series as well—

**Mr Pederick:** Hear, hear!

**Mr BOYER:** Exactly right—and I know from my own personal experience because my brother competed in the Murray Bridge race many years ago when he was in high school and we travelled across with my parents from Portland to participate. It was a fantastic thing, but like all great things that happen at our schools the extracurricular activities require volunteers to make them happen, just like the observatory does. It is the same with Pedal Prix. It involves parents and supporters putting in a lot of hours of their own time, outside work hours and on weekends, to take kids along and to do all the work that it takes to get these amazing vehicles up to scratch to compete in events such as the one that occurs at Murray Bridge.

There were also a couple of Biggest Morning Teas that were held last week that I was fortunate enough to go to, to raise money for the Cancer Council. I would like to mention one that I was particularly impressed with, and that was at the Surrey Downs Primary School. An amazing spread of food was put on, and there was a huge turnout of teachers, staff, governing council

members and parents and they raised an enormous amount of money. It also gave us all an opportunity to go along and see how the construction on the STEM laboratory is going, which the previous government funded, which will be fantastic for the school. It should be open later this year, along with a couple of projects out of Fund My Neighbourhood that the school was also successful in getting, which is recycled water for their oval and a new nature play space as well.

### MODBURY HOSPITAL

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:31):** There is always a great deal of talk about Modbury Hospital in my community. So very much of it is about the help the wonderful medical staff give us under what are often very difficult circumstances, the amazing help at the rehab centre or care in the palliative area and the volunteers who make the hospital so much of a community asset. In the parliament too, Modbury Hospital is often spoken about, again to highlight and thank the medical staff and volunteers for their amazing work and also about whatever current issue is befalling the health services of our hospital, and the state and the department that oversee it.

Modbury Hospital has been a focus of my community for over 40 years, for as long as I have lived there. People moved to the new and growing Modbury area because of the services located within what would go on to be the second largest suburban centre after Marion. Over the years, there have been many ups and downs at Modbury Hospital, due mostly, one would have to deduce, to the changes in government and/or departmental policy. Without going too far back, the outsourcing of management to Healthscope is about where I became truly active, and it would be fair to say that I have remained active ever since, albeit sometimes in the background.

This failed experiment did major damage to the fabric of Modbury Hospital and the staff who had made it such a well-loved and essential asset. As with many things, we do not always have anything or a lot to do with hospitals, but when we need them it is good to know that they are there and that they work—preferably well. Just as the Healthscope period was an attempt to exert some control over the state's health expenditure, so too was the Generational Health Review and, most recently, Transforming Health. I understand why the measures were put into place, but it is time to address the problems that have resulted from that initiative.

At the election in March this year, policies were put before the electorate, and it became overwhelmingly obvious that the community was demanding the return of the sort of level of care that had encouraged their move to the area. As we eagerly await the implementation of the new government's promises or policies—and there is much for them to do—there appear to be some impediments and a concerted effort to thwart any real change to the service configuration at Modbury Hospital, apart from the large chunk of brickwork that fell from the building towards the end of last year, which has seen changes, albeit only scaffolding, around the perimeter of the main building as we wait to see the engineer's report and the beginning of the work budgeted in both major parties' undertakings before the election.

We also saw bipartisan agreement about palliative care and an extended emergency care unit at the hospital. After that, though, there are differences, the most glaring being the restoration of a higher level of care area so that Modbury Hospital can deal with a greater number of cases, taking the pressure off the existing emergency department, the residents who use the service and, most importantly, the Lyell McEwin Health Service, where we know, despite enormous and welcome expenditure, the staff, again while doing their best, struggle now to cope with demand as we approach the even busier winter period.

Much has been made of a letter from medical staff, with 42 signatures, with reasons why higher care cannot be restored—safety being a major point. However, whilst selectively quoting from a 2011 report and not accepting that no service is safe unless properly resourced, the actual quote is 'resourced properly'. Those 42 signatories may now not feel that they want to deny Modbury Hospital to ensure other areas are funded beforehand. I have spoken with health minister Wade many times since the election and was happy to welcome him and the Premier to Modbury Hospital on Tuesday 24 April. Following the Premier's tour, minister Wade and the members for King and Newland and I met with a large range of medicos and admin staff.

It became apparent to me that some facts were disputed, like the actual definition of 'ramping'. At other hospitals it is all too apparent as patients do not leave the ambulance, while at

Modbury Hospital patients are placed on a barouche in the hall leading to the triage area. I have seen it and I have heard about it firsthand from people who work there and who have been there.

So, the devil is in the detail. Since that meeting, some 200 doctors, specialists, nurses and other medical staff have signed a petition, which unfortunately has fallen foul of the formal rules, so much so that it cannot be tabled in either house. Nevertheless, these opinions cannot be overlooked. These are people who are on the ground day in and day out tending to those in need. They say on the petition:

We urge you [that is the minister] to follow on from your election promises and reinstate the HDU at Modbury Hospital as a critical step in making the hospital a safer clinical base for patients.

They go on to say:

Extending patient services, including acute services, without a level 1 ICU or equivalent would increase the risk of the admitted patients. The present just over one in 10 patient transfer rate from the Modbury emergency department with many delays and subsequent delays to treatment, especially for the most critically ill, should already be unacceptable.

They are not being listened to and staff is beginning to turn over at the hospital, which is robbing it of much-needed corporate knowledge and history at Modbury. This is due in part to the uncertainty initially of the hospital's future under Transforming Health; and remember, prior to that, we had already lost the orthopaedic and paediatric wards, as well as the maternity area; so, we have given up a great deal at Modbury. Now, we wait for changes that are proving hard to implement.

Time expired.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:36):** I move without notice:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended to enable me to move a motion for the adoption of a sessional order in relation to answers to questions on notice.

**The SPEAKER:** There not being an absolute majority of the whole number of members of the house present, ring the bells.

*An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:*

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** Does the honourable member wish to speak in support of the proposed suspension motion?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:38):** I do, indeed. I move pursuant to order:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended to enable the adoption of a sessional order so as to provide that once a notice of a question has been given and placed on the *Notice Paper* pursuant to standing order 102, an answer to the question shall be delivered to the Clerk pursuant to standing order 103 not more than 30 days after the date on which it had first been printed on the *Notice Paper*.

I am delighted to both promote and support this initiative on behalf of the Marshall Liberal government to confirm our commitment to be a good and responsible government, including our accountability to this parliament.

Motion carried.

#### *Bills*

### **ELECTORAL (PRISONER VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:40):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:40):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Electoral (Prisoner Voting) Amendment Bill. As members know, the Marshall government has committed to introducing legislation to disqualify people who have committed serious offences from voting at South Australian state elections. This is a commitment that was taken to the 2018 election and affirms the position that people who commit a serious criminal offence should forfeit their democratic right to participate in state elections.

The Marshall Liberal government does not back away from the promise it had made prior to the election. Simply put, our view is that which is shared by most South Australians, namely, that it is an affront that people who commit serious criminal offences are entitled to elect the parliament that makes the law they have broken. Passing this bill will mean that a person who is in custody at the close of rolls and serving a sentence of imprisonment of three years or more will be ineligible to vote at a South Australian state election. This is an overdue change and one that will be broadly welcomed.

Currently, all prisoners in South Australia can vote in South Australian state elections; however, the position is not the same in other jurisdictions. The bill will bring South Australia broadly into line with the commonwealth position. It will mean that prisoners who are ineligible to vote in a commonwealth election will also be ineligible to vote in a South Australian election. Practically, the bill will apply to prisoners within the meaning of the Correctional Services Act 1982 who are serving a sentence of three years or more.

A difference between this bill and the commonwealth laws is in relation to prisoners serving a sentence of imprisonment of three years or more on home detention, who will be ineligible to vote at a state election. People sentenced to home detention must realise this is a serious sentence from the court and will impact on their right to vote just as any other type of custodial sentence would. The bill will also apply to a person who is serving their sentence of imprisonment on home detention. The rationale for this is that home detention is, for the purposes of the Sentencing Act, treated as a form of custody.

The bill will also apply to a young person who is serving a sentence of three years or more in a training centre. The circumstances where this could occur are where a young person is sentenced as an adult, having regard to the serious nature of their offending, and serves that sentence (or part of it) in a training centre. Importantly, the bill will not apply to people who are detained under the mental impairment provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935.

Regardless of whether a person has committed multiple offences, the disqualification will apply to them if the total period of time for which they have been sentenced to imprisonment exceeds three years and they are in custody at the close of rolls. It does not matter whether they are serving sentences cumulatively or concurrently.

This bill does not affect a person's enrolment status or their ability to enrol. Enrolment is provided for in part 5 of the Electoral Act 1985 (Electoral Act). It is unaffected by these amendments, which relate specifically to the entitlement to vote that is provided in part 9, division 1, of the Electoral Act. A prisoner who is enrolled but ineligible to vote will remain on the roll and will be able to vote again once they are released. I want that to be absolutely clear.

I was asked about this recently on radio, and I think the assumption of the interviewer was that this proposed law would have effect for life for anyone who had committed an offence and received a sentence of more than three years. That is not the case. Upon release, they will resume their freedoms and entitlements of other citizens. In other words, once a person has finished a custodial sentence their rights are restored, including their right to vote. That is how it should be.

The bill makes a number of technical amendments to the Electoral Act to support the new position on prisoner voting. It makes amendments to section 68 of the Electoral Act, which provides for the preparation of the certified list of electors for an election. While the name of a prisoner who is ineligible to vote will remain on the electoral roll, the amendments provide that the name of a prisoner

who is ineligible to vote at an election will not appear on the certified list of electors that is prepared for that election.

The bill also inserts new section 27B into the Electoral Act, which is entitled Provision of information to Commonwealth Electoral Commissioner. New section 27B enables the Electoral Commissioner to provide information about prisoners serving a sentence of three years or more to the Australian Electoral Commissioner, who is responsible for updating the electoral rolls and roll extracts that are used in state elections. In terms of implementing the bill, the Electoral Commissioner will work with the Department for Correctional Services and the Australian Electoral Commissioner to ensure that the bill is able to be implemented at the next election.

Finally, the Marshall government approach to this and all justice issues is a principled one. It is the right thing to do and should have been done years ago. South Australia is currently the only state that has not imposed restrictions upon prisoners voting, and it is appropriate that we fall into line with the other jurisdictions—indeed, catch up. I commend the bill to the members and table an explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Mullighan.

**Mr MULLIGHAN:** Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

*Address in Reply*

#### **ADDRESS IN REPLY**

**The SPEAKER:** I inform the house that His Excellency the Governor will receive the house for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 4pm today. I ask the mover and the seconder of the address, and other members, to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the address.

*Sitting suspended from 15:49 to 16:26.*

**The SPEAKER:** I inform the house that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech, and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to His Excellency the address adopted by the house on 15 May 2018, to which His Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

Thank you for the Address-in-Reply to the Speech with which I opened the First Session of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray that your deliberations will add meaning and value to the lives of our South Australian community.

His Excellency The Honourable Hieu Van Le AC

*Bills*

#### **FAIR TRADING (TICKET SCALPING) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:27):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fair Trading Act 1987. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:28):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am very pleased to introduce the Fair Trading (Ticket Scalping) Amendment Bill 2018. We committed to taking a number of strong measures to increase consumer protection in relation to ticket scalping in South Australia. It was an election commitment and, once again, the Marshall government is delivering what it promised. Further, we committed to introducing this legislation within the first 100 days, and this is what we are doing. Along with amendments made to the same act to allow for extended gift card expiry dates, this important reform, for once, puts consumers first.

The bill repeals section 9 of the Major Events Act 2013 and makes amendments to the Fair Trading Act 1987 to increase consumer protection in relation to ticket scalping in South Australia. The Fair Trading Act 1987 is administered by Consumer and Business Services and is the appropriate legislation to amend to address the current limitations associated with existing ticket-scalping provisions.

The former government put their head in the sand with ticket scalping, with the former minister for tourism in this place stating that the 'hype' of ticket scalping does not actually 'live up to the reality' and that just because tickets were offered online at high prices it did not mean they actually needed to be bought. Such rhetoric diminishes the rights of South Australians to purchase a ticket at its true price and prevent scamming.

While I am on this topic, let us also take a moment to reflect upon the Major Events Act, which was brought into effect in 2014, which actually failed to declare any events as major, completely denying the public any protection from ticket scalpers. It was even revealed in 2017 that not one person has been prosecuted for selling tickets at inflated prices under the dodgy law since its assent. This was an absolute failure of the former government and the then minister for tourism in refusing to declare huge public events as major to be captured and protected under the act.

Ticket scalping is a serious breach of consumers' rights and should be treated as such. That is why this government is taking the power out of the Major Events Act and ensuring that it is in a place where the authorities can be properly notified and breaches appropriately dealt with. To get to the crux of the bill I lay before you today, ticket scalping is the term given to the unauthorised reselling of tickets to an event at a price higher than the ticket's original face value, sold with the intention of making a profit. In addition to ticket-scalping activities that take place at the location and on the day of the event, ticket scalping also occurs via a number of websites such as eBay, Gumtree and Trading Post.

In 2017, we saw the sale of tickets to popular songstress, Adele, selling at nearly 700 times their true value. This government acknowledges that there is a need for a secondary market to allow the legitimate resale of tickets to events—for example, in circumstances where someone may no longer be able to attend an event. However, the existence of a secondary market has both a positive and negative impact for consumers. While it provides consumers with access to tickets, it also exposes them to the risks associated with the unauthorised resale of tickets, including ticket scalping.

Currently, the Major Events Act 2013 requires the government to declare major events in order for the existing ticket-scalping provisions to apply. As I have already detailed, this really does not work if the minister refuses to declare an event major. Section 9 of the Major Events Act prohibits the sale or offering for sale of tickets in a controlled area for a major event, and in any other case prohibits the sale or offering for sale of tickets to a major event at a price that exceeds the original price by more than 10 per cent.

There are, however, clear limitations with respect to existing ticket-scalping provisions, including an inability for the current provisions to be effectively enforced. Further, existing provisions made under the Major Events Act do not address technological advances that enable the use of ticket bots—something I had never heard of before this legislation, I have to confess, but I am sure others are very familiar with them.

Apparently, it relates to the software applications that can perform simple actions such as purchasing a ticket at fractions of the time frame possible by an actual person. Such bots are used to purchase large amounts of tickets in a short period of time, which are later resold at a much higher price for profit. As a result, the availability of tickets to members of the general public at the original face value is significantly reduced, and in order to attend popular events, people are often forced to purchase tickets at a significantly higher price via the secondary market.

Legislative amendments are therefore required to address these risks and limitations and to increase overall consumer protection with respect to ticket scalping in South Australia. This was the commitment this government made throughout the election and one which we are firming to ensure consumers are protected. The bill actually repeals section 9 of the Major Events Act and amends the Fair Trading Act to deal with this complex issue in the best way possible. The bill will broaden the scope of the legislation so that ticket-scalping provisions apply to any sporting or entertainment event

in South Australia that is subject to a resale restriction, removing the requirement to declare a major event. This will already include major concerts, such as Adele and Ed Sheeran, AFL grand finals and sporting events.

The bill will prohibit the advertising—hosting of an advertisement—for the resale of tickets or the actual resale to an event in South Australia to which the provisions apply for an amount that exceeds 110 per cent of the original supply cost of the ticket. This policy aligns with other jurisdictions interstate. There will be a requirement that any resale advertisement must include certain information, including the original supply cost of the ticket and the details of the location from which the ticket holder is authorised to view the event, including, for example, any bay number, row number or seat number of the ticket.

Importantly, to deal directly with bots on the internet, this bill will prohibit the use of software that enables or assists a person to circumvent the security measures of a website in order to purchase tickets for an event in contravention of the terms and conditions. Finally, the bill will enable the minister to require an event organiser to publicly disclose certain information about a particular event, including the total number of tickets available for sale to the general public. This reform is modelled on similar reforms that commenced in New South Wales from 31 March 2018.

These reforms not only increase transparency within the primary market but also enhance consumer protections with respect to the resale of tickets by the secondary market. Consumers will be better able to assess the availability of tickets and will have greater information available to them to make an informed decision on purchasing tickets. Consumer and Business Services, which sits under the Attorney-General's portfolio, administers the Fair Trading Act and has the necessary systems, processes and structures to carry out a compliance and enforcement function in relation to ticket scalping.

Quite simply, this bill puts consumers first. Authorised officers are already defined under the Fair Trading Act and, subject to the passing of the bill through this parliament, CBS authorised officers will monitor compliance with the new provisions and undertake appropriate enforcement activities. CBS will also provide advice to consumers who have questions or complaints in relation to ticket scalping. Expiable offences have also been introduced to enable quick and effective enforcement in appropriate cases, and this will also act as an effective deterrent to others.

This bill reflects the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to easing the burdens on consumers and protecting them where protections are required. The bill also delivers an election promise, and it delivers it within 100 days. It is a bill I am proud to introduce, and I look forward to its support. I want to commend the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing for his valued advice in relation to the development of this policy. I am sure that he will have an opportunity to contribute to the debate for the passage of this bill. Again, I place on record our appreciation of his work in this regard. I commend the bill to the members of the house, and I table a copy of the explanation of clauses.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Koutsantonis.

*Matter of Privilege*

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (16:37):** I rise on a matter of privilege. On 9 May, the Leader of the Opposition asked this question of the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government: 'Does the minister stand by his commitment to deliver the Regency to Pym project by 2020?' The minister answered the question with one word, 'Yes.' He then went on to detail his answer and ended it with:

We expect to deliver this project on time, but this is the easy project to do it on. The other projects are a lot more difficult because—

Then there is a picture of me interjecting and the Speaker calling for order. The minister went on to say 'once again, we need to do our homework, and we fully accept that'. Then, on 29 May of this year in the house, there is a response to a question from me. That question was:

My question is for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Given the federal Department of Infrastructure, Regional Development and Cities confirmed in Senate estimates that just \$10 million would be allocated



for the Pym to Regency projects in 2019-20 and \$20 million in 2021, does the minister stand by his promise that the project will be completed by 2020?

In that answer, he says:

To clarify, like I had to clarify the last time I had a question of this nature asked, the commitment that I gave and the question that was asked of me was, 'When will this project commence?' and commence construction, because what I would say is that the project has actually commenced, and that consultation in relation to the compulsory acquisitions for those adjoining landowners around the Regency to Pym projects has already begun.

However—

he goes on to say—

the question I was asked—

that is, the minister—

was, 'When is this project going to kick off, in terms of construction phase?' At this stage, late 2019 is when the construction is slated to begin. Construction work will also continue into 2020. In terms of the final completion of this project, that is something that potentially could be longer than 2020, which is consistent with what I have been saying all along; and, in fact, it is an answer I gave two weeks ago if the member for West Torrens would like.

I think he meant to go on to say 'to check'.

The statements to the house are inconsistent and only one can be accurate. I have searched *Hansard* to see if the minister indeed had been consistent on the time line for the completion of the Regency to Pym sections of South Road, as he claimed in his answer of 29 May, to substantiate his claim to the house that:

...the final completion of this project, that is something that potentially could be longer than 2020, which is consistent with what I have been saying all along; and, in fact, is an answer I gave two weeks ago if the member for West Torrens would like.

And then he stops speaking.

I believe the minister has deliberately and intentionally misled the House of Assembly and that a prima facie case exists for the establishment of a Privileges Committee. I ask that you give consideration to my matter of privilege and rule if a motion to establish a Privileges Committee should be given precedence over other business in the House of Assembly.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, I have listened to your matter of privilege and it is something I will ask the Speaker to adjudicate on. I ask the member to bring any other evidence he might have and we will present that to the Speaker and I will ask him to come back to the house with his findings.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Clarification, Mr Deputy Speaker: I am assuming that the material that has been read from are the documents that have just been handed to you, and on that basis I do not have any further request.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Sorry, I missed the last bit of your contribution there.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** If the documents that have just been handed to you by the member for West Torrens were all the documents that have been referred to in the quotes identified by the member in his request for precedence to be established on a privileges matter, then I do not ask that any further documents be provided. If that is the case, I will not take the matter any further: if it is not, then any other material could be presented.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** That is essentially what I asked of the member.

**Mr KOUTSANTONIS:** All the material I provided, sir, is from *Hansard*.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Okay, thank you—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Yes, I am sorry. Can I clarify then, because I understood what you said, Mr Deputy Speaker, that if there are any other documents upon which he wishes to rely could he present them—I paraphrase what you said there. That is different from presenting to you the documents from which he has quoted. so we do not require the member for West Torrens to immediately present any other material. He is entitled to do that anyway, and we do not take objection

to that. We simply want to know that what he has quoted from he has provided, and that appears to be the case.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** It appears to be the case. Thank you, minister.

*Bills*

**CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:43):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Procedure Act 1921. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:44):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This bill seeks to remedy a number of unintended consequences of major indictable reforms introduced by the former government in the Summary Procedure (Indictable Offences) Amendment Act 2017. The act became operative on 5 March 2018. I say 'unintended' on the basis that we are advised that the matters that have come to light would not have been known to the previous government, so we are not in any way reflecting on their progressing of the original bill in respect of these deficiencies.

Some issues have been highlighted by the judiciary and Director of Public Prosecutions in recent weeks, who have raised concerns with some aspects of the act and its ability to achieve its stated objectives. I have listened to the concerns, and the introduction of the bill is the government's response to them. The changes in the bill will:

- reinstate the unintended repeal of a provision relating to the procedure for pleading guilty in writing introduced by the Summary Procedure (Service) Amendment Act 2017;
- rectify the unintentional exposure parties have been facing to costs orders in an historically no-costs jurisdiction; and
- remove the unintended re-instatement of the effect of repealed provisions relating to the discreditable conduct notices via the new case statement provisions.

A further amendment addresses a practical difficulty with the requirement to have a defendant sign a case statement in the presence of their legal representative. This is a practical measure and has been supported by the profession. The bill addresses and remedies each of the above issues. I now turn to detail the aspects of this bill and their origins.

The Summary Procedure (Service) Amendment Act commenced on 4 March 2018. It included an amendment that repeals and substitutes a new section 62B dealing with the powers of magistrates to take certain action on a written plea of guilty. The Summary Procedure (Indictable Offences) Amendment Act commenced the following day. It included amendments that were intended for section 62B(5) that predated the introduction of the Summary Procedure (Service) Amendment Act.

The provisions appeared in both acts due to there being two separate bills purporting to amend the Summary Procedure Act 1921 progressing through the parliament at the same time, but with uncertainty as to the commencement dates of each. As the Summary Procedure (Indictable Offences) Amendment Act commenced after the Summary Procedure (Service) Amendment Act, the correct section 62B(5) contained in the Summary Procedure (Service) Amendment Act was inadvertently further amended the day after it commenced by the commencement of the Summary Procedure (Indictable Offences) Amendment Act. The bill reinstates the version of section 62B(5) that was intended to be the final version as provided for in the Summary Procedure (Service) Amendment Act. This is a minor clause, which rectifies this commencement issue.

The next aspect of the bill addresses the issue of costs and those who are exposed to costs. Another unintended consequence introduced by the Summary Procedure (Indictable Offences)

Amendment Act has resulted in exposing parties to costs orders in what has historically been a no-costs jurisdiction. Prior to the amendments, parties were not entitled to costs in relation to the prosecution of major indictable matters (except in very limited circumstances). In the lower court, this was made clear by application of section 189B of the Summary Procedure Act which provided:

Despite any other provision of this Part, costs will not be awarded against a party to a preliminary examination of an indictable offence unless the Court is satisfied that the party has unreasonably obstructed the proceedings.

The provision was amended to remove the reference to 'preliminary examination' and replace it with the updated terminology of 'committal proceedings'. The amendment overlooked the new pre-committal phase which had been included in the Criminal Procedure Act. There was no intention to change the scope of operation of section 189B of the Summary Procedure Act; rather it was amended purely to update terminology.

The bill reinstates the long-held position that major indictable matters are not subject to costs. The transitional provision ensures this is the case for all matters that may have been impacted by the unintended change since the commencement of the Summary Procedure (Indictable Offences) Amendment Act on 5 March 2018.

I will now move to parts of the bill dealing with discreditable conduct provisions in case statements. The Summary Procedure (Indictable Offences) Amendment Act introduced case statements into the Criminal Procedure Act. Section 123(2)(f) of the Criminal Procedure Act requires the prosecution case statement to set out:

...whether the prosecution intends to lead discreditable conduct evidence (within the meaning of section 34P of the Evidence Act 1929) and, if so, details of that evidence.

Prior to the commencement of the Criminal Procedure Act, section 34P of the Evidence Act 1929 governed the requirement to give notice when discreditable conduct evidence was proposed to be led. The Evidence Act was specifically amended in 2013 to ensure that notice is only required to be given when the discreditable conduct was being sought to be led for a propensity or similar fact purpose.

The original requirement to give notice without reference to purpose had imposed an impractical burden on the Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions because the concept of discreditable conduct captures a vast amount of evidence commonly used in court for purposes other than for a propensity or similar fact purpose. The 2013 amendment also brought the notice requirement into line with a similar requirement in uniform Evidence Act states.

It is arguable that the way that section 123(2)(f) has been phrased has the effect of unintentionally reinstating the requirements contained in section 34P that existed prior to the 2013 amendments. This would recreate an onerous and impractical burden on the Office of the DPP which was not intended. This bill remedies this.

Finally, the bill deals with the practical aspects of signing defence case statements. Section 123(5) of the Criminal Procedure Act requires the defence case statement to be signed either by the defendant personally or by a legal representative representing them in the presence of the defendant. Representatives from the defence profession have raised concerns about the practicality of complying with this requirement. There are concerns that this will often not be possible, particularly where defendants are remanded in custody in a regional prison. This may impact on the ability of some defendants and legal practitioners to comply with the required time lines for filing a defence case statement on time.

The bill removes the requirement that the case statement must be signed in the presence of the defendant in situations where the legal practitioner is signing on their behalf. It will remain incumbent on defence practitioners to ensure they have appropriate instructions before filing a case statement. For the most part, this bill seeks to remedy unintended impacts arising out of the Summary Procedure (Indictable Offences) Amendment Act. To better facilitate defence case statements, the amendment will assist defendants to comply with their case statement obligations, which in turn will positively impact on the efficiency of the progress of the matter. This in turn may positively impact on victims of crime by removing a possible contributor to delays.

The house may recall the length of time that was spent on these reforms over the last two years. The judiciary and the legal profession are currently coming to terms with major changes in these reforms and will likely continue to find intricacies in the acts. It is still yet to be seen whether the reforms move matters through the courts more quickly, to remedy delays and encourage early guilty pleas.

As Attorney-General, I am watching the practical aspects of this reform very closely and will continue to do so. South Australians deserve an effective and timely justice system, which is a priority for this government. I commend the bill to members and indicate that, as with our other bills, advice will be given as to a time when members can receive a detailed briefing in respect of these amendments. I appreciate that at first blush they may not be fully understandable to a number of members, but for those who have an interest in this area, I implore that they do consider attending the briefing.

Sometimes these are best described by using examples. I have not taken time today to outline those, but I hope that will assist when members have an opportunity to ask questions at that briefing and have a full explanation. In the meantime, I table an explanation of clauses, which I hope will assist in that regard.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Hildyard.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

**VISITORS**

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Before I go any further, I welcome to the Speaker's gallery the former member for Schubert, Mr Ivan Venning. Welcome.

*Bills*

**INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (INVESTIGATION POWERS)  
AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 May 2018.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:54):** I rise to speak to the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (Investigation Powers) Amendment Bill 2018. There are two primary outcomes of this bill: it fulfils our government's election commitment to give the ICAC commissioner the discretion to hold public inquiries in cases that involve potential maladministration or misconduct in public administration, and it clarifies the commissioner's powers by enumerating these in a schedule to the act rather than by reference to the Ombudsman Act or Royal Commissions Act.

There are good reasons that we are doing this. A lot of time was spent on legal argument during the Oakden inquiry on the uncertainty regarding the commissioner's powers. If there ever was a dark day in South Australia's history, it was the debacle of Oakden, not just what happened there—

**Ms Luethen:** Shame!

**Mr PEDERICK:** —absolutely, shame—at Oakden with the mistreatment of our frail and our elderly who had no right of defence, but then the almost—what would you say—non-caring view of the previous minister, who did not take the time to read a very short report, from what I understand, of about 30 pages. It is very disturbing when things like this happen, and it could have been tidied up very quickly by the previous minister, and it was not.

When our most vulnerable, whether they be, as in this case, our elderly or our young and they cannot look after themselves, it is disgraceful. There is no reason why a fundamental integrity body such as ICAC should have to borrow its powers from other entities or have to endure costly delays when investigating suspected maladministration or corruption. South Australia cannot afford to have an ICAC the powers of which are unclear. We have already had Oakden, Gillman and the acquisition of dirty diesel generators. I look at—

*Mr McBride interjecting:*

**Mr PEDERICK:** —absolutely—Gillman, and we were told that there were going to be 6,000 jobs at Gillman. There was an unsolicited bid. Other bidders were blocked out. I would like to know how many jobs there were in the legal profession, but my understanding is that the roomful of lawyers would have been the only jobs that came out of the Gillman debacle.

I used to work in the oil and gas industry in the Cooper Basin and in the Mereenie oilfield outside Alice Springs, as I have mentioned in this house plenty of times. I acknowledge the potential of what we have in this state of servicing especially the Cooper Basin and getting a sealed road up the Strzelecki Track. It is going to be a big job, but, apart from that, was the so-called commitment to these so many oil and gas jobs that were going to happen under the previous government. Well, what did we see? It all fell apart because of the shroud of secrecy around Gillman, and the only jobs that were provided were those in the legal profession.

We saw dirty diesel generators come about because the previous government, with different premiers over time, decided with their climate change policy that we will just go hellbent on having wind farms and solar power with no consequence on base load. Well, there were consequences of base load and, as we heard today, 28 September 2016 will stand in my memory forever. It was when Labor completely failed this state, apart from whatever else it got wrong on electricity supply to this state. The whole state went out from Mount Gambier to Border Village, and it was an absolute disgrace.

We were running on emergency generators here in Parliament House. I think it was 4.16pm on that day that everything fell to bits and, as a matter of safety and security, we shut down debate in the house so that public servants and people who work in this place could try to get home safely. People were locked in gridlock that day across the city. It would take an hour to get from one side to the other because we were communicating with people trying to get across the city. I was not game to leave the building until late at night because there was no point. You would just be locked up in a traffic jam outside. This was because of the failed energy policy of the previous government.

There was a contribution today about the policies around power. I can tell you, sir, that, as we know, \$24 million would have kept Port Augusta going. But, oh, no, the green-eyed genie had come out of the bottle: 'We'll just knock Port Augusta down,' and I think about 540 megawatts of base load power were just knocked out of the system. We have something like 53 per cent of renewables in this state, and when the wind does not blow and the sun does not shine guess what? The lights go out. In the end, we have had the most expensive electricity in the world, which was inflicted on us by the former government. It is a disgrace.

Then there were hundreds of millions of dollars invested in diesel generators. Let's not be too cynical, but we have a previous government that was supporting solar power and wind power, but when it all hit the fan—because the fans were not working—we bought nine diesel generators in this state because that is where you will get base load generation. They were going to burn, at full noise, I think it was 80,000 litres of diesel an hour. I remember interjecting on the former energy minister, suggesting that he did not need a truck to deliver the fuel to these generators; he would need a ship. It is just mind-boggling to think we were left in such a situation that we saw a dirty deal done over dirty diesel generators.

The former Labor government was afraid of transparency and accountability, but we recognise our obligations to the South Australian public, and we are committed to governing openly and transparently. This bill is an integral part of our transparency and accountability agenda across government, and this includes other bills. One of them we hope to progress later on today—protecting journalists from having to reveal confidential sources and strengthening protections for whistleblowers. It will be interesting to see what the journalists who are now members of parliament on the Labor side of the house have to say about that legislation.

What we are doing with this current legislation involving the ICAC is that this bill allows for the commissioner to determine whether any inquiry will be public, private or partly both. We will set out the grounds on which the commissioner can make a determination on the same. The bill also allows for the commissioner to delegate his powers to a deputy commissioner to conduct an investigation. The commissioner may also issue directions regarding the disclosure and publication

of evidence in an investigation—this is currently found in the Royal Commissions Act—including the power to issue non-publication orders retrospectively, which is currently in the Ombudsman Act.

The bill will also provide the commissioner with the power to compel the production of material that is otherwise subject to immunity or privilege, save for limited exceptions as recommended by the commissioner. It will also provide the commissioner with the power to make public statements or publish a report in respect of an investigation as well as to make findings as to whether maladministration or misconduct in public administration has occurred, along with recommendations. It will also provide the commissioner with contempt powers, which is also currently found in the Royal Commissions Act.

I note that this bill was drafted in consultation with the commissioner and reflects the most recent lessons to be drawn from the Oakden inquiry. I commend the bill and I commend the work of the Attorney-General. I commend the work of the former member for Heysen, who was a champion of this type of legislation, and I commend the Marshall Liberal government for putting this legislation forward.

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:04):** I have a few comments before the Attorney closes off the debate. I want to give notice that I will be tabling some amendments to the legislation. I have some concerns around the presumption of innocence and those sorts of things and how witnesses might be protected if they are called before open hearings, so I look forward to the debate in the committee stage. I thank the house for its indulgence.

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

*A quorum having been formed:*

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 7 passed.

Clause 8.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bedford-1]—

Page 4, lines 26 and 27 [clause 8, inserted section 36B(b)]—Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

(b) a question arises as to whether—

- (i) the Commissioner has jurisdiction to conduct the investigation; or
- (ii) a determination by the Commissioner to conduct a public inquiry was properly made (in accordance with clause 2 of Schedule 3A),

This is to make clear that a person can apply to the Supreme Court for a review of the commissioner's decision to hold a public inquiry.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I thank the member for the scheduled amendments provided prior to the debate. Of course, the bill was only introduced in the parliament yesterday and we have tried to work through them as quickly as possible. My understanding is that there is already a capacity to review. As an administrative determination there is already provision for review. This is a matter which had also been raised by the Hon. Kyam Maher, I understand.

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I just make the point that it has been highlighted. Obviously there seems to be some appetite for some clarity around this. I just want to assure the house that orders that are made by the commissioner are administrative orders and therefore are reviewable. However, between the houses we will look to see if there is any aspect of this. At first blush, reference to the words 'was properly made' probably attracts more concern in the sense that it may even narrow the terms of what is reviewable under the administrative law appeal process as it is.

I fairly clearly understand what the member is trying to achieve, and we will try to make sure that there is reassurance and identification of where the orders are for review. At this instance, I indicate that we will oppose the amendment, but we are very happy to look at the detail between the houses.

**Ms BEDFORD:** My understanding of the ICAC is that it is an investigatory body, but we are giving it court-like powers. I think that anything we can do to clarify that is useful. If it is the three words you have, as you say, maybe we could find three less offensive words for you between the houses.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** If I can perhaps respond to the question of whether we are giving ICAC court-like powers in this bill. In essence the ICAC, together with the Office for Public Integrity, has four or five significant areas of responsibility. One of those is in relation to corruption matters which are either referred to it or which it identifies of its own notion. It can conduct an investigation. It does not make any finding but, if it collates sufficient evidence to suggest that corruption has occurred, it then refers it to the relevant authority without making a decision as to whether or not there is corruption. That may be the police, for further investigation, or it may be to the DPP, the commonwealth, or wherever. That is one role.

That role is largely an investigative role. They have special powers to tap phones and require documents to be produced to try to identify that because it is a very special type of criminal offence. The whole purpose of having these commissions is to ensure that we have an agency that has the capacity and specialised personnel to do just that. It does not sit as a court in relation to that role.

In its second area, which is another primary area of responsibility, it investigates and adjudicates in respect of allegations of systemic or serious maladministration or misconduct. In this regard, it already has under the principal act not only the responsibility to do that but the rules that apply when it does so. One of the aspects of the bill is using the powers of the Ombudsman Act. He has frequently done that, and we have seen the result in very public documents, such as the Gillman inquiry into the sale of government land and the Oakden inquiry in respect of the allegations that were referred to it in regard to the mistreatment of our frail-aged in a mental health facility.

In those instances, the commissioner can receive evidence, collate material that it has itself investigated, call witnesses, question witnesses and generally investigate the matter and make a decision about whether there have been failings in the maladministration or misconduct arena, and by whom. Already under that aspect of its responsibility, it very much acts like a court, except that what we are trying to do today is to give it the transparency that other courts have, and that is the opportunity to be heard in public.

I want to be clear that we are not expanding its role as a court-like process, but we are certainly making it transparent by shining a light on it in allowing the whole or part of it to be public. In that sense, the public will be able to see when that discretion is exercised, how the proceedings are being conducted and, in the court of public opinion, make an assessment about whether they feel that has been properly carried out. In addition, in the existing structure they have powers and obligations. There are appeal rights in relation to the administrative decisions they make.

I foreshadow amendments Nos 5 and 6, which, I am advised, are in practice already operated as elements that are designed by the member to put in clear language the entitlement to have a legal practitioner, etc., which you would expect to have in an open court hearing. There are a number of other areas that I am not going into for the purposes of that. In that secondary area of responsibility, already they are carrying that out, and obviously the overall objective of this act in its first instance is to give them a chance to allow sunshine to be the best disinfectant.

**Ms BEDFORD:** This is my final question. The Attorney has already said it is a court-like power but it is not a court. We have to be very clear: people can be caught up in this process and, as you say, you are not even charged at that point; you are only being recommended to be charged, but the damage is probably already done by the time we get to that. I think any protection we can give to anybody at that level is really important. I am hoping that some of my learned friends on this side will have some questions for you, too.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 9 to 14 passed.

Clause 15.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I move:

Amendment No 2 [Bedford-1]—

Page 9, after line 33 [clause 15, inserted Schedule 3A, clause 2]—After subclause (2) insert:

(2a) The Commissioner must prepare a report setting out the grounds on which the Commissioner is satisfied that it is in the public interest to conduct a public inquiry and the report must be published, before the public inquiry is commenced, on a website determined by the Commissioner.

In moving this amendment, I again try to make clear that this is about ensuring that the reasons for holding a public inquiry are known, and then a person can use this information to seek a review by the Supreme Court under the previous amendment, which of course was lost. It is looking to make sure that people who are caught up in this process have some rights.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** As we understand it, this essentially requires the commissioner to disclose the basis upon which he makes a decision to have a public hearing, for example. There are some aspects in relation to the use of the word 'report' and 'grounds' that we would have some concerns about. Sometimes, I have seen in legislation an obligation on the party making a decision to publish reasons, and sometimes it is even less restrictive—publish reasons in the event that they are requested. There are various ways that this can be done to identify the basis upon which they have made the decision, as I say, in this case, to declare part of it in the public interest.

In terms of something like the Oakden matter, Mr Lander publicly said that it reminded him of the even more important reasons why these matters should be public in identifying this as a significant government service, particularly where it provided services to the frail, aged and vulnerable, and it was a service that was offered by persons who were employed by government and who were under the direction of senior personnel and ultimately responsible to ministers.

He quite clearly felt, and has made public statements to this effect, that that is exactly the type of situation where he would like to have heard all or part of that matter in a public forum. He was not able to because this law had not been passed at that stage, of course. However, even in that matter, on several occasions he published information about his conduct of that inquiry, and determinations he had made, by way of press release.

I am not suggesting that that is an adequate substitute for publication of reasons but, again, these matters are reviewable. The question is whether we confine it in the terms that have been identified. What I think the member clearly wants to do is say, 'Well, if you're going to have a public hearing and you say it's in the public interest, that is not enough. I need to know what in particular is in the public interest.'

At first blush, the way that we would look at how this would be best dealt with, without creating another layer of review and complicating the review process under administrative law, may be to have a provision that requires the commissioner, when he makes the decision, to make a statement about the way matters that he is already legally bound to take into account are to be considered and how they are to be considered. We will work on it between the houses, and I thank the member for bringing it to our attention. I think I have the general thrust of what is being sought here: transparency.

We are not dealing with an ordinary court situation, where it is all open unless it is closed, which is the more common approach. Obviously, we already know in the general court arena that from time to time a judge will say, 'I am going to hear the evidence of a child, I am going to hear very delicate evidence, I am going to hear criminal intelligence. Therefore, I am going to close the court and/or only allow limited media access,' and the like. For different reasons, that happens. However, we are doing a reverse here: it is closed unless he exercises discretion otherwise, and I hear a request that he in some way publicly accounts for the reasons he has done that.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Florey, does this question still relate to your second amendment?

**Ms BEDFORD:** Yes, surely that is all I am allowed to talk on, sir. I would not dare defy the table.



**The CHAIR:** Yes, that is right, we are just being clear on that. Member for Florey.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I have only asked two questions. I am familiar with the question session. As the Attorney says, the point is that the commissioner can make his findings public at the end. I do have some problems with that because even at that point the presumption of innocence is still there, you would think, because it is only a recommendation to charge.

If again we have two offending words, we might be able to find better words between the houses, but I think it is vitally important that we recognise both the right of the commissioner to say he wants it to be public and the right of whomever he is taking before him in a public setting to have some rights and be able to exercise them. My question is: will you definitely be looking at it between the houses, officially?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I assure the member that we will be looking at it between the houses. In respect of something that has been said, I think it is important that, in determining cases they are investigating and maybe sent off to charge, not making a decision—that is, corruption cases—the law that we are addressing in this bill does not relate to investigations in relation to corruption.

We are not even asking, in relation to any investigation in respect of corruption, to have any or all of that investigation open. In fact, in that regard the commissioner has been very clear since the inception of the act. He is not conducting an inquiry for the purposes of making findings and determinations. He is purely carrying out investigation, a bit like a high-powered police officer and detective team who then hand all that over the somebody else.

All that remains out of the public eye, just as it does in a current police inquiry when they undertake their investigations. It may take a very long period of time, and then they may make a decision about whether a crime or multiple crimes have been committed. Obviously, they may then identify if charges are to be laid. They may refer it to the DPP to review for charges to be laid. That is an entirely investigative role. We are only talking here about serious or systemic maladministration or misconduct, remembering that there is a third area that relates to what the police ombudsman used to do when we had one. So he has an extra role there, but we are not talking about corruption inquiries.

**Ms BEDFORD:** No. It is the beginning of that process should anything go further, surely. If he finds corruption, then you move on to the next level, do you not?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Can I just clarify this. If he is going along doing his investigation in relation to a corruption matter and there is not enough evidence, he closes the file, presumably, or keeps it there or keeps an eye on it or whatever. That is his business, and it is just as the police do. It may be, though, that in undertaking a corruption investigation he stumbles across the basis for an inquiry into serious or systemic maladministration or misconduct and then starts that inquiry. In relation to that, he would be under these reforms, obviously, undertaking an inquiry for the purpose of making a finding, and potentially a determination, on whether there was any breach in respect of those two areas.

**Ms BEDFORD:** But it is already in the public, is it not?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No. While it is still an investigation in relation to corruption—this is the one that transfers over—that is all secret. If he finds other information that suggests there is some shocking behaviour happening in some department but it is not corruption—it is just a maladministration matter—he may make a decision at that point to send it to the Auditor-General, the Ombudsman or other integrity bodies, or he might think it serious and systemic and therefore he will do the investigation. He starts that inquiry, and it is that inquiry that is the subject of this reform. With the passage of this bill, he would have the right to have all or part of the hearings in public.

Amendment negated.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I move:

Amendment No 3 [Bedford-1]—

Page 10, line 37 [clause 15, inserted Schedule 3A, clause 4]—Delete 'In' and substitute 'Subject to this clause, in'

This is a pretty easy one. The word 'in' cannot be offensive, can it?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I indicate that we are not supporting that for the same reason.

Amendment negatived.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I move:

Amendment No 4 [Bedford—1]—

Page 10, after line 40 [clause 15, inserted Schedule 3A, clause 4]—After the present contents of clause 4 (now to be designated as subclause (1)) insert:

(2) A public examination of a witness must be conducted in accordance with—

- (a) the rules of evidence; and
- (b) so far as is reasonably practicable, the rules of the Supreme Court applying to examination of witnesses in criminal matters.

This makes sure that witnesses, if they are called for a public examination, have some protection so that the rules of evidence are there as in the Supreme Court.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** We will look at this aspect of it, whether there needs to be any other amendment with it if it is going to be acceptable. However, generally I think the best way of ensuring that inquiries are conducted in a manner that is fair to all concerned is to open them up. That is the best way of ensuring that we do not have an inappropriate inquiry—a Star Chamber, if you will—behind closed doors.

We want these inquiries in relation to serious allegations, clearly, to be open and able to be seen, and the best way is to shine the torch on those, including the opportunity for people who are called in these investigations, either as a witness or a suspect in that sense of misconduct or maladministration, having the right to be able to present their evidence—and that is usually what the rules of evidence attempt to do. They ensure that as best as possible the evidence that is available goes in uncorrupted and is not denied, other than through a proper and well-worn development of a set of rules that operates under the Evidence Act. We will certainly have a look at it and come back to the member on that.

**Ms BEDFORD:** We are talking about something that is akin to a court but not a court. Whether it is or is not, I suppose, is in the eye of the beholder. Some witnesses could perhaps benefit from having reasonable notice of the questions that they might be asked. You cannot just be led in and asked questions. Is there no case that you can ever recall where someone has been taken to something like this and actually been innocent, but it has gone to the very end and their name just cannot be retrieved? Publicly, they have been besmirched and there is no way out of it.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I think there are probably a number of different issues in that question and the concerns that the member raises. If I can just identify one area that I would see as a problem with this clause. Let's assume that there is an obligation in relation to the public hearing examination of a witness that requires this standard you have proposed. If that is only to apply to a public hearing, then how do we address the circumstance where the hearing is undertaken partly in public and partly in private? Even the same witness could give part of their evidence in private and some in public.

If that is the concern you have in that instance, how do we know if the witness is being fairly treated in the secret part? I am just saying that I think I understand what you are trying to achieve here, and that is that you want there to be a fair structure set around people who appear in these inquiries. Sometimes they might go to it thinking they are a witness and they become a suspect, so I understand the significance and concern that people have, especially because of the secrecy of these inquiries. Therefore, things like those you foreshadow later on in relation to having legal representation, etc. are things we understand the significance and importance of, but I highlight that because there is the capacity for there to be a hearing partly in secret and partly in public, that is the sort of anomaly we will have to have a look at.

If we are satisfied that we need to write in there that the rules of evidence should apply, then we may need to consider how we do that across the whole of the inquiry, even if part of it is not in the public arena. Again, leave that with us. We undertake to have a look at it.

**Ms BEDFORD:** You just said that partly this is to protect the witness in the secret bit. I am not sure how that actually works. This is about protecting people if the inquiry is closed. We are not actually having open inquiries so that the public can see them. We are having an open inquiry to look after the interests of the person who is being investigated.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Let's be clear. The reason we are proposing a public inquiry is for both.

**Ms BEDFORD:** For both, okay.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** People who appear in these types of inquiries ought to have fair access to be treated appropriately. We understand that, and that is one of the reasons to have that, but the other is to make sure that the public can see how these things are progressing and that they can see that either the witness or person under investigation is getting a fair hearing and that the commission itself is conducting itself in an appropriate manner. Frankly, the danger of having anything in secret is that all sorts of things can happen behind closed doors. That is why it is a fundamental principle in relation to our court processes that, apart from exceptional circumstances, they are kept private.

The Family Court is slightly different. You have to be over 18 and be a party and various other things; it is not just open to anybody who wants to go in. So there are certain areas where there is an exception; however, largely, just like our parliament, it is open. The public can see what we are saying and doing. They do not all come in; they can see us online now, which is another initiative.

This is the whole idea. The press can come or they can go and find our live stream, wherever that gets hidden, and they can access that information. That transparency is very important to our side of the house even in these types of inquiries, and even though they do have another secret role, which is basically an investigative role into corruption, that is not what we are talking about today. For both those reasons we will do it. Yes, we will have a look at the matter between the houses as to how that might work if it is included. In anticipation of clauses 5 and 6, my answer will be the same—that we will look at those matters between the houses.

Amendment negated.

**Ms BEDFORD:** I think we can do amendments 5 and 6 together, if that is okay with everybody. As the Attorney said, she will give them the same treatment as all the rest of them. I move:

Amendment No 5 [Bedford-1]—

Page 11, lines 4 to 6 [clause 15, inserted Schedule 3A, clause 5(a)] —Delete '(not being an examination conducted in public in accordance with clause 2)'

Amendment No 6 [Bedford-1]—

Page 11, lines 7 to 13 [clause 15, inserted Schedule 3A, clause 5(b)] —Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

- (b) any other person may be represented by a legal practitioner if the person heading the investigation is satisfied that special circumstances exist.

Amendments negated; clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:37):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I would just like to record the government's appreciation of the indication of support from members in the house, particularly from the Leader of the Opposition. He had indicated post election that in respect of this very important election commitment he would review it and look at how and under what circumstances the Australian Labor Party would support this legislation, because it has been up before and not been supported.

I appreciate that that would obviously have taken some consideration and we thank him for showing some leadership in this regard and ensuring that we have support through this house. I accept that the Hon. Kyam Maher, being the opposition's representative in the other place, may have some questions in relation to the practical implementation of this but I place on record our appreciation for the support at this time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

### **EVIDENCE (JOURNALISTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 10 May 2018.)

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for Kurna, are you the lead speaker?

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (17:39):** I am the lead speaker, but once again, outrageously, I will not need the unlimited time available to me. There are only three pages, so I do not think I will trouble 20 minutes with that.

I rise today to indicate that the opposition will not be opposing the journalist shield laws being introduced through the Evidence (Journalists) Amendment Bill 2018. Journalists are not much different from people in this chamber or those in the other place, in that they are first and foremost servants of their communities. Journalists provide their communities with information. They are their communities' record keepers. They share stories between neighbours of each other's successes and failures. They pass on warnings to be heeded and, importantly, they are entrusted with the responsibility of holding governments, big corporations and other interest groups or powerful individuals to account.

The bill amends the Evidence Act 1929 to introduce a default position that journalists cannot be compelled to answer a question or produce any document that may disclose the identity of a confidential informant. Along with Queensland, South Australia is one of two remaining states in Australia yet to enact specific privilege laws dealing with journalists and their sources. The effect of the bill will be to preclude a journalist, or a prescribed person in respect of a journalist, from incurring criminal or civil liability in most official proceedings for failing to answer questions or produce material that may disclose the identity of an informant.

Previously, those on this side of the chamber, although we were on the other side at the time, have raised reservations around these changes. We have now had time to consult, reflect and review our position and we will continue to do that. Defining a journalist today is not as clear cut as it once was. Yes, some journalists may base themselves in the newsroom of a paper, a television station or a radio station. However, some journalists may find themselves constantly on the road, filing his or her stories from an external location. They could be a one-person newsroom who runs a website or a blog from their living room. They could be a freelancer or primarily engaged on social media.

This bill's definition of a journalist is broad and identical to the definition used in the New South Wales and Western Australian legislation, with the important distinction that the South Australian bill provides for classes of persons to be excluded or included in the definition by the regulations. This power was reiterated by the Attorney-General, where it was described as a means to ensure the flexibility of the law in the face of a rapidly changing media landscape.

Putting aside the particulars of this specific bill, principally this is an important piece of legislation that will ensure the protection not only of the sources who are brave enough to speak out against a higher authority but of those who have the strength to voice concerns or expose information that might prevent a neighbour from being harmed, mistreated or misled. It will protect not only the sources but also the journalists who are willing to share their stories and put their own name in ink next to it.

We are looking forward to working with the government to implement these protections, allowing journalists and their sources the discretion they deserve in order to protect their communities to the very best of their abilities. I am sure that, as per other bills in this house, there will be a number

of questions that our shadow attorney-general will be pursuing and will question in the other place. With those words, I once again indicate that the opposition will not be opposing the bill in this house.

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (17:43):** As a former journalist and the son, grandson and great-grandson of newspaper proprietors and editors who have successfully run regional newspapers over three generations—and it would have been four had I not been fortunate enough to win the most recent election—I am proud to rise to speak about the Evidence (Journalists) Amendment Bill this evening.

Shield laws for journalists are long overdue in this state and will protect news sources where it is clearly in the public interest to do so. Given my family history, I am in the prized position to know firsthand the power of the media and the vital role they play in going in to bat for the underdog and the vulnerable, for the victim of unfair play or the cause that needs support quickly. In fact, I would argue that the vital role they play is underappreciated and one that deserves more recognition.

The media can provide a societal moral compass, a leveller for common sense and a voice when there is nowhere else to go for help. I will always support journalism and the role that it plays in ensuring that wrongdoings are held to account, that corruption is exposed, and that maladministration is uncovered. That being the case, it is no surprise that members opposite opposed this very protection whilst they were in government. Regional newspapers especially are renowned for the causes they support, which lead to change for the communities they serve. I have seen how our newspaper is approached by people in need of a voice when every other avenue for help has been tried and failed and a community action is needed.

The two newspapers in the Narungga electorate—the *Yorke Peninsula Country Times* and the *Plains Producer*, and their editors Nick Perry and Les Pearson, who are both award-winning editors in their own right—are both highly respected because the journalists within those publications care about the readership they serve and the actual communities they live in. Both publications are held as bibles for the locals who rely on them for information to know the issues of the day, what is on, when and where, and who is doing what.

The success of regional newspapers is derived, I believe, from the fact that the journalists are locals who live in the community they serve. They are seen at the local shop and at the local sporting field. They are volunteers on committees and are mindful that all actions and words published will be judged personally by readers, and they will be told face-to-face what is thought of their work by the person affected when they next meet down the street. It is a very practical way of being held to account. The personal side of regional journalism also ensures contact books are full, and that an open-door policy for editors is essential.

Yes, Facebook and other social media also provide information and are valuable communication tools, but for many, particularly in the regions, the mantra still holds true that if it is in the local paper, it is fact. The sources are credible and the work of a hardworking journo is backed by a strong code of ethics. We trust local journalists to print the truth and facts without fear or favour, propaganda or self-interest, and in order to preserve this integrity, to preserve this trust that what they are writing is accurate, the amendments proposed in this bill are vitally important.

Once respect for a journalist is lost, it is lost forever. It is imperative that whistleblowers seeking assistance from the media to shine needed light on corruption, maladministration and wrongdoing can approach with confidence that their information will remain confidential. It is equally imperative that journalists can use that information they receive without fear that disclosure will result in gaol time.

For journalists, loyalty to the source is paramount. Protecting sources has been described as the golden rule of journalism to override all other considerations, including the administration of justice. Journalists want to protect their own personal reputation to ensure sources will trust them in the future. Then there is the wider chill effect: once a journalist gains a reputation for betraying confidences, the entire profession is tainted and sources potentially dry up for everyone. Protecting sources is also critical to ensuring a free flow of information to the public, which is an essential requirement of a healthy democracy.

This bill also follows a well-publicised and welcome Marshall government push for increased transparency, openness, government accountability and informed public debate across all sectors of our community and agencies, a pledge I am particularly delighted to support. Secrecy, cover-up, lack of transparency, and dictation rather than respectful engagement in recent years have led to escalating levels of constituent cynicism and mistrust in governments of all tiers and across all sectors. This public disappointment, bordering on despair, is in my belief severely impacting, at the very least slowing, the implementation of any change, reform and improvements that are so sorely needed.

The cynicism and public switch-off from politics and politicians in general have also served to increase the need for a moral compass provided by the media and an upsurge of the 'power of the people' mantra. Our side, the Marshall Liberal government, proudly stands for increased transparency and the accountability that naturally follows, believing that if people can see and hear what is going on, some level of trust will be restored and a renewed sense of community camaraderie and working together for each other can follow.

The damage that cases like Gillman and Oakden, chemo overdosing and underdosing cover-ups in our public health system and child protection issues highlighted by the Chloe Valentine case cannot be underestimated and will take considerable time to restore. Having been outside this parliament when those stories broke, I can attest to the shock felt by the community that such things can be allowed to happen under any government's watch. Much has been written in the media of late about the rise of distrust in government, and these examples have certainly not assisted in this area.

Key factors in building public trust are openness, transparency and real engagement in decision-making to demonstrate unequivocally that the public good has been addressed. Our new SA government has, I am proud to say, already taken steps to make the Independent Commission Against Corruption more open and is considering improvements to the freedom of information processes, which is also supported by South Australia's public sector watchdog in its calling for an overhaul of freedom of information laws due to its belief that current processes are costly and cumbersome.

As SA Ombudsman, Wayne Lines, told *The Advertiser* back in April, the whole point of freedom of information is to allow transparency of government decision-making and for taxpayers to know, for instance, where the money has been spent and to make sure it has been spent wisely and prudently. Mr Lines declared, 'The more limits there are on secrecy the better it is for democracy.' His comments were backed by Associate Professor Rick Snell, a University of Tasmania law lecturer considered one of Australia's foremost freedom of information experts.

He said that Third World countries have better FOI laws than SA. I quote him, 'There is nothing in the Act robust enough to cope with today's spin doctors and information management.' Although I would add personally that the South Australian public seemed to see through the spin doctors on 17 March. Included in his suggestions for improvements was finding and publicly naming ministers and heads of government departments found to be interfering with the process. Professor Snell commented, 'People were still using Commodore 64 computers when the legislation was created,' which is indicative of their outdated nature.

The current royal commission looking at banks and the financial sector has also highlighted the need for increased transparency and openness, as has the scheduled anticorruption inquiry into SafeWork SA, with the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, Bruce Lander, set to hold his first open hearing for this inquiry on 1 June. This bill today to protect whistleblowers is a natural flow-on from those efforts.

The development of good public policy is rarely successful when just a handful of public servants or politicians push through or dictate change using restricted debate and access to key information. There has never been a more important time for protections to mainstream media to restore some faith in the leadership and motivations of governments. With the advent of fake news and social media spreading misinformation, it is vital that journalists feel comfortable running factual stories.

With today's ability for anyone to easily set up an online campaign and reach thousands quickly and easily based on lies or otherwise, more and more corrupt behaviour is occurring, affecting increasing numbers of people. You only need to keep up with the list of scams circulating at any time to know there are very professional but sinister communicators from around the world infiltrating our lives in South Australia. It is little wonder that people have become disengaged and confused by who to trust.

The Liberals have long backed the introduction of new shield laws of legal protection for our journalists. It has been noted previously that we have been waiting long enough, as SA and Queensland are now the only states without said shield laws. I believe the right balance is achieved with a bill that allows for the impact of the disclosure of the informant and that a court can order the disclosure of confidential sources in limited circumstances, if the end is warranted, where it is believed that disclosing the source outweighs any adverse impacts it may have on the source or the value of maintaining a free press.

The new protections will apply in instances where keeping sources confidential was clearly in the public interest, but it is noted that judges will be able to threaten punishment in instances where there is a greater good in discovering the identity. Importantly, in developing this bill, consultation has occurred with media stakeholders, the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, the Ombudsman, SAPOL, the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission, the Law Society, the Chief Justice, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Crown Solicitor, so this bill is not offered lightly. We advance it in the interest of transparency, openness and informed public debate—the cornerstones of effective leadership and governance. I commend this bill to the house.

*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. D.G. Pisoni.*

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (17:55):** I rise today to speak on the journalist shield laws to be introduced through the Evidence (Journalists) Amendment Bill 2018. We have already heard from my colleague the member for Kaurua, who indicated that Labor will not oppose the introduction of shield laws through this bill. I have spoken previously in support of shield laws in many forums at a state and national level, including in this chamber and in the Senate of the federal parliament. It is fair to say that over time there have been some on this side of the chamber who have raised reservations around the introduction of journalist shield laws, and I know that it has been the same for some members sitting opposite as well.

I am pleased that our caucus has been open to further consultation and listening to the arguments surrounding the need for journalist shield laws. I am particularly pleased to be able to play a role in this review of support for shield laws and will continue to do so in relation to the bill before us. For the record, I have throughout my time in this place worked towards securing support for the introduction of shield laws, and it is my view that we should not withhold legislating for protection for ethical journalists because of the handful of journalists who do not have regard for the Australian Journalist Code of Ethics.

It has at times been an argument with which others have not agreed. In the course of their employment, journalists are frequently given off-the-record information from confidential sources. The current situation in South Australia is that if a court compels a journalist to reveal his or her sources, and they do so, the journalist is in breach of their professional ethics and, of course, genuine sources would be reluctant to come forth in the future. If a journalist refuses to reveal the identity of a source, despite being ordered by a court to do so, they risk criminal prosecution for contempt of court, a conviction that can have many consequences, including being denied a visa to travel within some countries, impacting on both personal and work-related travel.

We have already heard that South Australia and Queensland are the only states today that have not enacted specific privilege laws dealing with journalists and their sources. The Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance says that the situation has a chilling effect on journalism because borderless digital publishing allows for jurisdiction shopping, effectively creating a situation where a subpoena can demand a journalist be compelled by a court to reveal their confidential sources even though the journalist and their media outlet do not operate or reside in that state.

The journalist would then face not only the expense of defending themselves in the state away from their home base but also the full wrath of the court if they were found guilty of contempt

for simply having maintained their ethical obligation not to reveal the identity of their confidential sources. There are some reasons that parliaments across Australia have been slow to introduce the shield laws.

It is imperative that the Australian media behave honourably and responsibly in their pursuit of truth and dedication to informing the public. Those who abide by journalist ethics are doing their profession and our democracy a great service. Journalists should never lose sight of their role not let their standards drop.

The bill before us today amends the Evidence Act 1929, introducing a default position that journalists cannot be compelled to answer a question or produce any document that may disclose the identity of a confidential informant. The effect of the bill will be to preclude a journalist, or a prescribed person in respect of a journalist, from incurring criminal or civil liability in most official proceedings, for failing to answer questions or to produce material that may disclose the identity of an informant.

The bill's definition of 'journalist' is identical to the definition used in the New South Wales and Western Australian legislation, but it is narrower than that in the commonwealth law, and it allows for variation of the definition by regulation—issues raised by the Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance, and a number of other media organisations.

This is an important piece of legislation. I consider it to be just the beginning of providing some protection for journalists and their sources in South Australia. Journalists should never be convicted for adhering to the code of ethics, doing their job accurately and acting in the public interest.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (18:00):** I rise to support the second reading of the Evidence (Journalists) Amendment Bill. This bill is an essential ingredient in our platform to advance transparency and openness in public debate. It is also part of a larger suite of legislation directed at opening up the scope of information available for public scrutiny in South Australia.

In practical terms, the bill amends the Evidence Act to introduce a qualified privilege for journalists who might otherwise incur civil or criminal liability for failing to disclose the identity of an informant. Media Entertainment and Arts Alliance Chief Executive Paul Murphy has made clear that, without the legislation, journalists in our state risk gaol for performing their role ethically and protecting vulnerable sources. Mr Murphy has remarked:

Public-interest journalism often relies on whistleblowers and other people who are brave enough to come forward and provide information. To be able to do that, they need a commitment from a journalist that their identity will be protected.

The privilege we propose is different in important ways from other privileges, for example, the privilege that exists between solicitor and client, doctor and patient and in some other professional relationships. The form of the privilege we now propose can be modified or extinguished by a court in the exercise of its discretion. The court's discretion is fettered pursuant to the operation of the proposed section 72B(3) of the Evidence Act. That section, if passed by this house and in the other place, would provide:

The court may only make an order under subsection (2)(a) if it is satisfied that, having regard to the circumstances of the case, the public interest in disclosing the identity of the informant—

and there follows a number of paragraphs—

- (a) outweighs any likely adverse effect of the disclosure on the informant or on any other person; and
- (b) outweighs the public interest relating to the communication of information by the news media generally; and
- (c) outweighs the need of the news media to be able to access information held by potential informants.

It is important to reflect that the legislation recognises the need of the news media to access information held by informants. This is not just a change in the law but a change in philosophy and the direction of government. Of course, we have not brought on glasnost—we are more thoughtful than that—but the changes we are making reflect our principled belief that open and informed public debate better serves the public interest overall.



In assisting the Attorney to bring this legislation to the house, I have had the benefit of reading a paper prepared by Ms Lorraine Ingham, at that time an intern with the Special Broadcasting Service. Ms Ingham observes:

A journalist being compelled to reveal his confidential source in court faces a dilemma. On one hand, the journalist has a loyalty to the source, to maintain the secrecy of his or her identity. On the other hand, the courts require full disclosure of all relevant evidence in order to administer justice between the parties. This has led to a tension between journalists and the courts, which has been described as a 'worship of fundamentally different gods'.

Ms Ingham goes on to remark in her paper:

Journalists who refuse to give evidence may be found to be in contempt of court. Several Australian journalists have been sent [to gaol] for protecting their sources. But, given the important role the media plays in Australia's democratic system, imprisonment of journalists sits uncomfortably with law makers...

It certainly sits very uncomfortably with those on this side of the house.

As well, I have had the benefit of considering the report of the Senate Standing Committee on Legal and Constitutional Affairs, 'Off the record: shield laws for journalists' confidential sources', prepared in October 1994. The report retains its utility despite the passage of some time. At chapter 4, page 37, there is a conventional statement of the role of the media alongside that of the executive, parliament and the judiciary as an essential part of any democracy. I read into *Hansard* evidence given to that committee by Mr McLachlan, then general counsel of the Nine television network:

Mr McLachlan—If I can just pick up on two themes, as I see them. On the role of the media as the fourth estate, obviously it is our belief that the media has a very important role to play in ensuring the maintenance of our democratic society. It does act as a watchdog and provides a forum for accountability of the exercise of public and private power. The importance of the media in that regard is internationally recognised in a number of international treaties and instruments to which Australia is a signatory. So we say that freedom of expression and freedom to publish are of the utmost importance in maintaining the fourth link in the whole estate.

Judicial statements stop short of recognising the part the media play in Australia's constitutional balance. A reading, for instance, of *Nationwide News Pty Ltd v Wills* or *Australian Capital Television Ptd Ltd v Commonwealth* is not a fruitful one if the reader is seeking a statement that would protect journalists from an order to deliver up the names of sources or reflect on the way in which the information for stories has otherwise been gathered.

The decisions do, however, emphasise the essential character of political communication in preserving constitutional rights, however limited those rights might ultimately prove to be. In any case, the decisions emphasise the importance of the legislation we have now brought to the house. It is important to observe that these measures do not always serve the interests of the government of the day. We are now the government of the day, and there is some courage required to adopt these changes. I recall the previous government's steadfast objection to some of the reforms we are now introducing. We are adopting them nevertheless, believing that they are in the interests of the state.

The privilege we are conferring is, of course, a powerful one. We are conferring it at a time when there is an assault on the very nature of the media, especially traditional long-form media, which I cherish and which, though I am perhaps younger than some members of this house, I see as vital to our democracy. I also see it as vital that it continue in its present form. Competitive pressures and changes in the media landscape are producing at times a form of journalism that is hyperpartisan. Mr Speaker, you know I have reflected before on the damage hyperpartisanship is doing to our democracy and to confidence in our democracy.

The damage that new journalism can do and is doing to our democracy is, in my respectful view, also significant. Just as we would do better to avoid hyperpartisanship, journalists would, I think, do better to ensure they continue to distinguish clearly between opinion and news. I am not opposed to contrary opinions. I have plenty of my own, and one of the reasons I remain a lonely consumer of long-form journalism is so that as a daily habit I am forced to consider those contrary views. I feel, however, that the admixture of opinion and news—that is, the failure to adequately distinguish between fact and opinion—is a corrosive force.

I say respectfully that nothing will diminish the standing of any news outlet more quickly than the widespread knowledge that a journalist or an editor has become a participant rather than an observer. It is proper that each journalist, being a citizen, takes the natural interest in democracy that each citizen must take, but journalists, in my respectful view, are journalists and not citizen journalists; they are first and before anything else reporters of fact and not reporters of their own opinion, however urbane that opinion may be. Thank you for your indulgence.

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (18:09):** I wish to express how fervently I support this bill and the proposed amendments that will offer support and protection to journalists. These individuals provide a great service to our community. As the Deputy Premier so eloquently put it, the media facilitates the rationale and the critical debate, which in turn provide an additional check on all branches of government. At this time, four Australian states, including the Australian Capital Territory, have shield laws in place to protect their journalists. It seems time that South Australia follows suit, as it would, in my eyes, be deemed an injustice for these people to be criminally prosecuted or persecuted for honouring the confidentiality of their sources and for doing their job—a job that is so instrumental in the function and flow of the everyday.

Furthermore, transparency—something that will be achieved by the implementation of this bill—is a cornerstone of what this government is striving for and what it should always have endeavoured to achieve. How can we not protect these individuals who maintain this transparency and accountability in those with the power to create change for the people of South Australia? In MacKillop alone, we have five local newspapers: the *Border Chronicle*, the *Naracoorte Herald*, the *Kingston Leader*, the *Penola Pennant* and *The South Eastern Times* in Millicent. We also have infiltration from *The Border Watch* from Mount Gambier.

Radio is also a major source of information for the constituents of MacKillop, with people tuning into 5THE FM Millicent community radio, Triple M radio at Mount Gambier, as well as our ABC radio, also based at Mount Gambier. The journalists who work tirelessly to support these news sources are faced with seven-day work weeks, often going through the night to provide the best material for the public. The public in question are nothing but grateful, with many of them preferring to read the newspaper and listen to the radio, rather than tune into online news.

This makes these journalists absolutely instrumental in maintaining the flow of information to the majority of constituents in MacKillop and many other country electorates, as they heavily rely upon them to do so. This kind of relationship has inspired a loyalty between the public and the journalists of these news sources—a loyalty that journalists are acutely aware of, prompting such statements around as preferring to go to gaol rather than to do in their sources.

This is especially important to journalists in my electorate, who have brought to light the lack of protection in place against their own employers. Clearly, a response of this nature can only foster a better flow of information if shield laws were to be implemented. As the Deputy Premier noted in her second reading, protection of journalists and their informants is highly likely to prompt other members of the public to come forward with vital information in the case of major investigations.

Once again, I wish to reiterate the importance of putting this bill through at this point in time to support journalists to report as fully and frankly as possible, without fear of going to gaol over dishonouring the confidentiality of their informants. The fear of gaol is an alarming reality that those in the profession should not have to accept in order to do their job. It truly is about time that we start doing something to help journalists and their informants to continue providing information to the public, and forcing all of us to come to terms with the truth as observed by the public and those that we are honour-bound to serve. I commend the bill to the house.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (18:13):** I rise to thank all the speakers who have made a contribution to this debate, particularly the member for Kaurna's indication on behalf of the opposition of their support for this bill. Having reflected on the matter since their period in government, they have found their way clear to support this bill, and we are appreciative of their consideration and welcome their support.

I also acknowledge the other speakers who have made a contribution: the member for Torrens, who has had a prior career in journalism and whose comments were welcome; and some of our newer members, who have made a very valuable contribution to this debate in outlining the

practical, on-the-ground significance of those who work hard every day to shine a torch on matters of public interest and to publish the same.

To the best of my knowledge, the last person who was imprisoned in South Australia as a journalist for contempt of court was the ABC's Chris Nicholls in 1993. He spent three months in prison in South Australia after refusing to disclose information about a matter concerning the business interests of a former Labor tourism minister and her partner. It was a controversial issue of the day but a matter in which Mr Chris Nicholls staunchly maintained his position, and ultimately he was released. No-one should have to go through that again, and with the passage of this bill that will not occur.

There have been others, just for the interest of members. In 1992, which was a year before that, in other states *The Courier Mail's* Joe Budd was imprisoned for a week in Queensland. In Western Australia—they do all sorts of peculiar things in Western Australia—in this category in 2013, the Western Australian Supreme Court ordered Hancock Prospecting to pay Fairfax journalist Adele Ferguson's legal costs in a battle over revealing her sources, and in 1989, *The Australian's* Tony Barrass was in prison for a week after declining to reveal sources of confidential tax information. In New South Wales in 2007, two *Herald Sun* journalists, Michael Harvey and Gerard McManus, were fined \$7,000 each for refusing to reveal their sources for a story on the then alleged shabby treatment of war veterans by the federal government.

Other states have acted. They have remedied this situation. It is time that we did it here. I am very pleased with the passage of this bill. I say, that if there is any opportunity for any of those who were around and understood what happened in Mr Nicholls' situation, they, too, I hope will be pleased, after what he went through, that this legislation will see favour through the parliament. At this first stage, I welcome the same.

Bill read a second time.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (18:17):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

The Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that it had appointed the Hon. T.T. Ngo to the committee in place of the Hon. C.M. Scriven (resigned).

At 18:18 the house adjourned until Thursday 31 May 2018 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions*

**TERMINATION PAYOUTS**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (17 May 2018).

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** The cost of termination payouts to department chief executives since the government came to office totals \$2,065 million.