

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**Wednesday, 1 August 2018****The SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.**The SPEAKER:** I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.*Bills***ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:34): I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22

Noes 20

Majority 2

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.

Cregan, D.

Gardner, J.A.W.

Knoll, S.K.

Murray, S.

Pisoni, D.G.

Treloar, P.A.

Wingard, C.L.

Chapman, V.A.

Duluk, S.

Habib, C.

Luethen, P.

Patterson, S.J.R.

Sanderson, R.

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Cowdrey, M.J.

Ellis, F.J.

Harvey, R.M. (teller)

McBride, N.

Pederick, A.S.

Teague, J.B.

Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Brown, M.E. (teller)

Gee, J.P.

Koutsantonis, A.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Stinson, J.M.

Bell, T.S.

Boyer, B.I.

Close, S.E.

Hildyard, K.A.

Malinauskas, P.

Piccolo, A.

Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.

Brock, G.G.

Cook, N.F.

Hughes, E.J.

Mullighan, S.C.

Rau, J.R.

PAIRS

Marshall, S.S.

Picton, C.J.

Weatherill, J.W.

Speirs, D.J.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Motions***NATIONAL FARM SAFETY WEEK**

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Teague:

That this house—

- (a) notes that National Farm Safety Week was held from 16 to 22 July, raising awareness of farm safety issues across Australia, including South Australia;
- (b) recognises this year's theme as being 'innovative, safe and healthy'; and
- (c) acknowledges the united effort across the nation to reduce the deaths and injuries associated with health and safety risks on farms.

(Continued from 25 July 2018.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (10:40): I rise to close debate on the motion and I thank honourable members for the opportunity to conclude the debate on the motion moved last week. I recognise the members for Giles, Finniss, Mount Gambier, Hammond and the minister, the member for Chaffey, who all made contributions to the debate. I thank them, and I ask that the motion now be accepted by the house.

Motion carried.

INTERNATIONAL EPILEPSY DAY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (10:42): I seek leave to introduce this motion in an amended form.

Leave granted.

Mr BELL: I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises International Epilepsy Day, also known as Purple Day, which was held on 26 March 2018;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of raising awareness of the condition, as it affects about 61,000 people in South Australia;
- (c) calls on the state government to recognise epilepsy as a chronic health condition and calls on the state government to provide funding for educational and awareness programs and to provide funding to the Epilepsy Centre.

This year, International Epilepsy Day, also known as Purple Day, was held on 26 March. Some 61,000 people have been diagnosed with epilepsy in South Australia alone. Epilepsy affects about 3 to 4 per cent of the population, so there is a fair chance that you know someone or know of someone who lives with epilepsy. Epilepsy affects more people in our community than cerebral palsy, multiple sclerosis, Parkinson's disease, muscular dystrophy and blindness combined. Such an outstanding statistic further demonstrates the importance of Purple Day and its purpose to raise awareness of the condition and of all the people it directly and indirectly affects.

To define epilepsy, according to the national leading body of epilepsy support, Epilepsy Australia, epilepsy is a disorder of brain function that takes the form of recurring convulsive and non-convulsive seizures. Epilepsy is not just one condition; rather, it is a diverse family of disorders comprising many seizure types. There are over 40 different types of epilepsies and epilepsy syndromes. To put into perspective the effects that epilepsy can have on an affected person and their family, I will speak today of an epilepsy advocate in my own community of Mount Gambier: eight-year-old Ella and her mother, Katherine Height.

Ella is a bright and bubbly young girl who, in 2015, was diagnosed with the rare genetic disorder, GLUT1 deficiency—a disorder affecting just 1 in 400 people. Ella's condition prevents her brain from absorbing glucose properly, which in turn triggers seizures when her brain is starved of energy. Ella suffered her first seizure at three months of age while sitting on the lap of her mother. Ella turned blue and slumped forward. This episode was initially diagnosed as being caused by a viral infection.

Ella continued to develop as normal, hitting all the milestones of a young child, although she was still suffering through these blank events. Then on one terrifying day, the day of the local Christmas parade, Ella experienced her first tonic-clonic seizure, in which she lost consciousness before going through muscle convulsions, which lasted less than two minutes. Four months later, Ella finally had an appointment to see a neurologist. By this time, Ella had experienced seven seizures in 24 hours. What followed was a series of procedures and the prescribing of a loading dose of medication to control the seizures. Ella was finally diagnosed with her GLUT1 deficiency disorder. Ella's mum describes this time as follows:

It was so hard to see her go through the procedures, they were helping and hurting her at the same time, but we had to keep going until we knew what was wrong.

Ella is now on a strict ketogenic diet—high in fats but low in carbohydrates and protein. Ella will also need to take anti-epileptic medications for life. Every three months, Ella travels to Adelaide to see four different specialists, who are managing her condition and giving her the best possible quality of life. These appointments take two days, and the only financial assistance that is received for these trips is through the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS). Katherine says:

It has been really hard, especially the bigger seizures. I tend to put a block up about them because it just brings back too much pain. It is something that I've come to learn and get really passionate and a little angry about.

Her passion is no more evident than in the creation of the initiative Ella's Purple Promise, a foundation through which Katherine and Ella raise awareness of epilepsy and also raise funds for the Epilepsy Centre. Through Katherine's dedicated efforts, an epilepsy awareness information session will be held in Mount Gambier at St Martin's Kindergarten on 7 and 8 August.

This has only been made possible by the money that Katherine fundraised by holding a golf day earlier this year in the name of Ella's Purple Promise. Katherine has more fundraising events planned, include a movie night and another major fundraiser to coincide with International Epilepsy Day next year. I commend Katherine and Ella for all they have done to spread awareness of the condition. They are true advocates for epilepsy and for the Mount Gambier community at large.

South Australia is well overdue in supporting those living with the sometimes debilitating condition of epilepsy, particularly those in regional South Australia. South Australia and the Northern Territory are the only state and territory in Australia that do not receive state government funding to support more than 61,000 epileptics and their families living in South Australia and, additionally, 8,000 living in the Northern Territory. Currently, the leading support centre that assists South Australian and Northern Territory epileptics and their families is the Epilepsy Centre.

This centre was established in 1976 by a small group of parents, and for over 40 years it has provided invaluable support by way of counselling and psychological support, developing care and management plans and providing individual workplace, school and family training. The dedicated nursing team at the centre also provides epilepsy first aid training as well as teaching those with epilepsy and their families how to identify and respond to different seizures. Annual family retreats, camps for children and youth, presentation of workshops and also the hosting of workshops is also undertaken by the centre.

This impressive list of support, which is provided by the centre, is funded solely by private donations. The Epilepsy Centre urgently needs further funding to enable them to offer additional full-time nurses, allowing the centre to continue to provide support, compassion and understanding to those families who are on the epilepsy journey. To give an understanding of the level of need for this centre's services, five new families approach the Epilepsy Centre every week asking for assistance.

It should also be noted that when epilepsy has been established as the primary diagnosis, it is then regarded as a medical condition rather than a disability. This generally means that NDIS support is therefore not available. If a person has uncontrolled epilepsy but also a chronic syndrome, such as Dravet or West syndrome, where their epilepsy is classed as a secondary condition, it is only then that the person is recognised as having a disability and qualifies for NDIS support.

The distinction between primary and secondary diagnosis creates a significant gap in public health services. The organisation filling this gap is the Epilepsy Centre. The intervention provided by the centre improves the awareness of parents and children on this rollercoaster, helping them to

believe that epilepsy is not an insurmountable obstacle to achieving a full life. In South Australia, 34,000 people have a primary diagnosis and many of these are reliant on the support of the Epilepsy Centre.

A report prepared by Flinders University on the rates and costs of seizure-related hospital admissions of both children and adults in South Australia over a two-year period between 2012 and 2014 noted the combined cost of these admissions was \$15,436,525. During this period, over 678 children and 1,726 adults presented, resulting in 3,325 admissions to hospital. With appropriate preventative care, including the implementation of care and management plans, the cost of these admissions could be reduced.

How do we achieve this? By investing more funds in the Epilepsy Centre, enabling them to provide more nursing services. The member for Davenport, Mr Sam Duluk, previously made an impassioned speech on 23 June 2016, raising awareness of epilepsy. On that occasion, an occasion when I was in this house to listen to him, Mr Duluk also called on the state government to adequately fund more epilepsy services, research and diagnosis. During that speech, the member for Davenport said, and I quote:

I urge the SA government to provide direct funding to the Epilepsy Centre and I urge the SA government to recognise epilepsy as a disability to enable access to the NDIS and to help the Epilepsy Centre to better attract corporate sponsorship. The benefits of improving the resources available to the Epilepsy Centre would be enormous, not just for individuals and their families who live with epilepsy but also for the state's health budget.

I take this moment to compare the funding with other states. In Tasmania, the Liberal Party has committed to providing \$880,000 over two years to Epilepsy Tasmania to support improved services. This will result in the increase of availability of support services for both families and carers and also an increase in education and awareness of epilepsy.

In Victoria, where there are 63,000 people living with epilepsy as a primary condition, the Victorian Labor state government funds the Epilepsy Foundation in the order of \$1.2 million. Imagine the 34,000 people of South Australia similarly affected and how completely unsupported they must feel by their state government. It is time for South Australia to keep up with the rest of Australia and deliver the much-needed services for all the Ellas and Katherines out there.

It is challenging, not only for those suffering from epilepsy but also for their families, friends and carers. Having epilepsy is a constant juggling act. It does not stop with the seizures: it is the routine of medications and specialist appointments as well as the social aspect of how it often affects the individual's functioning in society.

Mount Gambier's champion Katherine Height would like to see the stigma attached to epilepsy removed and to make the community aware that no two days are the same for people with epilepsy. We can help Katherine reach that goal by supporting the Epilepsy Centre at Prospect to achieve its mission statement, which is to support and enrich the life journey of people impacted by epilepsy through education and awareness programs that empower people to change lives.

In closing, I call on the state Liberal government to show care for the 61,000 South Australians with epilepsy, show you care and become epilepsy aware. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (10:56): I move:

Delete paragraph (c) and substitute:

- (c) urges the National Disability Insurance Agency to assess applications of eligibility expeditiously to provide much-needed support to individuals whose functional capacity is profoundly impacted by epilepsy.

I rise to commend the member for Mount Gambier's motion in its amended form and wholeheartedly thank the member for Mount Gambier for bringing it to the house. As the member raised in his contribution, it is an issue that is very important to me, to my constituents and to many South Australians, and he understands, as I do, the importance of supporting those in our community, some 61,000 South Australians, who live with this condition.

Epilepsy is a chronic health condition and is recognised as a disability under the National Disability Insurance Scheme Act 2013, both on its own and as part of other disability types. There is

a wide spectrum of how people are affected by epilepsy. The severity and impact of epilepsy through a functional capacity assessment determines whether a person with epilepsy is eligible to access the National Disability Scheme.

Epilepsy, uncontrolled whilst on medication, is listed at No. 3 on the list of recognised disabilities under the commonwealth Department of Social Services. In South Australia, neurological impairments of an episodic nature are considered a disability under the Disability Services Act 1993. The severity of one person's condition does not impact on accessibility of service provided by SA Health.

I think it is really important that we have this debate and continue to raise awareness. I know that back in 2016 I moved a motion that was unanimously supported in this house, a motion that also included the need for the state government to provide financial assistance directly to those people in South Australia living with epilepsy. It is also important to note that SA Health, in its work and across jurisdictions, is well on the path of providing assistance to those with epilepsy.

International Epilepsy Day, also known as Purple Day, is an important opportunity to raise awareness of epilepsy by wearing the colour purple. It is a grassroots movement that started in 2008 by then nine-year-old Cassidy Megan of Nova Scotia in Canada to increase awareness and help reduce ignorance and stigma that is often associated with epilepsy.

Purple Day is also an opportunity to acknowledge the work of epilepsy associations, including the Epilepsy Centre of South Australia and Northern Territory, which provides support and services for people with epilepsy, their families and carers. The day has grown each year, with people not only wearing purple but holding events and raising funds for research and support services. Whilst we should not underestimate the importance of Purple Day in helping raise awareness of epilepsy, it has become a critical fundraising event on the Epilepsy Centre's calendar to provide much-needed services back to the community that they represent.

The Epilepsy Centre is a major provider of neurological community support for people in South Australia. Since 1976, the Epilepsy Centre has had the mission to improve the welfare of those affected by epilepsy in South Australia and the Northern Territory. Staff work tirelessly with very few resources to help the many thousands of South Australians affected by epilepsy. They do so without any state government funding.

I have been a strong and vocal advocate for those affected by epilepsy and for the Epilepsy Centre. As I stated earlier, in 2016 I moved a motion that called on the now former state government to adequately fund epilepsy services, research and diagnosis. That motion was supported unanimously by the house. I think it is so important that the house, the parliament and the government of South Australia continue to recognise what the people, through the parliament, have put on the record before. I moved that motion in 2016 and I will not waver from the intent of what I stated back then. I thank the member for Mount Gambier for once again raising this issue before the house.

The Epilepsy Centre has expressed to me disappointment with the response they recently received from the government in relation to their request for funding. I would also like to note my disappointment in that regard. The Epilepsy Centre, I believe, has been looking for assistance of about \$240,000 a year for the next four years to support the fantastic work that they do. What does \$240,000 mean to the Epilepsy Centre? That funding would enable the centre to provide services equivalent to an additional three FTE registered nurses per annum to work with people in the community diagnosed with epilepsy as a primary condition and their families, especially children, young people and those who are newly diagnosed. They currently have only 2.5 FTE staff to resource these activities

The key aim of the Epilepsy Centre is to reduce the need for unnecessary presentations at acute hospitals through better care and planning, awareness and management of the impact of the condition. It is an important goal that aligns with the new Marshall Liberal government's commitments to invest in better prevention and targeted prevention. Preventable health conditions costs us dearly. Investing in prevention avoids future costs to both individuals and government, benefiting individuals, communities and the wider society.

This is the situation that we have at the moment. As I have just put on the record, I am disappointed that the Epilepsy Centre's request for funding has not been met by this new government. But they are the challenges that we confront as a result of Labor's waste and fiscal mismanagement. I look at the programs and schemes, government advertising and re-election charms that the former Labor government invested in, and I always ask myself: had those wasteful government expenditures not been undertaken by the former Labor government, would we today be able to properly afford front-line services for people with medical conditions? And the answer is yes.

I hope that within this four-year term of government there is capacity within the state budget to properly fund not only fantastic hardworking organisations like the Epilepsy Centre to meet their small need but of course all organisations that are in the preventative health space and support those people with disabilities and the like. That is my commitment to my electorate and that is my commitment to the parliament. It is something that, as a member of government from the benches, I will continue to lobby for on behalf the 61,000 South Australians who have this chronic condition. It is hardworking South Australians, such as those living with epilepsy, especially chronic epilepsy, who desperately need help—hardworking South Australians, such as Vikki and Glen in my electorate, whose son Archie suffers from severe epilepsy.

The Marshall government is committed to investing in prevention and working through balanced health service funding, in particular targeting support to those who are at greatest risk. Targeted prevention initiatives, such as investing in registered nurses to work with people in the community diagnosed with epilepsy, can avoid or delay the onset of illness and disability, stop the deterioration of the condition and reduce risk. I want the government to work constructively with the Epilepsy Centre to optimise health services around the thousands of South Australians living with epilepsy so that they can access much needed help and support.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:05): I rise to support the motion of the member for Mount Gambier. I will read the full motion now because there have been changes. I indicate from the start that we will support the amended version as submitted by the member for Mount Gambier, and I will provide reasons for that. The motion now reads:

That this house—

- (a) recognises International Epilepsy Day, also known as Purple Day, which was held 26 March 2018;
- (b) acknowledges the importance of raising awareness of the condition, as it affects about 61,000 people in South Australia;
- (c) calls on the state government to recognise epilepsy as a chronic health condition and calls on the state government to provide funding for educational and awareness programs and to provide funding to the Epilepsy Centre.

I want to thank and congratulate the member for Mount Gambier. I also congratulate the now member for Waite (and previous member for Davenport) on continuing to bring epilepsy to the forefront of conversation here in parliament for a group of people who have significantly suffered across the decades due to epilepsy. There are 61,000 Australians living with epilepsy. It is a diverse condition with a whole range of consequences from severe to minor. Any consequence that creates any form of disability is something we need to take seriously.

I would echo the comments made by the member for Mount Gambier by recognising International Epilepsy Day, which took place this year on 26 March. March was a significant and very busy time for many people in this house, and, sadly, International Epilepsy Day, or Purple Day, did not receive the full-throated endorsement or attention that it rightly deserves from members of this house. Of course, International Epilepsy Day is all about urging people around South Australia, and indeed internationally, to end the stigma and discrimination against those living with epilepsy in our community.

In brief, epilepsy is a common brain disorder that takes the form of recurrent seizures, some of which can be controlled and prevented with ongoing medication and stability. Of course, that is something all people suffering with epilepsy want to achieve. Having seen, across my nursing career, many, many people undergo treatment for epilepsy, I can tell members of this house that it is extremely difficult to gain that stability. Any support that we can give from a medical or psychosocial point of view will be well received.

According to Epilepsy Australia, epilepsy can develop at any age, regardless of gender or ethnicity. Throughout Australia, some 250,000 people currently live with epilepsy. That is actually one in 25. If you look at this house, there would be two people sitting in here with epilepsy. International Epilepsy Day, or Purple Day, was founded in 2008 by a young Canadian named Cassidy Megan. It has since grown into a global movement. There is something to be said about those Canadians and global movements: I understand that White Ribbon started there as well.

I encourage members and those listening to cast their minds forward to International Epilepsy Day in 2019. No doubt we will all be slightly less busy next March, and International Epilepsy Day will prove a great opportunity to do a fundraiser in support of those living with epilepsy or to acknowledge the common contribution of someone living with epilepsy in your electorate or community.

I take this opportunity to mention to the people of Hurtle Vale, and indeed the people of Reynell and Kaurana, the family of Chris and Amy Castle, who are the proprietors of the Morphett Vale Butcher. The Morphett Vale Butcher has been in Morphett Vale since I can remember. It used to be run by a gentleman called Stan and it sat on the western side of South Road, currently in the seat of Reynell. Many people who have walked or driven through Morphett Vale would recall that in the past five or six years that that butcher has moved across South Road and now sits within the shops on the eastern side of South Road.

Previously, Chris and Amy, out of love for their daughter, who has battled and still does battle significant and severe epilepsy, painted their butcher shop purple. Chris and Amy continue to fundraise and raise awareness about epilepsy in our community. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the work they do and thank them for it. Not only do they do that but they generously donate barbecue meat to provide opportunities for other charities to get support. Thank you to the Castle family.

The original paragraph (c) of the member for Mount Gambier's motion links to his new paragraph (c). Both before the last state election and since, people have been coming into my electorate office regarding epilepsy and indicating how difficult it is to secure funding for treatment through the NDIS. Many of the severe cases of epilepsy that need a lot of care and support for whole families have been in the early rollout, in fact the trial of NDIS, because of their age. It has been a testing of the waters in terms of how to access NDIS for these children, and there have been significant challenges for every family. I could list dozens of families I have spoken to who have had a bumpy ride because it is such a complex condition.

In terms of where we are now, my latest advice is that the cost of medical expenses and equipment is not currently funded by the NDIS but that non-medical costs associated with living with epilepsy, whether it is psychological, physical or otherwise, are covered and are, in fact, a disability recognised. It seems that some consequential circumstances are recognised and funded by the NDIS but that some other primary condition issues are not.

What is clear to me is that taking out the original call about the NDIS is worthwhile, but then inserting the call for funding is extremely important because there is enormous confusion within the community about how children and families—and adults, in fact, with epilepsy—are supported and how to gain support and how to gain funding for things they need to lead a dignified and active life, where they can move forward, seek employment and become a really important part of the community. I think that the call for funding is timely and therefore I indicate that we will certainly support funding for places such as the Epilepsy Centre, and indeed education for the community, because it is required.

I could provide dozens of quotes from the previous member for Davenport, now member for Waite, in previous motions regarding his lambasting of our state government and our lack of desire to provide adequate funding for those centres and for people with epilepsy. We are in a new world and you are in government, and you have the chequebook and you have the power to sign those forms now. Now you are in government, so listen to the calls, the pleas of the now member for Waite who stated:

I do condemn the state government for its failure to provide the Epilepsy Centre with any government funding—not one single dollar. The Epilepsy Centre, the major provider of community support for individuals and their families suffering from epilepsy, does not receive one dollar in direct state government funding.

I feel terrible that that did not happen, but it is timely. It was also stated, 'Once again, South Australia's families are being left behind because of this Labor government's ineptitude.' Well, the Liberal Marshall government has not yet put money in. I cannot find an election commitment so, sadly, the member for Waite was not able—

Mr Pederick: Yes, you burnt up nearly \$500 million on EPAS.

Ms COOK: I do not think it is something you have to boom across the chamber, member for Hammond.

The SPEAKER: Yes, please do not.

Ms COOK: Just because you have a big, booming voice does not make you important. Stay there. I think one of—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pederick: No, just putting a fact.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms COOK: —the things that is important—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms COOK: —is that we work together and we now move forward. You have the purse strings, and I support the member for Mount Gambier's motion.

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (11:15): I also rise to support the member for Mount Gambier's motion. I will cover some of the points raised by the member for Hurtle Vale because the practical reality is that, as she says, we are now in government and we have inherited the chequebook. The practical problem we have with the chequebook is that there are no funds in the account, if I could use that analogy, with which to operate it.

We learnt yesterday, courtesy of the Treasurer, that the Labor Party had planned to chop roughly \$700 million out of the budget, of which the South Australian health department was going to suffer \$400 million, so there is considerable work for us to do. Albeit that we are in charge of the chequebook, the member for Hurtle Vale's point, there is not a lot of coin left—but thanks anyway.

Ms Cook: Cheers.

Mr MURRAY: Yes, cheers—cheers, indeed. I rise to provide my support for the motion based on some personal knowledge of this disease, and in particular a fairly severe form, but more particularly in recognition of a small family whom I met on the first day I doorknocked in my electorate. I will not name the family, but they had considerable issues. When I doorknocked, I was mistaken for the pizza delivery driver and had to disabuse the kids in question that I was not the driver. I stress that was not based on my appearance, although I recognise that some stereotypes might well apply.

This particular family had considerable issues, not the least which was that they had several children who were chronic sufferers of epilepsy. As I said, it was one of the first homes I doorknocked as a candidate, and I was particularly struck with how tough that family was doing it. What I sought to do, and what I will continue to seek to do as their representative, is the best I possibly can for them and indeed for other sufferers.

As other speakers have pointed out, Epilepsy Day, or Purple Day, is an important means of providing publicity for the condition. It is one that affects literally thousands of South Australians, and we are extremely lucky that they are being supported by the work of the epilepsy associations, including the Epilepsy Centre of South Australia and the Northern Territory, and the CEO, Robyn Wakefield, is a constituent of mine.

Purple Day, as the member for Hurtle Vale has pointed out, was somewhat clouded this year courtesy of the hullabaloo surrounding the election, but I join with her in her suggestion that we gird our loins for 2019 and endeavour to do what we can to raise awareness of the condition and help raise funds, in particular, to support people who suffer from the condition.

Insofar as government support is concerned, we have an ongoing commitment to improving the accessibility and quality of services in South Australia. I am told that SA Health has invested in technology, staffing and other resources in all our local health networks to provide a range of services for both children and adults living with epilepsy. These include outpatient and inpatient neurological and neurophysiology services, including tertiary level medical diagnostic and treatment services and education services for admitted and non-admitted patients.

I share the member for Hurtle Vale's view on her points regarding the NDIS and the square peg in a round hole approach that we are all forced to adopt in our electoral offices, trying to assist people in accessing services or move from the state to the NDIS. I thank her for her contributions insofar as the split of what is funded and supported and what is not supported is concerned.

The NDIS is a fact of life in some respects. Again, I support the member for Mount Gambier's motion and, in particular, the means by which it can elevate the treatment and recognition of this condition out of it simply becoming yet another condition covered, however well or not, as the case may be, under the NDIS. I would like to return to the intent of this motion and, in particular, express not just my support for the motion but my support for the family I referred to earlier.

There is not a lot of capacity that we as an incoming government have. As the member for Waite pointed out, there was not a lot that could have been done previously. I will close by supporting the points made by the member for Waite. I think it is incumbent upon us to do what we can for our constituents. Sometimes we may need to become a little bit obstropolous and insistent in order to make that happen. I support his comments in that regard and, in so doing, support the motion.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:22): I will close the debate by thanking all members who have contributed to this motion: the members for Hurtle Vale, Waite and, of course, Davenport. I think there have been some very good points put forward: this disability needs to be elevated and there needs to be money allocated to the Epilepsy Centre. How we achieve that through a bipartisan approach is something that I look forward to working with the government to achieve.

On behalf of all 61,000 people in South Australia who have epilepsy, I wholeheartedly thank all members in this house and ask that we give consideration to a bipartisan approach for funding and moving this forward. When you look at the amount of money being requested, around \$240,000 each year, it really is a minuscule amount. In my speech, I quite deliberately touched on the cost to the healthcare budget. When it gets to an acute stage and a hospitalisation stage, you are talking about millions and millions of dollars.

I believe that Liberals are very good at economic rationalisation and working out that it is a finite budget—let's not our kid ourselves about that. An investment of \$240,000 to save over \$2 million makes very good economic sense to me and is something that I would encourage the government of the day to turn their attention to. With those closing remarks, I commend my original motion to the house.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 22
Noes 19
Majority 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Duluk, S.
Habib, C.
Luethen, P.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Sanderson, R.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Speirs, D.J.

Cregan, D.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Knoll, S.K.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Teague, J.B.

AYES

Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Whetstone, T.J.

NOES

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Piccolo, A.
Wortley, D.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Mullighan, S.C.
Rau, J.R.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Gee, J.P.
Koutsantonis, A.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Stinson, J.M.

PAIRS

Chapman, V.A.
Picton, C.J.

Weatherill, J.W.

Marshall, S.S.

Amendment thus carried; motion as amended carried.

ORGAN DONATION

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:30): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises DonateLife Week from 29 July to 5 August;
- (b) recognises the importance of organ donation;
- (c) encourages families to discuss the importance of organ donation and to register their decision on the Australian Organ Donor Register;
- (d) encourages the state government to support a comprehensive publicity and education program focusing on both the general public and healthcare professionals; and
- (e) urges the state government to investigate the effectiveness of opt-out legislation for organ donation.

This week is DonateLife Week across Australia, a time when events are held to increase public awareness of the importance of organ and tissue donation. In Adelaide this week, donor families and heart, lung, kidney and cornea recipients joined at the Adelaide Oval roof climb, and there will also be public displays at Flinders Medical Centre, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Adelaide Central Market and sporting events.

In South Australia, DonateLife SA coordinates all organ and tissue donor activity across the state and works with hospital, medical and nursing specialists to provide professional donation services and encourage best practice to increase donation rates. In recognition of this important week, I want to tell you about the stories of two Mount Gambier people whose lives are at opposite ends of the organ donation journey: Adam Dixon and Kimberley Telford.

In January 2014, Adam had just finished year 12, was looking forward to starting his engineering degree at Flinders University and was living life as only an 18 year old can. Adam was holidaying with his friends on Kangaroo Island when he was critically injured in a car crash. He was helicoptered to Flinders Medical Centre, where he was put on life support, but sadly his life was gone.

Just a week before the accident, in a casual conversation with his parents, Matthew and Fiona, Adam told them he had registered to become an organ donor. That night in hospital, Adam's decision randomly changed the lives of five people he would never meet. His lungs, kidney, liver and pancreas were donated to five people out of the roughly 1,400 Australians on the waitlist to receive transplants.

Every year, Fiona checks in with the donor coordinator to see how the five recipients are doing. Fiona says that donating Adam's organs is the bright light out of a terrible situation. 'It is a pretty powerful thing to be able to say yes to,' she says. 'Adam touched a lot of lives.' In the years since Adam's death, Matthew and Fiona have worked incredibly hard to increase awareness of organ donation. There is no doubt that stories like Adam's resonate with the public, but both Matthew and Fiona believe more awareness and education are needed to boost organ donation rates.

The 2017 Australian Donation and Transplantation Activity Report showed that just 32 South Australians became organ donors last year, compared with 40 the year before. This figure is despite South Australia having the highest rate of participation nationally on the Australian Organ Donor Register, with more than 68 per cent of adults registered. We already have world-class research and development going on in South Australia in this area. The Royal Adelaide Hospital will soon be one of just three in Australia offering kidney/pancreas transplants. The Dixons have helped fundraise tens of thousands of dollars in Adam's memory to support pioneering research into the preservation of organs before transplant.

We should also investigate the merits of introducing opt-out legislation, an approach which Matthew and Fiona Dixon support. This approach effectively turns every South Australian into a potential organ donor, unless they officially register to opt out. Countries that have embraced the opt-out approach to organ donation include France, Spain, Austria, Belgium and Singapore. Although some opt-out countries are reporting higher organ donation results as a result of the law change, this approach can also be impacted by differing cultural and religious beliefs. I believe there is an opportunity to have a wider debate on this subject and consult South Australians on their views.

However, there is something all of us can do today to help boost organ donation, and that is to spend five minutes signing up to the Organ Donor Register. Anyone over the age of 16 can do this and officially make your intentions clear about what organs and tissues you do and do not want to donate. Many people still believe that little tick on your licence is all it takes to become an organ donor, but it is still important to put your decision on the register. This way medical personnel around Australia can see around the clock that you are an organ donor. Transplants happen quickly, so this is vital. Also, talk to your family about your decision. It is a conversation we all ignore, but it is one we all need to have.

Why do we need to have this conversation when we are already on the register? Because your next of kin have the final say on donation, and research shows that they are 90 per cent more likely to follow your wishes if they already know about them. This figure drops to about 52 per cent where the deceased was not registered and the family had no prior knowledge of their decision. It is a fact that less than 2 per cent of people who die in hospital will be able to donate their organs, so it is a game of odds and circumstance where all the factors have to match up perfectly to result in a successful donation and transplant procedure. That means we need a large number of people simply to register to increase those odds. Introducing an opt-out policy will mean we will have a much larger pool of potential donors.

As Matthew Dixon says, 'You don't ever have the conversation thinking it will happen.' Introducing opt-out legislation would mean that the onus is on those who feel strongly against organ donation, rather than those who simply have not had the conversation yet. The conversation about organ donation should be had with family and loved ones before it is required, not at the time of immense stress and heartache.

The importance of organ donation is recognised in the thousands of people around Australia whose lives have been changed for the better. Right now, Mount Gambier mother Kimberley Telford is one of the many Australians on the list awaiting a call that will change her life. Kimberley is 43, a similar age to mine, and undergoes 10 hours of dialysis each night because of renal failure due to diabetes. She plans her day around her dialysis. She has good weeks and bad weeks. On a recent family trip to the Grampians, Kimberley was able to walk only 50 metres from the car until she got tired and had to return.

Soon Kimberley is expected to be the Royal Adelaide Hospital's first kidney/pancreas transplant recipient. Her husband, Brenton, told me their teenage sons have never known their mother without diabetes. Brenton believes opt-out legislation would have major benefits for the

current organ donation system. In fact, it is Brenton's continual conversations with me that have raised the awareness with me and brought this notice of motion to the house today. The current benefits will significantly decrease waiting times resulting in fewer health complications for patients and, in turn, less impact on the health system.

In effect, the opt-out approach would save taxpayers money. Brenton said, 'I don't believe in taking them with you. Give someone else a second chance.' These are important words from someone who understands the organ donation journey. This week, I encourage all South Australians to hear the stories of Adam and Kimberley, make their decisions clear on the Australian Organ Donor Register and talk about it with family, friends and loved ones. Kimberley's life and the lives of other South Australians depend on it. I commend the motion to the house.

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (11:40): I concur with the motion as per the *Notice Paper* with the exception of paragraphs (d) and (e). I move to slightly amend the motion as follows:

Delete all words in paragraphs (d) and (e) and substitute:

- (d) encourages the state government to support ongoing comprehensive publicity and education focusing on both the general public and healthcare professionals; and
- (e) urges the state government to investigate opportunities to increase organ donation, including opt-out legislation.

As I indicated, I concur with the vast bulk and certainly the sentiment of the motion put to us by the member for Mount Gambier. I welcome the recognition of DonateLife Week, which is underway from 29 July through to 5 August. The week aims to raise awareness of organ and tissue donation. It encourages all Australians to register their donation decision on the Australian Organ Donor Register and, in addition, to discuss their donation decisions with their loved ones—an important point, as I will further detail.

We should all acknowledge that it goes without saying that donation of both organs and tissue for transplants saves lives and improves the lives of Australians. As part and parcel of this motion, we should thank and acknowledge the generosity of all Australians who donate, or indicate an intention to donate, their organs and tissue, given the impact not just on the recipients but on the families of the recipients. As the member for Mount Gambier has pointed out, these decisions have a momentous impact not just on the recipients and their families but also indirectly on the families of those who have been a party to their loved ones being donors.

Organ donation is, in fact, a rare event. Between 1 and 2 per cent of people who die in hospitals die in the specific circumstances required to be potential organ donors. As the member for Mount Gambier has pointed out, South Australia has the highest national registration rate on the Australian Organ Donor Register, at just over 68 per cent. The achievement of this rate is attributed to South Australia recording a person's intention to become an organ donor on their South Australian driver's licence. It is a proactive measure that we in this state have undertaken for some time now, which is one of the reasons for us having the highest national registration rate at this juncture.

Additionally, South Australia is the only jurisdiction to have retained this process in conjunction with the Australian Organ Donor Register. We have ongoing improvements in systems facilitating organ donation. One of those improvements is a move to notify DonateLife of all deaths in hospitals and to have 100 per cent of organ donation conversations with families be led by health professionals with specific training.

South Australia is a participant in research to better understand why potential donor families say no to the offer of donation. These initiatives are aimed at improving processes and are expected to increase donation rates over time. The point I make is that we need to keep trying to improve organ and tissue donation, and consent models need to be part and parcel of that consideration. This process does need to be done carefully in conjunction with other jurisdictions.

Australia's current informed consent model, the so-called opt-in model, means individuals may record their intent to donate their organs and tissues on the Australian Organ Donor Register. The informed consent model used in Australia is an ethical and transparent approach that balances the need for organ and tissue donors with the right of Australians to make an informed choice. The

Australian Organ and Tissue Authority, in partnership with state and territory governments, has carefully considered and will continue to consider consent model options.

I am informed that investigations at this point have concluded that there is no clear evidence that an opt-out model would contribute to achieving higher donation rates. Five separate independent reviews have been undertaken in Victoria, New South Wales, Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania, and all have decided against changing the consent framework and have agreed to retain the opt-in model.

In Australia, research has shown that documented legal consent and family knowledge of wishes are key drivers for an increase in donations, together with the scope and quality of the conversation held with potential donors. The current informed consent model used in Australia is an ethical and transparent approach that balances the need for organ tissue donors with the right of Australians to make an informed choice.

Having made that point, I will conclude by again commending the member for Mount Gambier for his motion. I make the point that the substance of his motion is not just commendable but also understandable in the circumstances. I am satisfied on the basis of the evidence provided to me that our current consent model is sufficient and adequately traverses the minefield that, by necessity, we have to traverse in these sorts of circumstances: the wishes of the deceased and their families, weighed up against the potential to vastly improve the lives of not just potential recipients but also their families and loved ones. In closing, I commend the amended motion to the house.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:47): It gives me great pleasure to support the member for Mount Gambier's motion and also the amendments made by the member for Davenport. I am honoured to recognise DonateLife Week between 29 July and 5 August, which raises awareness for a register through which people can participate in organ donation. It highlights the fact that I am a donor and have participated in this process by ticking the box on the licence, but I may not have gone far enough to register as a donor. I am not sure whether I have done the wrong or right thing, but as a member I will make sure that I do the right thing, and for my family as well because we have had discussions that we wish to participate in organ donation for a number of reasons, which I will talk about and highlight in a second.

There is nothing more important than a society that works together. We are not all as fortunate as some, and we are not all given a gift of cards that unravel in a way that we can live healthy lives. The donation principle goes to the heart of a society. It is wonderful to see that, as a state, we have the highest participation rate in organ donation. I hope we can do better with a government policy that respects the difficult nature of this discussion, and the opportunities that are still out there, despite our state having the highest organ donation participation rate in Australia.

Donations made by individuals, normally in unlucky and unforeseen circumstances, give an opportunity to others who are in a situation where life is not as grand or easy as most of us come to appreciate. The donation principle highlights the two aspects of this. One is that we have community citizens who come to the end for a number of reasons, and the opportunity then lies with the ability to give and gift a part of anyone's anatomy to help those who do not have a quality of life and could be improved with the development of technology and a greater health aspect.

The reason that we have discussed this as a family is that I have a son who is a type 1 diabetic, and it is an ongoing issue, as it is for many diabetics in our society, and it is one of those that will never go away. It is due to the collapse of his pancreas at the age of 7 that he is a type 1 diabetic. I note that Adelaide is now participating in the transplant of pancreases. While I recognise that that procedure is still in its infancy, not only for South Australia to take up but also as a development in Australian health accolades, I do know that the diabetics taking this option have to be in a great deal of strife with the management of their sugar, and so forth, because their rejection drugs and those sorts of consequences can be quite onerous with a transplant like this taking place.

However, as we know, technologies get better. We know that the drugs get better. We know that as we progress and we develop these donations and the gift of giving organs, and so forth, right across the board we will become more expert at it, the drugs will be better, the operations will be smaller and the success rate will be higher.

One of the points that was made was that this whole idea of donating organs is a rare event in itself, with the 1 or 2 per cent who die in a hospital being able to then go on and donate organs to those in need. It tells you that a lot of things have to stack up and be in line for an organ transplant to take place, where the organ is absolutely available, in absolute pristine condition and the right mix and match to those who are close to the Organ Donation Register.

Coming back to what we can do as a government, we can recognise that we have a section of the community that suffers from a number of health consequences, maybe not as a consequence of their own lifestyle but because of something they could be born with, just as I believe my son was, when at the age of seven something comes along and kills off the pancreas. Other people can suffer everything from kidney disease, a bad heart and the like.

When the healthiest of us fall on unforeseen circumstances, be it an accident, be it a health issue that takes it, there is nothing worse and good—there are two elements to this. No-one wants to forfeit their life early, but those who are affected, obviously all those close to those individuals, have the opportunity to see that that individual in passing can help a number of lives live to their full potential.

Although I think that the whole aspect of donation can be quite a difficult discussion to take place, if you look beyond that and at the unforeseen circumstances that can or could arise, with something really positive coming out of it, I know and we know as a society those stories of individuals, recognising that one individual was able to help those who were the organ recipients of that one loss, for whatever reason.

There are a couple of highlights I would mention. The member for Mount Gambier has given a couple of local examples, and I mention the highlight of a very well-to-do man, the late Kerry Packer, who required dialysis and needed a kidney. Of all the chances, his helicopter pilot was a match and wanted to donate a kidney to give Kerry Packer a quality of life at the end, which in reality was not that long, but no-one is to know that when it is done. They are the sorts of transplants that can take place on a voluntary basis to the next transplant to those who are beyond help, beyond saving, and it is known that they are going to see the end, and any organ of any value can be taken from them to help those less fortunate.

As we know, we have technologies in place. With diabetes, we have injections and you inject yourself with insulin to compensate for the lack of pancreatic behaviour. There are kidney dialysis machines. There are machines that can operate your heart when you do not have a heart, in other words, to pump the blood around the system. There are those mechanical means, but they provide an absolutely poorer standard of life than the natural organ can for a human. This is why I think it is so important that the government does all it can to highlight the opportunities that are given to every one of us who has a healthy lifestyle to be able to help those less fortunate. I congratulate the member for Mount Gambier on bringing this motion, which I also support.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:55): I have the privilege to speak to the motion brought to the house by the member for Mount Gambier. I will not repeat the motion, but I indicate that we the opposition will be supporting both the original motion and the amendment made by the government, I believe with the blessing of the member for Mount Gambier.

The support of organ donation is one of those wonderful aspects of politics that the vast majority of us here in this place absolutely 100 per cent agree on. Today, obviously, is no different. While numbers vary every year, around 1,500 Aussies, give or take, are waiting for organ transplants. Many people get to a point in their disease where they are very unwell by the time they receive their transplant, and far too many people die while waiting.

One organ donor can save or significantly improve up to 10 lives and improve the lives of those people around the recipient. While to many of us it is a no-brainer and a simple decision, it is not a simple decision for everybody, especially if those people do not understand. If the conversation has not happened before the accident or the tragedy, it makes it extremely difficult at that time for a family to make a decision.

It is an extraordinary thing to understand that your child, partner, parent, sibling or dear friend is not going to wake up and breathe by themselves. It is extraordinary to try to comprehend that they look like they did the day before—they are warm and you can see the lines on the monitors moving

as they are supposed to, the things that go beep are going beep and your loved one's chest is going up and down—but they are not alive, or not alive as we know life to be.

We are so lucky that there are wonderful doctors, nurses and allied health team members who do understand. They understand how difficult this is. They not only understand but they are armed with answers. Great education goes on in our hospitals for the teams involved in organ donor care. Do not get me wrong, there is always more that can be done. Often this costs money and takes time, so the member for Mount Gambier's call for that investment is being supported and heeded, I believe, by everybody in this house. I also acknowledge that there has been an increase in funding from the federal government into this great program that has been improving year upon year.

It is such a privilege to be part of the time in people's lives when they are going in for organ donation. The time caring for people who are donors is a true privilege. As a clinician, I can remember every person I ever looked after who gave their organ. I remember their names, I remember their stories and, most of all, I remember their families. They are people you do not forget, and every single one of them has a powerful story and a loving story.

Sudden brain death is a crazy concept to try to fathom. It is almost impossible to comprehend how your loved one is displaying all the signs of life but really is not truly alive. I remember having the conversation with family members just like it was yesterday. All those conversations are cemented in my mind—it is a really powerful experience.

Family members often implore you to change what you are saying. They beg you to say, 'This isn't right what you just said. Please change. Please tell me it's not true. Please tell me something else.' They want you to confirm that there has been some sort of mistake. It is a really tough conversation to have, and I think that is why all clinicians who have had that conversation at the bedside remember it.

I can honestly say that, even having been an intensive care nurse for many years, I still wanted clinicians to change what they were saying to us as a family. We had the conversation before our son passed away. He asked me about putting his name down as an organ donor on his driver's licence. I told him to look after his organs and not to thrash them because then they would be a lot more useful. He was a good kid. He exercised and was super fit. I know that there is a young child—now not so young, probably a teenager—running around with his valve in his heart who probably kills chicken parma's every night.

There are other families who would have benefited from our son's organs, and it is a true relief to know that. But if I had trouble, as an intensive care nurse, knowing full well what my son wanted, imagine how hard it must be to make the decision if it is something you have just never imagined possible. The importance of the conversation and registering intent can be seen in donor rates. Ninety per cent of families agree to the donation if their loved one is registered and they have had that conversation. It is less than half if the loved one is not registered.

So please have that conversation with your loved ones. Make your wishes known because then the science and the reality become so much easier. It comes back to the simple fact that your loved one would have wanted it. They made it clear. Do not forget as well, as pointed out just previously, that live donors and intended donors are so important. At every DonateLife function I have been to they are heartily acknowledged and welcomed.

Sometimes it becomes impossible for somebody to donate their organs, but if they were an intended organ donor they will be thanked and their family will be acknowledged, so please make your intentions known. DonateLife Week, from Sunday 29 July to Sunday 5 August, is a great time to have that conversation and to encourage others. That brings me to the last part of the motion: the call for the investigation for opt-out legislation.

Again, I know that we are supporting an investigation of this, but I want to make a few points of caution around opt-out legislation. We do not want to ruin or go backwards in what we have achieved in Australia. We are generous and we do well with donation rates. As acknowledged in the amendments, we want to improve those donation rates. There is no evidence here in Australia or internationally that an opt-out system actually improves outcomes or numbers. In fact, in many jurisdictions the opt-out model still insists that there is a consent, so it is a combination approach.

The evidence currently shows that our method, which focuses on that consistent and coordinated approach, is benchmark. It is a model that requires the focus and the education of highly qualified, highly trained nurses, doctors and other clinicians in the hospital system and in the community. I am great friends with many of the team here in South Australia and I thank them for the brilliant work they do. They do an amazing job.

What we have seen in previous years is more than a doubling of the donor rate and about a 75 per cent increase in the transplantation rate since the program was refreshed in 2009 by the then federal Labor government. We need to improve consent rates and improve registration rates. We will do that by awareness and education and an investigation using a bipartisan approach in parliament. Getting the support of media and getting support and input from our communities is one of those magnificent ways we can improve donation rates.

As members of parliament, we can and do play a role. Thank you so much to the member Mount Gambier for bringing a motion to the house that I am deeply connected with and so grateful for. If the member for Mount Gambier would like to do anything at all in Mount Gambier to raise the awareness and importance of the deep value of organ donation, my offer to fund that myself and come down to spend time in Mount Gambier to do that is on the table. I would be deeply privileged to be able to do that with you because it is so important. I know people in the South-East who have benefited. I commend the motion and the amendments to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:05): I will say a few words about this incredibly important issue, and I, too, commend the member for Mount Gambier for bringing it to the house. Many of us have been touched by this issue through either family members who have donated through tragic circumstances or members of our family who might require an organ donation.

In my case, it was one of those things that will always remain with me through the experience of a member of our extended family. We were all called down to the RAH. She was a young, vibrant woman who had much of her life still to live. Unfortunately, she contracted a run-of-the-mill virus and, as a result of that virus, ended up with cardiomyopathy. She lived with that for a few years and then developed pulmonary hypertension. Eventually, her life drew to a close.

The extended family were all there at the RAH as we watched them progressively turn off the machines that were keeping her alive. She was on the list for, ultimately, a heart-lung transplant. Unfortunately, she did not get there, and she did get there not because of an infection that she picked up while at the old RAH, which is not an uncommon story. If she had lived, she was someone who would have desperately needed a heart and a lung.

I have a close friend who now lives in Whyalla. He used to live in Mount Gambier, but he prefers Whyalla far more than Mount Gambier, I have to point out. He was someone who had lived in Mount Gambier all his life. He was a man who came over to a big musical event in Whyalla and he contracted a virus.

Once again, he was an incredibly active individual and a very skilled tradesperson. He was into scuba diving and all sorts of things and, as a result of that virus, he also ended up with cardiomyopathy. He is living with that. He is not on a transplant list and hopefully he will continue to carry on in the way that he is currently going, but that condition has had an incredibly marked impact on his life. It is entirely possible that down the track he might need a transplant. Fingers crossed that he will not, but it is entirely possible.

Even closer to home, since the age of five my daughter has had type 1 diabetes. I listened with interest to the member for MacKillop as he spoke about his son who also has type 1 diabetes, in his case as a result of some significant damage to the pancreas. In most cases, type 1 diabetes is an autoimmune disease.

Even though my daughter is in good health, and she is now 26 and looks after herself, given the sorts of risks that you run with either type 1 diabetes or type 2 diabetes, it is entirely possible that in the future she might need a kidney transplant, but hopefully not. That is incredibly personal stuff. In terms of general principle, but also as a result of what I have been exposed to in my life, I have been a strong supporter of organ donation. I encourage people to take all the necessary steps, including speaking to family members, to ensure that, if something unfortunate happens, you would be in a position to donate organs and assist somebody else.

The member for Mount Gambier flagged the opt-out strategy. It was certainly something that I was interested in. Intuitively, I actually thought it was the right direction to move in. I think it still requires comprehensive investigation, notwithstanding the work that has really been done in other states in Australia when it comes to looking at that particular approach. There are a number of countries, especially in Europe, that have gone in that direction. For some of those countries, it has made hardly any difference whatsoever and for other countries it has improved organ donation rates.

These things are often complex, and there might be a whole raft of other variables at work, but it does not hurt to re-examine it and have a look at where the evidence now lies. I know that a lot of the experts in Australia indicate that the systems that we have in place in Australia, with the opt-in system, are working. However, we need to do more to encourage many more people to be available, if the worst happens, to be in a position to donate their organs.

It is interesting to look at the reasons why people have not opted in. We can all be slack buggers, and that is one of the reasons. When it comes to people being asked, 'Why haven't you opted in?' the two biggest reasons are that they are either too busy—it does not take long—or they have not even thought about it. In terms of that second element especially, if you have not thought about it, anything we can do to get out there in the public eye to promote it might encourage more people to think about it. It is great to see that in South Australia those people who have opted in are, in terms of percentage, the highest in the country, but even we have room to move and build on that.

When it comes to my electorate, there are some real challenges in terms of organ donation. We have the APY lands, where there is a disproportionate number of people with either chronic or acute kidney disease. I am a strong advocate of having on-land dialysis and, hopefully, that will happen in the very near future. I commend the federal government for now adopting the policy to provide a Medicare provider number for that particular service for remote communities. I think that is a good step forward.

When I was first elected to parliament, the members who were then opposite were strong advocates of having dialysis on the lands. We had a transitional approach to it. As the former state government, we introduced the mobile dialysis service, which has been very useful. I think the opposition at the time had it right. There are complexities around it, and I do not deny that, but the opposition at the time had it right in saying that we should have dialysis on the lands. Hopefully, we will see Purple House in the not too distant future do that.

When it comes to organ transplants, once again there is a gap between Aboriginal people, especially in remote communities, and the general population. That is something that needs to be addressed. It is part of a spectrum of disadvantage that Aboriginal people face, especially in remote communities. Organ donation is important in that area as well, and we need to get those numbers up for those people in Aboriginal communities who require donations. In different sections of our population, there are often cultural or other reasons why there is a reluctance to go in the particular direction of being available for organ donation or not.

I will just finish on the opt-out system again for 30 seconds. I think it is worthwhile investigating yet again, but the balance of the evidence in Australia appears to indicate that the system we have in place, though it can be improved, is working quite well.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:15): I also want support the member for Mount Gambier for moving this motion. For me, this highlights the importance of private members' time because it allows the house to debate and raise awareness of many issues which, not for lack of want but more for lack of time, do not get priority at other times in the parliamentary sitting week.

This motion is around acknowledging DonateLife Week, which is being recognised this week from 29 July to 5 August. The week is about raising awareness of organ and tissue donation and encouraging all Australians to register their donation decision on the Australian Organ Donor Register and discuss their donation decisions with their loved ones.

I echo and commend the contributions and remarks of the speakers before me: the members for MacKillop, Hurtle Vale and Giles. The reality is that organ donation does save lives. Every time someone registers to become an organ donor and every time that donation is accepted and used at some point, a life is saved or a quality of life improved.

I want to personally thank everyone who is an organ donor and the families of everyone who has donated an organ. It is singularly one of the most important things one can do to transform a life. In my own family, my mum is the recipient of an organ, and I thank that family—as my whole family does—that anonymous, unknown family whom my family will never know; I thank them for allowing their loved one to donate an organ and allow my mum to have a much better quality of life. Thank you to that family.

It is a very hard decision for families, at times, to accept the consent of a loved one who has said they would like to be an organ donor because by and large, especially in renal cases, kidneys, it is at a time when the loss of one life gives the ability for organs to be donated and harvested. It is a very difficult time. The reality is that organ donation is quite a rare event in Australia. We can do a lot more, and it is actually quite easy to do. In my view, there is no excuse for anyone not to do it.

So I commend the member for Mount Gambier for moving this motion. I think it is important that the house does recognise this; I know that we as a government, as well as the former government, have recognised DonateLife. There is the annual DonateLife service of remembrance held at the Masonic Lodge on North Terrace, and I attended in April this year with the member for Hurtle Vale. The families attended that event, and we listened to their stories of hope and the quality of life that organ donation has given.

I urge every member, if they do not know someone who has been the beneficiary or the family of a giver of an organ, to meet someone and hear their story. Once you have heard their story and recognised the selflessness that act entails, it will remind us all of the importance of organ donation. I think the member for Giles touched on the fact that South Australia has one of the highest participation rates on the national register. I think it is about 68 per cent. This is a great achievement by South Australians through the initiatives that we have, which is really important.

It is up to us to be a lead jurisdiction within COAG in the national framework around DonateLife. I commend the work of DonateLife SA and what they do. With those words, I thank the member for Mount Gambier for raising this important issue within the parliament.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:20): I would like to thank all members who have made a contribution to this very important motion and reiterate the importance of discussing organ donation with your family. If you do have a personal desire, please make that known at least. That is the first step, even if you do not want to go online and formally register. The important thing is to have those conversations so that your wishes are at least known and understood by your family.

Most importantly, I would like to sincerely thank Fiona and Matthew Dixon for allowing me to share their son Adam's story in this place, and Kimberley and Brendan Telford for sharing Kimberley's journey. I wish her all the best. I pray that a donor becomes available and that someone from Mount Gambier is the first to have a transplant in the Royal Adelaide Hospital. That is my wish for a whole range of reasons, not the least of which is the quality of life for Kimberley. With those few words, I commend the motion to the house.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:21): I rise to move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the vital economic contribution and important role that regional and rural South Australia plays;
- (b) acknowledges the state Liberal government's focus and commitment to growing the regional South Australian economy; and
- (c) notes that more than 50 per cent of South Australia's merchandise exports originate from regional South Australia.

South Australia's economy has always relied on regional commodities from its earliest days. This very building actually sits on the site of South Australia's first wheat crop—and a good one at that in those times, at 36 bushels per acre.

Our first exports were regional commodities: wool and copper. Copper from Burra and Kapunda saved South Australia from economic failure in the 1840s. Regarding copper figures today, more than 260,000 tonnes were produced in 2017, worth more than \$2 billion. Copper represents 17 per cent of South Australia's goods exported and 8,300 direct and indirect jobs. We also produce iron ore, mineral sands, gold, silver and uranium, and let's not forget that Coober Pedy is the opal capital of the world.

Regions are responsible for more than a quarter of the gross state product: \$25 billion. The food sector alone employs one in five working South Australians. The state produces some of the best agricultural and food products in the world. Grain and pasture crops—wheat, barley, hay, pulses, canola—with a five-year average of around 8.3 million tonnes generate \$0.6 billion in revenue for the state economy, and 85 per cent of this is exported. We see great livestock exports as well contributing \$4.6 billion. About half the national wine production and 80 per cent of the premium wine production generates more than \$2.3 billion and exports to more than 100 countries.

Horticulture is another important part of the regional economy, which generates over \$3 billion in revenue for the state. Citrus is worth \$90 million and has had huge increases in exports recently. Potatoes are worth well over \$200 million, and South Australia is the leading potato state. Almond export is worth over \$100 million and is growing. We produce 67,000 tonnes of seafood, which is worth more than \$900 million. Finished food production generates more than \$6 billion and more than 140,000 jobs. This is all contributed by what has come from our regions. Farms employ more than 30,000 people directly.

Focusing on an industry I know well, the dairy industry, there are 241 dairy farmers in South Australia, milking about 65,000 cows and producing 5.4 per cent of the national production, which delivers 487 million litres of milk. Much of that milk can also be exported, with \$65 million in dairy exports. There is \$181 million worth of income generated at farm gates, supporting our communities in the regions, and 1,300 jobs directly involved in this.

There has been a huge shift in this sector over the last 40 years. Farms were much smaller in size and their productivity was much lower. The average production per dairy farm has changed enormously, with cows back in the late 1970s producing just over 3,000 litres of milk per year. Today, it is more than double that, with more than 6,500 litres per year. Improving the productivity on their farms is an enormous change and an enormous credit to the dairy farmers of today.

A huge number of smaller farms were involved in the industry previously. Forty years ago, we had another 1,500 dairy farmers. That does not mean that we do not have roughly the same number of farmers still involved in business; it just means that many more of them are actually employees of larger businesses, rather than the one-man and one-woman enterprises that were operated back in the early 1970s.

We continue to see huge efforts made in trying to get better markets for our dairy product exports, as well as other agricultural products. One of the key things I was involved with in my latter years of being involved in the South Australian dairy industry with the South Australian Dairyfarmers' Association, was getting fresh milk out of South Australia into markets in China. At that point in time, no-one was exporting fresh milk from South Australia. There was one business in Queensland that had just got access to exporting fresh milk out of Queensland into China, but no-one from South Australia had even looked at it.

As an association, we decided that there was great potential there, so we looked into this space and were able to establish a supply chain and get the South Australian Dairyfarmers' Association's own brand of milk, SADA Fresh, into China, and it has been exported to China ever since. To me, that was very much about a small association proving to the rest of the industry that it is not that hard.

There were a few challenges, particularly in dealing with some of the laws in China around labelling and trying to make the labels appropriate for the Chinese market and what they required on them. Dealing with the bureaucracy was very challenging, right down to the registration of the SADA Fresh trademark. That was even held up and, amazingly, I still have the email I received back from the Chinese government apologising for the delay, but they had run out of paper to print the

registration. I find it interesting that bureaucracies around the world have similar sorts of problems at times in trying to achieve outcomes.

It is a fantastic effort for an organisation like SADA to get that milk there, and others in this state have gone on to also find markets overseas for fresh milk. It is only a small sector, but it shows the potential that South Australian agriculture, in particular, has in getting into markets like China, other parts of Asia and the Middle East, and I am aware that SADA are working on getting the milk into the Middle East. There is potential all around the world to improve our exports by doing things differently from the way we have done them in the past.

The Marshall Liberal government focuses on growing regional economy, backing business so it can invest in our state with certainty, developing new and innovative products and services, increasing export potential to drive sales and opportunities and creating real and lasting jobs. The measures that we are looking at are the Regional Growth Fund, \$150 million; economic advice and support; stamp duty relief on multi-peril crop insurance; supporting farmers; the review of marine parks; protecting the livestock industries; new trade offices; and opening up our reservoirs—all part of opening our regions to the world.

Over 50 per cent of our merchandise exports are from our regions. A great example of this is the local business of Mountain Fresh Fruit Juices. I had the pleasure of going there recently with the federal minister, Mathias Cormann. It was established more than 40 years ago at Mount Compass, and it has quietly sat and operated in the Mount Compass community, producing fantastic fresh fruit juice products. They are very much based around just fruit juice. There are no preservatives or additives in their fruit juices; it is very much about just juice.

They have done a great job in the 40 years they have been there. They have been able to access many parts of Australia and are now exporting to places like China, Hong Kong, Japan, New Zealand, South Korea, Singapore and Malaysia. They are also available here in Parliament House. Mountain Fresh Fruit Juices is a great product and I commend them for their efforts to establish their business and for how they have not relied on government handouts, etc., to do what they have done. They have done what they can quietly in the community and have developed their markets enormously. I think this is a great example of what regional businesses can do. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:33): In large measure, I welcome this particular motion but, as probably anticipated, I have an amendment. I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraph (b).

The motion would now read:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the vital economic contribution and important role that regional and rural South Australia plays; and
- (b) notes that more than 50 per cent of South Australia's merchandise exports originate from regional South Australia.

Otherwise, the motion reads as is, with that relatively minor amendment.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Giles, could you provide a signed and seconded copy. Thank you.

Mr HUGHES: The reason for the amendment is that it is very early days in the life of this government. In my view, one of those old-fashioned views, we should not be judged on what we say we are going to do; we should actually be judged on the results. When we get down the track a bit, we will be in a position to say what might be good from this Liberal government when it comes to regional development, and the regions in general, and what might be bad. I guess one of the first indicators will be the budget in September to see what is delivered on.

One of the interesting things to date, especially in relation to some of the Dorothy Dixers that have been asked of the ministers, is the willingness to get up and speak in a very positive sense about what is going on in South Australia. However, usually in the responses to those Dorothy Dixers

there is no acknowledgement that the things they are getting up and praising are in large measure a result of initiatives undertaken by the previous government.

The member for Stuart, the Minister for Energy and Mining, got up and waxed lyrical about a number of initiatives, initiatives that were well underway under the previous Labor government, and a whole raft of energy projects, mining projects and a lot of good things going on. In fact, even yesterday on the copper strategy, a great Labor initiative, they waxed lyrical about the work that has been done, the very sophisticated work, including the aerial magnetic surveying and other forms of surveying that have been done in this state to unlock our mineral potential.

In fact, when you follow the history of that particular initiative, which ultimately got the name of PACE, it went all the way back to a previous member for Giles, the late Frank Blevins. That highly innovative approach to unlocking our mineral wealth was an old Labor Party initiative. I acknowledge that the previous Liberal government did not junk that particular strategy and continued to fund it, so I commend that previous government for doing that.

There is a whole raft of other things which were Labor initiatives out there in the regions and which the Marshall government is very desirous of claiming as their initiative. We were a little bit staggered by a media release that went out to regional South Australia, especially in my electorate and the member for Flinders' electorate, with the Marshall government flagging the initiative to protect the oyster industry and talking about the funding that is being provided.

The Liberal government took credit for providing a financial boost to help the state's oyster farmers and said that the Marshall government is now stepping in and will waive almost \$800,000 in fees per year over the next two years. Well, actually that was an initiative of the previous Labor government and the funding was committed. That did not go unnoted in the oyster industry and amongst the media.

I have absolutely no problem with the Marshall government claiming credit for things they do, but they need to get over trying to claim initiatives undertaken by the previous government as their own. It is a bit cheeky; maybe it is politics but, as I said, I am an old-fashioned person and I believe that credit should go where credit is due.

Much of what the member for Finniss had to say was good, and it was a reflection of a lot of those worthwhile things that are going on in regional South Australia. Of course, I, myself, come from regional South Australia. With a bit of a gap of about four or five years, I have essentially lived in regional South Australia since the age of 10, in a community that has been based on mining and manufacturing.

You could well argue that our bent or nuance when it comes to regions is some of those larger manufacturing communities: for instance, the manner in which the state Labor government went to the assistance of Port Pirie when the smelter was under threat and the manner in which the state Labor government went to the assistance of Whyalla when it was facing an existential threat. On top of that, though, we have not been hostile to the primary producers in this state.

Indeed, under the terms of the previous Labor government, the primary industry sector grew. I do not put that down exclusively or anywhere near exclusively to the government. We all know that when it comes to primary industry and to a whole range of other industries all sorts of factors are at play, and it is often global factors that are at play. It might be the state of the Australian dollar or seasonal conditions in Russia, the United States or Canada. There are all sorts of influences when it comes to having an impact on primary industry and other industries in our state.

I will point out that in 2016 there were record levels reached in South Australia in food and wine gross revenue. It was just short of \$20 billion. There was a lot of other good stuff done under the umbrella of the previous state government, but the real credit goes to the primary producers themselves. That is due to the way they have worked over many years and adapted to the conditions, though government does have a role in assisting.

As a state government, we hear that we never did anything for 16 years. I do not know where you were for 16 years if you actually believe that is the case. There were many worthwhile initiatives undertaken by the previous state government to assist regional South Australia. I touched on the PACE program. You can look at some of the real specifics of where the previous state government

got into bed—and this is picking winners—with particular companies to enhance the exploration endeavours in this state.

In my electorate, there is the OZ Minerals Carrapateena development. That was the direct result of the state government going into partnership with a small explorer. As a result of that, over 1,000 jobs are going to be created. Construction has already started at the mine site, so there will be around 500 jobs there during the construction phase, and it is anticipated that when the mine is up and running there will be about 500 jobs there.

We can look at a number of examples like that where the tangible input on the part of the state government has made a real difference. There is talk of the Regional Growth Fund and the criteria being established, and people have been encouraged to put in their bids. In some respects, that is just a rebranding of the program that we already had in place under the Labor government, which also had a \$150 million commitment over 10 years. Ours was going to be CPI adjusted, but I am not sure if those opposite are going to CPI adjust.

Time expired.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:44): I rise to support the original motion of the member for Finniss:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the vital economic contribution and important role that regional and rural South Australia plays;
- (b) acknowledges the state Liberal government's focus and commitment to growing the regional South Australian economy; and
- (c) notes that more than 50 per cent of South Australia's merchandise exports originate from regional South Australia.

I know we have differing points of view in this place sometimes, but we got to about eight minutes into the member for Giles' speech—and I do acknowledge that he is a regional member; he is the regional member for the Labor Party—before I could agree with anything he said.

An honourable member: It's a lonely task.

Mr PEDERICK: It is a lonely task, a lone voice in that wilderness. I commend him for holding his seat. In fact, I happened to be in William Creek the other day. The boundary line is the Oodnadatta Track, and I could be in Stuart one minute and Giles the next, the two biggest seats in the state. It was a very interesting place to—

Mr Hughes: Yes, but the member for Stuart gets the pub and our side misses out on the pub.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, well, I slept in your electorate, and I might have met some new friends in the member for Stuart's electorate. Be that as it may, the member for Giles gave some interesting reflections. Over the whole time I have been in this place, apart from being the member for Hammond and a farmer, I have been a shadow parliamentary secretary for agriculture and I have been a shadow minister for agriculture. That does not mean that I am an expert, but I guess I know a bit about the subject.

Sadly, what I saw over all the time I have been here was money ripped out of the primary industries budget—ripped out time and again. It saddened me as time went on, under the relentless bashing on the regions by the previous Labor government, when decades ago we had such a strong focus on agriculture and how we in fact—and I have mentioned this in the house before—exported our skills to the world. When I say 'our skills', we took our technology—our John Shearer equipment and other equipment—to the Middle East, for example, and taught other people not just how to farm but to farm with product made right here in South Australia.

I agree with the member for Giles that it is the farmers who make the difference. They certainly do, and they contribute across our regional economy in this state \$25 billion in final finished food products. Sadly, while the member for Giles knows what it is like to go north of Gepps Cross, not many others on the other side do. In fact, when the previous government was in place they had

to set up regional cabinet meetings, and the ministers had to look up mapping apps so they could work out where regional South Australia was and how to get there.

Ms Wortley interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: No, it is a fact. I have heard the stories. I have heard the previous minister say, 'How far away to this place?' in conversations they have had with members from this side. Our side has regional members from right across South Australia, from down at MacKillop right over to the West Coast and the beautiful area the member for Flinders represents. Apart from that, we have members right throughout the Fleurieu as well as Yorke Peninsula—the member for Narungga—and others right across.

That creates an influence on a party that is committed with its Regional Growth Fund of \$150 million over 10 years and committed with a \$10 million blackspot funding arrangement, instead of a paltry amount. I think it was about \$1.6 million in the whole time Labor were in, I believe, for mobile blackspot funding in this state.

I talked about mobile blackspot funding just then, and I must commend Optus for some of the work they are doing in the outback at places like William Creek and Marree, where I was the other day. They have small cell technology there, working off satellite. While I was at William Creek, they had a crew there looking at expanding that process. That will connect not only the two million tourists who visit the outback every year across South Australia and the Northern Territory, and round the whole Diamantina, Queensland, and New South Wales area, but also the station owners and people who operate in that area.

On this side, to back our regional communities, we are backing regional health. We are putting more regional health practitioners into regional areas. We are certainly making sure that education is upgraded to the right standard and that people do not just stay in the regions but are attracted to regional South Australia by the many employment opportunities that are there. I tell you what, it is hard. It is very hard at the moment this year in South Australia. There are varying fortunes right across the state, with some people in serious forms of drought through to some people who are looking as if they will get a reasonable crop. From what I have seen, it is terrible in the Eastern States, especially in Queensland and New South Wales.

I would like to commend what our hardworking men and women do in regional South Australia. They have done it with very little support. On this side, we are committed to making sure that we get those right outcomes. In regard to transport, which is one thing I have not canvassed yet in my contribution, we want to make sure that we can have efficient transport systems throughout the state instead of there being a \$1 billion backlog in road funding, as there is at the minute in South Australia.

We want to make sure that we get our roads back, as with those that have just had the signs changed from 110 km/h to 100 km/h. That is easy. That is the easy option. That is the option the previous government took. We lose all that productivity from people getting to where they need to be, getting products to export, and it impacts right across South Australia. With those few remarks, I commend the motion by the member for Finniss and salute the work that everyone in regional South Australia does.

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:52): I rise today to support the amendments proposed by the member for Giles to this motion. While I do not live in regional South Australia now, I was born in Whyalla, in the Spencer Gulf area. It was a very positive experience with my family and my mum and dad as they started out their life together.

I would like to reflect on some of the great Labor achievements in the regional areas. Most significantly, let's consider the 6,000 direct and indirect jobs in Whyalla with the sale of Arrium. We provided significant support to modernise and expand the Arrium steelworks. We supported 750 direct jobs and thousands of indirect jobs with the \$660 million Nyrstar redevelopment in Port Pirie.

BHP added 120 new jobs to the already 350 jobs previously announced for the \$350 million Olympic Dam smelter upgrade. Development of the \$916 million copper mine at Carrapateena generated about 1,000 jobs in construction and 550 ongoing jobs. SolarReserve committed to

building a \$650 million solar thermal power station at Port Augusta, and we have seen significant greenhouse developments at Sundrop Farms near Port Augusta.

We have seen ZEN Energy's \$700 million plan to establish one gigawatt of additional renewable generation assets in Whyalla and Port Augusta, and of course we cannot forget the \$500 million invested in the Hornsdale wind farm near Jamestown, operated by Neoen. Costa has invested \$60 million to expand its mushroom production facility at Monarto, creating 200 jobs in South Australia's Murray and Mallee region. Of course, Big River Pork's \$14 million expansion will expand and enhance production at Murray Bridge.

Dairy farmers who are here in the house will know that Blue Lake Dairy Group has a \$64 million expansion of its milk processing plant at Tantanoola in the state's South-East. According to the latest data from DPC, in the 12 months to April 2018 the value of South Australia's overseas goods exports total \$11.8 billion, and this is up 6 per cent on the previous 12 months. We know that our regions matter and we know that they contribute to this. During this period, wine exports were up 19 per cent, wheat was up 24 per cent, petroleum-related products were up 174 per cent, copper was up 8.4 per cent, and machinery was up by 10 per cent.

Labor's premium food and wine strategy saw gross food and wine revenue reach a record \$19.97 billion in 2016-17, and overseas exports of food and wine research were a record \$5.64 billion. Labor backed our producers of premium food and wine through a range of measures, including the membership of the Great Wine Capitals Global Network, the introduction of the annual \$1.8 million South Australian Wine Industry Development Scheme, annualising the Tasting Australia festival, and funding a range of development and export grants. I am proud of the record that we have as our state and I support the amended motion.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:56): I thank all those members for making comment on the motion and I very much support the member for Hammond's words about some of the things that have been missing, particularly over the last 16 years, regarding the investment in roads. Certainly, through the area of Finniss and neighbouring seat of Mawson, the old seat of Finniss, there have been significant issues in trying to get B-double access. It is an issue not just in those areas but also through parts of the Adelaide Hills to allow the South Australian agricultural producers, horticultural producers and forestry to compete with other businesses in South Australia and interstate.

There are many areas where there has been neglect and I think it is a real shame that we have just heard that much of the focus of the regional investment of the previous 16 years has been very much around the member for Giles' electorate and adjoining areas. To me, that is not the regions of South Australia; that is one region of South Australia, and we need to make sure the areas right around rural parts of South Australia are recognised.

We need to make sure that those communities receive the same support that we have seen going to other communities across the state, both metropolitan and regional, to make sure that we see our state continue to prosper. As we see here on the carpet of this chamber, the key parts of this economy of South Australia have very much been based on the regions with the wheat and the grapes. I certainly commend my motion to the house without the amendment.

Amendment negatived; motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:01): I give notice that on Thursday 2 August, I will move that a message be sent to the Legislative Council requesting that the Treasurer be permitted to attend at the table of the house on Tuesday 4 September 2018 for the purpose of giving a speech in relation to the Appropriation Bill.

The SPEAKER: I do not think that has happened since 1999.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Since 2001.

The SPEAKER: Since 2001.

Mr Koutsantonis: A stranger in the house, sir.

The SPEAKER: Indeed.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today, year 12 students and two staff members from Salisbury East High School, who are guests of the member for King.

Question Time

ROMALDI, MR M.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier now publicly denounce the offensive, sexist and racist remarks made by former South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission member, Mario Romaldi?

Mr Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:03): Thank you very much, Mr Speaker. Following the allegations, which were made in the house yesterday, I took the opportunity to review the material that was referred to in the house. It was completely inappropriate, it was offensive and certainly nobody on this side of the house would condone those messages or reposts, so I took the opportunity at the very earliest opportunity to call Mr Romaldi. He offered his resignation and I accepted that resignation. He is no longer a member of the SAMEAC. We have taken action on this issue at the very earliest opportunity.

ROMALDI, MR M.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier ask Mr Romaldi to resign?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04): I have just given that information in my previous answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! Leader of the Opposition.

ROMALDI, MR M.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier take his time and wait for Mr Romaldi to offer his resignation, rather than ask for it immediately upon his attention being drawn to this information?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04): I would like to take this opportunity to answer this question, not that I think I need to. I have provided all the information to the house that is required. But it is interesting the double standard that those opposite are offering to the house today. It wasn't that long ago when there was some absolutely outrageous language used by a cabinet minister of the former government.

The former government minister of the Crown referred to another interstate minister of the Crown in an absolutely vulgar and completely unacceptable way, using a term that I would never, ever utter in this house. What was the standard that was applied by the former government? The Leader of the Opposition sat in the cabinet alongside the person, the minister, who used that completely and utterly unacceptable language and did nothing. Is the Leader of the Opposition suggesting to this house that he is going to stand up today and call for the resignation of that former minister, or maybe—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —his frontbencher, sitting just two seats away from him—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —at the moment? We know what the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption said against the former treasurer's language—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —used directly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to senior members of the Public Service—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —yet no consequences, no consequences whatsoever. The double standard of those opposite is appalling. The Leader of the Opposition, if he had a shred of decency, would be calling for the member sitting two seats behind him to take responsibility for his outrageous behaviour towards members of our Public Service. Move him to the backbench. Let me tell you what I did: we actually took action. I called Mr Romaldi—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —he offered his resignation. It was accepted straightaway.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for King, I call to order the following members: the leader, the deputy leader, the member for Playford, the member for Badcoe, the member for Kaurna and the Minister for Education.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I am also advised today in the house that we have present with us the Hon. Anne Levy, who was an MLC, I am advised, from 1975 to 1977, the first female President of the Legislative Council, a guest of the member for Hurtle Vale. Welcome to you.

Question Time

ECONOMIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on the establishment of the Economic Advisory Council and how the council will contribute to our state's future economic development?

The SPEAKER: The Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07): Thank you very much, sir, and I would like to thank the member for King for her important question regarding the advice that I am receiving via the Economic Advisory Council. As you would be aware, sir, in the lead-up to the last election we said that we would not be continuing with the economic development board, which was established under the former government, although at the time I did pay my grateful thanks to the former members of the economic development board. Each of them has made a valuable contribution to this state.

However, as a group, we thought new government, new opportunity for different advice in a different format, and that's exactly what we did after the election. So we disbanded, with thanks to the former members, the economic development board, and I have now established my own Economic Advisory Council, and I am very pleased to let this house know that we have already held our very first meeting.

Mr Odenwalder: I'll have a look at Facebook.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: One of the members of that Economic Advisory Council is, of course, Professor Tanya Monro. She was a member of the former economic development board, and we thought that it was important to keep that continuity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —with the board. As I said, they did a lot of work and provided some useful advice to government. Unfortunately, very rarely did the former government adopt that information or that advice. In fact, I have a lot of reports that, of course, were prepared, and a lot of work was done by that board. Not a lot of action was implemented. We will be keeping that continuity with the former board. I met with the former board, prior to announcing the composition of the new board, to get a download. I was joined by other members of cabinet and it was a very fruitful meeting.

We took a strong plan for real change to the last election—more jobs, lower costs and better services—and these are specifically the things that the new board are advising us on. They come from a range of different backgrounds, including information technology, entrepreneurship, defence, banking and finance, education, tourism, mining, scientific research and overall economic development. Most importantly, they understand the value of the private sector here in this state and the range of different connections to industry that I am already finding very valuable.

Most importantly, I think it's important to update the house that these people have not been offered, nor sought, any remuneration for the time that they are putting in to providing this advice to me. They are doing this because they are passionate South Australians.

Mr Koutsantonis: They are still public officers.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are—

Mr Koutsantonis: They are still public officers.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens will cease interjecting.

Mr Koutsantonis: I'm just assisting the house, sir.

The SPEAKER: I don't think you are.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They are providing that advice free of charge to the people of South Australia because they are passionate South Australians. They believe in our future. They want us to get ahead in South Australia and that is precisely what we want to do as well. I am happy to report on some of the important issues that we have already discussed: (1) is ensuring that we maximise the defence opportunity that is coming to our state; (2) is looking at the important area of skills and making sure that we fix up the mess left by the previous government, who didn't have the right level of technical skills being put in place to make sure that we could deliver on these defence opportunities.

We have also discussed making sure that we are maximising the opportunities for increased trade, economic activity and investment in our economy and, most importantly, supporting business by lowering taxes, removing regulation and building productive infrastructure. These are the things that we are considering. I am looking forward to our second meeting.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the member for Waite. The Leader of the Opposition.

ROMALDI, MR M.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier asked Mr Romaldi to apologise for his offensive posts and comments?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): As I mentioned in my previous answer, he has apologised. When I spoke to him yesterday, Mr Romaldi was quite clear. He regretted any offence that was taken from those comments, and I understand that I included that in my press release that was put out yesterday.

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order and warned. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by the comments made by his assistant multicultural affairs minister that the selection process for SAMEAC was 'very thorough'?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): As per usual, we never get a complete quote from those on the opposition benches. That is probably why they are on the opposition benches.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I went through the process yesterday. It was a cabinet consideration and it was an important board that we were recruiting for. The previous members of the SAMEAC board's time came to an end on 30 June. We took that opportunity for a total refresh.

Mr Malinauskas: Super fresh.

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said in my previous answer, I am surprised at the opposition, with their very poor track record in taking responsibility for the outrageous comments—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —not of members that they have appointed to boards—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but of their own team, the people they sit next to in cabinet. Where is the shadow minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Where is the shadow minister for women standing up saying that the behaviour, the language and the attitude of her colleagues in her caucus is completely outrageous? Where is the statement from Labor? Where was the resignation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: In fact, the double standard is so delicious. It's just so delicious. Where was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Could the Premier please be seated.

Mr Odenwalder: Good ruling, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned. The Premier can continue.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order? This better not be a bogus point of order.

Mr KOUTSANTONIS: Personal reflections on members, sir. The Premier is insinuating that members of the opposition have made remarks offensive to women.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Point of order on the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The rulings of successive Speakers have been that, if a member takes offence at something specific to them, they can raise that point of order. The member reminds us that he has been here for 21 years, and he should know better.

The SPEAKER: I uphold that point of order. The Minister for Education is correct. I asked the Premier to sit down because he was being constantly interjected by members on my left. I will not hesitate to intervene if I need to restore the house to order. Premier, please continue.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. I was just pointing to my incredulous response to the continuing line of questioning from those opposite. It goes without saying that I would have thought that, if they are so ropeable about this current scenario that effected a resignation within an hour, they might have had a similar attitude towards some of their fellow members of their caucus who had senior roles in the former government: cabinet ministers sitting alongside the Leader of the Opposition.

There's been a lot on, and maybe I got it wrong, but I cannot recall the Leader of the Opposition, I cannot recall the shadow minister for women, making comments about the suitability of the outrageous comments made by their former cabinet colleagues. If they—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Which comments?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Which comments? Well, I think most of us recall a certain fracas that occurred on Leigh Street, inside and outside Rigoni's.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Now, I'm not going to repeat in this—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not going to repeat—

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Do not.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in this house precisely what was said. But let me tell you, it was outrageous. I'm not going to repeat the words that were referred to in the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption's comments in his final report regarding Gillman, but it goes without saying that the former treasurer had to apologise for that. Did he lose his job? Is he still on the front bench? Actually, he's pulling the strings of this dodgy opposition opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The reality is that those opposite are absolutely hypocritical on this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They all seem very upset today. They've got their grumpy faces on, and that's because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They've got their grumpy faces on—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will not interject.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —because they've realised that the people of South Australia will be judging them as the hypocrites that they are.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call to order the Minister for Transport, who has been doing it all day. The member for Badcoe is warned, the member for Kaurna is warned, and I call to order the Minister for Child Protection. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MULTICULTURAL AND ETHNIC AFFAIRS COMMISSION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is again to the Premier. Does the Premier still believe that his due diligence process for appointing SAMEAC board members was thorough and appropriate?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18): I have answered this question multiple times, and I do not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —intend to waste the time of this parliament on this issue any further.

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell has the call. She will be heard in silence.

BOARD MEMBER APPOINTMENTS

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:18): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier undertake a review of the government's due diligence processes for the appointment of board members?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18): I thank the member for her question. That will be a matter for cabinet.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen.

HOTEL INDUSTRY

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:18): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has the call.

Mr TEAGUE: My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General inform the house on recent achievements in the hotel industry and the particular role of the hotel industry in growing SA jobs?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:18): I am happy to do so, and I thank the member for Heysen for the question, particularly as he has now taken a slice of Bragg into the seat of Heysen, and some good news comes with that.

Last week, the Australian Hotels Association of South Australia hosted their annual awards at the Entertainment Centre. Our Premier and the Minister for Tourism attended to represent the government at these important awards, which some 800 guests attended. It was a great night, and if any of those from the opposition were there I commend their attendance as well.

The member for Heysen must be excited, having celebrated the recognition of Crafers Hotel—formerly in Bragg—for being best overall hotel in the state. It took five awards all-up for its accommodation, bistro dining, redevelopment and apprentice training. On the night, the judges said that since the hotel changed hands in 2014 the Crafers Hotel had been transformed into 'a French inspired, uniquely stylish gastropub'—sounds very Bragg, doesn't it?—which offers 'delicious food, exceptional wines and well-priced accommodation'.

It is a huge achievement for Ed and Julie Peter, with shareholders Brett Matthews and Jodi Brumby, who should be proud of the contribution they make to South Australia and our local communities. Currently, our South Australian hotels in this industry employ roughly 26,500 people and the flow-on effects of the successful hospitality businesses can be felt in our local communities and beyond. The importance of pubs and hotels in our communities is immense, assisting those who work there, local community clubs, sporting clubs and residents.

Other winners on the night include the Uraidla Hotel (also formerly in Bragg), the Port Admiral Hotel, the Cathedral, Sevenhill, Playford, Mount Lofty House, the Feathers—both still thankfully in Bragg—Sporties, Warradale, the Vine Inn, Largs Pier, the Port Lincoln Hotel, the Lion and many more. For all members who represent areas in which these hotels have been acknowledged and service their community, I am sure that they should also feel immensely proud and pass on their congratulations.

As the minister responsible for consumer and business services, I note that the work the AHA and hotels more broadly do is excellent. Notably, the contribution of some \$161 million in capital investment in our regional areas in the last five years has been referred to, and \$4.025 million in South Australia's gross state product.

I would like to thank all owners, managers and employees of the South Australian pubs and hotels for their ongoing work. I look forward to visiting many of these great venues that have won awards at this year's award. I will be drinking soda water, I think, given the Premier's new edict about alcohol. I wish them the very best in the upcoming—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: No interest in malbec?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —national awards in the Gold Coast later this year.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned, as is the member for West Torrens. The member for Reynell.

ROMALDI, MR M.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it is appropriate that Mr Romaldi is remunerated for any SAMEAC meetings attended, considering his sexist, offensive public comments?

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order from the Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 97, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I uphold the point of order. We had a similar thing yesterday. I will move to the government, and I will come back to the opposition. The member for Newland.

FIREFIGHTERS, INTERNATIONAL DEPLOYMENT

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport will not interject. The member for Newland has the call.

Dr HARVEY: My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. How is South Australia supporting firefighters in the United States?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:23): I thank the member for the question and note the member for Newland has a very keen interest in particular in the CFS but in all the emergency services in our state. I was pleased but not surprised to learn this week that the Country Fire Service, in addition to the MFS and SES and the Department for Environment and Water, was approached to assist firefighters in the United States. Just a short time ago before entering the house, I was made aware of another request for a team of specialists that has been made for deployment to British Columbia to help with Canadian wildfires. This is now in the planning stage and I will have more to say about that and the participation in that in the next few days.

Getting back to the first request for assistance to the United States, this was made to all states and territories and New Zealand to assemble a team comprising more than 180 firefighters. The CFS identified two specialist staff, with another who will be seconded from the Department for Environment and Water. They will leave tomorrow for a briefing in Sydney before heading to the United States for a 42-day deployment. This reflects favourably on the capability and expertise in our workforce in South Australia, who will no doubt provide valuable assistance towards a long and protracted firefighting effort in the United States.

There have been more than 130 significant fires burning in the north-west of the United States that have swept through more than 376,000 hectares across 14 states between Texas and Alaska, and into Canada. These devastating fires have also sadly claimed the lives of two firefighters along the way. So, when it came out this week to tap into our firefighting resources, our emergency services swung into action to provide much-needed assistance for this effort.

The two specialist CFS firefighting staff who will be deployed to California after being briefed in Sydney tomorrow are Dyson Taverner and Phillip Tapscott, and from the Department for Environment and Water, Mr Ross Anderson. Their deployment will add to two other CFS staff who are already in Melbourne at the Emergency Management Victoria base helping to coordinate the Australia-New Zealand deployment contingent.

The CFS has approximately 150 full-time employees, and this request from the United States required a very specific skill set for highly qualified firefighters for a 42-day deployment. As you would understand, 42 days away from home and working in these sorts of conditions is a very, very big ask. The CFS balanced its operational requirements while preparing for the forthcoming fire danger season but was also keen to provide assistance without impacting on its planning commitments. This is something that is not foreign to our emergency services, with the CFS and MFS previously having been involved in overseas deployments to help other countries when required.

As recently as last June, CFS staff were deployed to Kiribati in the Central Pacific to create a firefighting service. At this time of year, three CFS incident management team specialists were deployed to British Columbia to help with Canadian wildfires. International deployment requests are becoming more common, and our emergency services crews never let us down, by always being ready and prepared to respond to these calls.

I would like to convey on behalf of the people of South Australia my best wishes to the two CFS officers who will be deployed to the United States, and the member from the Department for Environment and Water. They are amongst many other candidates from around Australia who are placed in a national pool before being selected. We are proud of their service and commitment, and wish them a safe return to their homes and families.

ROMALDI, MR M.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it is appropriate that Mr Romaldi is remunerated for any SAMEAC meetings attended, considering the reasons for his resignation?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27): I am not aware of any payments that have been made in this area, but I will make inquiries and I will inform the member.

ROMALDI, MR M.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:27): My question is again to the Premier. Why did the Premier's statement to the media yesterday specifically highlight that Mr Romaldi's comments were made some years ago? Does the Premier consider that the time frame somehow lessens their impact?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27): No, I think I was just highlighting the fact that they certainly weren't made while he was a commissioner, but that in no way diminishes the offensive nature of those comments.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY VISITS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister made time to get out on the front line and personally meet young people in residential care?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:28): I thank the member for her important question. Yes, of course I have. That was one of the most important things for me. When you were questioning me on lists of commissioners and other people, I made it quite clear that one of my most important duties would be to meet with staff on the front line and to meet with children in residential care, foster care and kinship care. I have done that throughout the regions and throughout the metropolitan area, and I have more booked in the coming weeks.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY VISITS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:28): Supplementary, Mr Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Supplementary.

Ms STINSON: Can the minister inform the house of further meetings with children that she has scheduled or that she has requested?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:29): Well, I don't have a copy of my diary on me, but I do know that I am out, I believe, in Morphett Vale next week. I am meeting with SNAICC this Friday, helping with kids being allocated backpacks who live in residential care. I have a very full diary, as you know—you have FOI'd it before—and I will continue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —to meet with as many children as possible. I've got plans to go to Port Lincoln. We're working on diary arrangements with the local member so he can drive me to Ceduna. Everything I do is about the best interests of children in my guardianship, and I will continue to do so.

COPPER MINING

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on recent milestones at Olympic Dam and its importance to the economy?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:29): Thank you again to the member for Hammond for this important question. Yes, I was very pleased to give an update on the importance of copper more broadly yesterday. But, in a little bit

more detail with regard to the member's question about Olympic Dam, Olympic Dam is the largest operating underground mine in Australia. It is a very important business for our state and our nation.

BHP, which operates the Olympic Dam mine, released some information very recently. In fact, on 18 July BHP released its operational review for the fourth quarter for the 2018 financial year, so April, May, June just gone. Some quick points to share with the house and the member for Hammond that came out of that report are:

- Olympic Dam achieved 137,000 tonnes of copper cathode production for the year;
- there's a strong recovery from the major smelting maintenance work undertaken last year;
- BHP obtained their first ore from the high-grade southern mine area—

An honourable member: Hear, hear!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Yes, a very positive development. This requires less processing, and the maintenance work allows this area to be developed. BHP also produced the first copper cathode from its heap leach trial, another very important development.

These innovations will help underpin steady growth. There are more investments planned to upgrade surface perforations and increase production from the southern mine area, as I just mentioned. I am very pleased with BHP's information for the market, that up from 137,000 tonnes these investments and innovations could produce between 200,000 and 220,000 tonnes of copper cathode this financial year.

This important information is not only about the company's performance but it is actually about South Australia—very important, obviously, for the Roxby Downs community, which is not only important for the people who live and work right there but it is a very important service centre for outback South Australia, and very important for employment across our state, whether that be direct employment with BHP or the multitude of contractors who work for companies supporting BHP and not only at Olympic Dam but in other parts of the state as well, including here in Adelaide.

This production is very important to our state's royalties income. Very importantly, one of the things that the mining industry does, as well as generating wealth across our state, is contribute an income stream directly into the state government based on their productivity, which then goes through Treasury on to fund other important expenditure on behalf of taxpayers. So it is a very important area of mining.

It would be remiss of me to talk about Olympic Dam and BHP without mentioning OZ Minerals at Prominent Hill and Carrapateena. Carrapateena is going to be the very next mine up and operating in South Australia, just on the western edge of Lake Torrens in the electorate of Giles. It is a very important development, and OZ Minerals is doing a fantastic job there.

There are two shining examples of copper in South Australia. Let me say, exploration is flourishing and our government is doing important work with the Geological Survey of South Australia, providing information to explorers. I would like to acknowledge the Hon. Roger Goldsworthy, who all members of this house recognise as one of the most important people to unlock this wealth generation many decades ago.

CHILDREN IN RESIDENTIAL CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. What measures is the minister exploring to reduce the incidence of young people absconding from residential care?

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier will not interject.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:34): There are a lot of initiatives that my department is working on. We are going through all the Nyland royal commission recommendations. There are many areas to work on, as the former minister would know.

It's working on every part at the same time. The more I visit the residential care facilities, the more I meet the children and the more idea I have about their lives and how I can improve their lives.

RESIDENTIAL CARE FACILITY VISITS

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:34): Can you name any examples?

The SPEAKER: Sorry, member for Badcoe, is the question to the minister?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will be quiet.

Ms STINSON: You were all new once.

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe, would you like to just rephrase that, please. Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms STINSON: My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister name any examples?

Honourable members: Of what?

Ms STINSON: Of what she is doing to ensure that children are not absconding from residential care.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right, I am really struggling to hear the question with the wall of noise on my right. Minister, would you like—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite will be quiet, and he is warned for a second and final time. Could the member for Badcoe please repeat the entire question, and members on my right will be quiet.

Ms STINSON: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister name some examples of the measures that she is exploring to reduce the incidence of young people absconding from residential care?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:35): It is a good question because it is very important, and this is something that I questioned the former minister on: why are so many absconding and why aren't you doing something about it? As we know, in the 2008 Mullighan report, secure overnight facilities were recommended. The Labor government did nothing for a whole 10 years about that recommendation.

We know that in 2016, in the Nyland Royal Commission, again secure therapeutic services were recommended. The Labor government accepted the recommendation and put it into phase 3, which doesn't come into fruition until 2022. They thought it was so important—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —that they would wait a whole election cycle before even addressing the issue. Our government has placed importance on secure therapeutic care. The Deputy Premier fought hard in opposition; she spoke many times about the need for secure overnight facilities. As a consequence of that, my department is now looking at ways of bringing that recommendation forward (I believe it is 152), so we are addressing it.

The department is working hard to address ways. I believe there are therapeutic secure facilities in Victoria and New South Wales, which are models that we are looking into. We are doing everything we can. I am also meeting with children. I believe that we need to identify what children

are running from or what they are running to. Why are they leaving the facilities? Through meeting them, that is what I am establishing, and I am continuing that work.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe. The Minister for Education will cease interjecting.

CHILDREN IN RESIDENTIAL CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. What progress has the minister made in arranging the opera performances she detailed on FIVEaa on Monday 23 July as a solution to teenagers absconding from residential care?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:37): Well, I would like to say that's completely taken out of context. It was certainly not the intent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —at all, okay? It is a shocking interpretation. What I was suggesting in that conversation was meeting these children and identifying why they are leaving, what they are running from, what they are running to, how we engage them, why they aren't at school, why they are involved in risky behaviours. Of course, we would love them to be at school.

If they are not interested in school, as with one of the girls I spoke to—her only interest that she identified was singing. I said, 'Well, why don't we look into whether there are any local choirs, whether there are singing lessons available.' If that is the one passion she has in life, and she is under our guardianship, why wouldn't you look into it?

By consequence, a few days later I was at a Queen's Birthday church service at Christ Church and I met some ladies from Co-Opera, so it happened to come up that I mentioned someone interested in singing. It wasn't that they are having an opera career; it was any people that I meet that have ideas of engaging our young people in work or in extracurricular activities—horseriding, football, tennis.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: You need to engage these children. You need to identify what interests them, and that is what I am trying to achieve.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Morphett, I call to order the following members: the Minister for Industry, the Premier, the Deputy Premier and the member for Lee. The member for Morphett has the call.

CHELIAH, MR S.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister please update the house on the success of correctional services officer Sashi Cheliah?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:39): I thank the honourable member for his question and note that he is an absolute whiz in the kitchen. I am excited to update the house on the outstanding achievement of one of our correctional services case management coordinators, Sashi Cheliah—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —the latest winner of *MasterChef Australia*. What an outstanding result! I'm sure there are many members in this place who have been absolutely glued to their television sets over the past few months, so Sashi and his success will be of no news to them. For

those who have not had the time or perhaps the inclination to catch up on *MasterChef*, I am pleased to provide a bit of background information on South Australia's second *MasterChef* winner.

As I mentioned, Sashi is a case management coordinator at the Adelaide Women's Prison where his day-to-day role includes engaging with prisoners in custody from their initial admission through to their final day in custody. Sashi was born in Singapore and, as the eldest of seven children, was introduced to food through his mother's cafe. He grew up helping his mother and aunty cook meals for their growing family. It was his younger years spent cooking and eating Indian, Malaysian and Chinese food and his love for food all round that inspired Sashi's cooking and led to a record score of 93 out of 100—the highest ever result for a *MasterChef Australia* winner.

Sashi's wife, Rabicca, and his two young sons, Marcus and Ryan, were with Sashi during the final cook, supporting him from the sidelines and cheering him on, as were many South Australians. Before moving to Australia in 2011, Sashi was based in the STAR unit of the Singapore Police Force for nearly a decade. Not unlike the skills you need to compete in *MasterChef*, Sashi is highly trained in dealing in special tactics and rescue operations.

Of course, Sashi's success builds on that of previous South Australians, including former winner Adam Liaw, runner up Callum Hann, Andre Ursini, Laura Cassai and Poh, not to mention other excellent contestants from our great state who have competed along the way. I understand that Sashi has indicated that his post-*MasterChef* success will see him working with people in custody, helping to improve the skills of prisoners and link them with opportunities in the food and hospitality industry on the outside.

Sashi collected \$250,000 prize money and he is talking about opening potentially a restaurant in the city or maybe in Prospect. I might try to entice him down to Brighton as well, if we can. His idea of working with prisoners to improve their skills for when they are released, I think, is absolutely wonderful, and I know that a number of the industry programs that are happening through the Department of Correctional Services within the prison system are absolutely outstanding.

In the Women's Prison, they actually have a new kitchen facility in the Ruby Unit, and that is improving the skills of people so that when they leave prison they can give back to the community, get a job and pay their way through being constructive members of society. I have also been down to the Mount Gambier Prison, the Port Augusta Prison, Yatala as well, and some of the industry operations happening there are with furniture work, metalwork, creating industrial bins.

The sewing groups are absolutely outstanding. They are doing some really good work and these prisoners are getting the skills they need to get back and engage in the workforce after serving, which gives them the opportunity to give back to society, which is outstanding. This is all factual stuff. None of this has just been gleaned from Facebook. I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Sashi on his success—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —and thank him for the outstanding work that he has done within our correctional services sector.

CHILDREN IN RESIDENTIAL CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. What progress has the minister made in introducing etiquette or deportment classes for young people in residential care, and what does she see as the benefits of such a program?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:43): I thank the member for her question. There are no plans for those courses; however, having a business in that industry for 18½ years, I have absolutely seen the benefits. Many of the past students work in this house, many of the members of parliament of this house have sent their children to do these exact courses multiple times. Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will not interject. Order! A supplementary?

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite, you are on the edge today.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I might do that. The member for Badcoe has the call. Members on my left, be quiet please.

CHILDREN IN RESIDENTIAL CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:44): My supplementary question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister clarify that she has never raised the proposal of having etiquette or deportment classes for children in state care?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: the shadow minister has basically repeated her previous question.

The SPEAKER: I will allow this question. It is on the edge. If members on my left will be quiet, I will allow the question. Minister, would you like to respond.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:45): Sure. I have been meeting with many, many department officers, hundreds of people literally, to discuss any and all ideas. I welcome all suggestions, including my own, to be discussed and thought of and floated. So, of course; I have 18 years in the industry. I see great benefit in all engagement, whether it is in confidence, whether it is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —yes, getting jobs, job interview skills, speech classes. There are lots of things children can learn. There are no plans to be running these at this point but I have spoken at length with many people with any ideas that will improve the lives of our children because all I think about is how can I do a better job than they have had for 16 years? These children were neglected and it is time that we put some effort into them.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. What progress has the minister made on her child protection gala awards night?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:46): I don't know what you are referring to, I'm sorry.

The SPEAKER: Would you like to clarify, member for Badcoe?

Ms STINSON: Sure, yes. My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. I will reword it and give you a bit more information. Does the minister still intend to hold a gala awards night, as she stated on ABC radio on 5 April, which would be, and I quote, 'a bit like Channel 7 and 9 have their awards nights'?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Thank you for the question. It's fantastic to be always taken out of context. I believe that was referring to an interview where we were talking about staff and the fact that many reviews right back from the Layton inquiry talked about the toxic culture in the department and the need to change. One of the ways to change the department—besides a change of government, which is the most perfect way to change the culture—is to meet with the staff, many of whom, I must say when I was in Noarlunga, the last minister they met was David Wotton, as I have mentioned here before.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: For me, it is about meeting the staff. To change the culture, you need—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will not interject. The minister has the call. The deputy leader and the Premier will not interject at each other. Please cease interjecting, Premier.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be quiet. The minister has the call and she will be heard in silence.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As we know from the many and varied millions of dollars that were spent on reviews and reports, there was always an underlying toxic culture, a culture of cover up, of butt covering. People were too scared to ever put their views forward. They were oppressed and they were bullied and they were scared to talk, so everyone ticked boxes and did their job and mistakes were made. They were understaffed by up to 270 FTEs for at least the last four years—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Shame!

The SPEAKER: The Premier is warned.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —so they are under incredible pressure. There is a high turnover rate, there is amazing churn and there are lots of people on WorkCover. So, of course, the idea of maybe rewarding them and incentivising good work and good practice—why wouldn't you look at ways to change the culture of a department that is on record as having a poor culture? They see it as from the top, not from them. They want to change the culture. Why not reward good behaviour, good initiatives, good programs that are brought in so that they can be duplicated in other departments?

UPPER SPENCER GULF

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills. Can the minister update the house on continued efforts to realise future opportunities in the Upper Spencer Gulf region?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (14:49): I think I could have done with some department lessons myself as a young man.

The SPEAKER: I agree.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: There's still time.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: 'There's still time,' says the Premier. Thank you to the member for Flinders for his question. He is a very dedicated and committed local member to our regions here in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to regional South Australia. After 16 long years of neglect under the former state Labor government, our commitment is very much welcomed by regional South Australians. In June, I visited the Upper Spencer Gulf to listen to and speak with industry and small business about their future workforce needs, including training priorities to build a skilled workforce.

A number of key issues were identified as local to the region. In July I returned to Whyalla to host an industry-led Upper Spencer Gulf industry forum to advance apprenticeships and employment in the region. The initiative brought together major employers, including the largest employer in the region, GFG Liberty OneSteel, to discuss strategies to address issues, including workforce and skills shortages, access to adequate training, retention of skilled labour and population growth.

The desire of industry, business and the community to work together to develop strategies to capitalise on future opportunities in the region was evident. Fundamentally, there was a great level of resolve to address the significant challenges around building a strong and capable workforce to fill the future jobs as OneSteel sets to double its production, mining and defence projects come online and with the disability and aged-care sector continuing to grow.

Regional leaders have identified priority areas for reform underpinned by the Marshall Liberal government's target to increase the number of apprentices and trainees by more than 20,000. Over the next four years, with a co-investment from the federal government and the state government of more than \$200 million, we will be investing in training in South Australia, preparing our young people for the job opportunities that are coming our way.

Discussions at the forum raised skills retention, education and training, including those through better utilising TAFE facilities, as being key components of building and retaining a skilled workforce across the region. The Department for Industry and Skills is working to advance the priorities of the Upper Spencer Gulf community and businesses in particular.

While in Whyalla, I took the opportunity to meet with the council, Advancing Whyalla (which is a group that is charged with rejuvenating the CBD within Whyalla), Hillier Group, Becker Helicopters and RDA Whyalla and Eyre. The opportunities in the region are significant, and the level of optimism in line with the Marshall Liberal government's policy initiatives is evident and has injected much-needed confidence in the regions.

It is not just in Adelaide where we are seeing a boost in confidence in the business community but throughout the regions as well, because the regions know that they have a government on their side now. Our regional cities and centres are resilient, and they have been forced to be resilient because they have been left on their own for 16 years by the mob across the chamber. In changing the economy it is important that our regions are able to diversify and prosper, and we will continue to work to support the regions to address these challenges.

TREGENZA HOUSE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. When did the minister visit the Tregenza residential care facility?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:52): I don't recall the exact date, but I have visited Tregenza twice. I visited soon on becoming a minister—so, it was one of my first visits—and also with the former minister in opposition.

TREGENZA HOUSE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. When visiting the Tregenza centre, did the minister meet with young people?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:53): No. I did the first time in opposition but not the second time. When I noticed that that had been booked by the department at a time when children were at school, I have advised ever since then that the whole point of visiting residential care facilities is to meet with both the children and the staff, and that all visits should be conducted in after-school hours or during school holidays.

TREGENZA HOUSE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Did the minister visit Tregenza on 11 April at 10am and meet with young people?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will be quiet.

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond!

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will cease interjecting.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:54): Now, you would know because you FOI'd my diary, so I have been there, yes. There were no children when I went there because if it was 10 o'clock in the morning that would explain why they weren't there and why I have instructed my department to always put my visits during school holidays or after school because I want to meet the children.

SCHOOLS, LANGUAGE PROGRAMS

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on programs the government is supporting in relation to language education?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:54): I am very pleased to have that question from the member for Kavel, who I know has a strong passion for education, being the son of educators. His passion for his schools is very strong. I can inform the house that I get a letter or a phone call from the member for Kavel at least once a week, and I think that is something that a number of other ministers are familiar with. He is an excellent local member, always advocating for his schools and indeed for education across the state.

One of the commitments this government has taken to the people of South Australia is that we would like to reinvigorate the study of languages in South Australia. This is very important and that is why, in August of last year, the Liberal Party released a set of policies designed to do just that. Unfortunately, in 2002, I am advised that about 12 per cent of South Australian students undertook a language as part of their year 12 studies and, by the time that the figures had come around at the end of last year, that had reduced to less than 5 per cent.

This isn't just a problem in South Australia that not enough people are learning languages, other than English as a second language. It is a challenge across the English-speaking world and across Australia. But the decline in language studies in South Australia has been profound and significant and worse than in many other jurisdictions and that is why we believe it is important to turn it around.

There are a number of reasons why that was important. We know there are opportunities in people's careers, whether through tourism, hospitality, business, or a range of other things, where learning a second language is valuable, and indeed the intercultural understanding and benefits for one's own understanding of English literacy are significant.

I know that the shadow minister agrees with me on this, and that was why we were pleased in October that the then government followed our lead in announcing a set of measures to improve language education in South Australia. I commended the minister at the time, as I do again, for undertaking that initiative. It is unfortunate, of course, that it took the shadow minister to achieve the role as education minister for the Labor Party to become interested in this. For a number of years prior they had not been so, but I commend the shadow minister for coming on board with what we proposed.

I want to talk about one of these initiatives. There were a number, of course, that I talked about. We will deliver on all of them and I look forward to answering questions like this as we deliver on others, but one of them in particular that I want to talk about today is the Languages Alive! initiative. This was actually something that was come up with by the School of Languages, an excellent school led by Lia Tedesco, a fine educator who is well regarded across South Australia. They had an idea to invest some of their money in a program called Languages Alive!, a school holiday program, but it was only able to be offered a couple of times.

We had good feedback from it last year. In particular, I note the support that the governing council of the School of Languages had for it and the feedback they were able to provide for us. That is why the Liberal Party committed from opposition to a substantial expansion of the Languages Alive! holiday program. It is very important that we encourage more young people to get excited about learning languages. The earlier they start, the earlier children are likely to pick it up and become fluent.

During the July school holidays, the School of Languages ran the program over two days for reception to year 7 students with a wide range of languages, and over 140 students attended. They engaged in four workshops. They could choose between French, Spanish, Italian, Chinese, Hindi, Japanese or Korean. The program also exposed students to a range of cultural activities. The opportunity was there, of course, for students whose own schools don't offer these languages to continue the study of that language through the School of Languages, so it's a particularly important feeder to developing this program that leads to more young people undertaking a language at year 12.

We are continuing the program in the April, July and October holidays. In the October holidays, I am looking forward to personally visiting and participating in the program. I hope I will have other reasons to participate in the years ahead in this excellent initiative, as the Marshall Liberal government continues to deliver on our promises.

FOSTER CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister advocated for the establishment of a pilot project in which she would pair her friends with children in state care?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:58): As I have mentioned already, I have met with many, many people and there are many ideas that have been suggested. Certainly no, I have not advocated for my friends to be matched with people. Any person would need to go through a foster care agency and would need to go through full training. Yes, I have recommended that people I know go through foster care training and become foster carers. In fact, I would recommend it to anybody in this house. I know we have one foster carer already, and I thank you very much because that is a very, very important role. These children need families.

We have double the national average of children in out-of-home care. We know that it's the worst outcome for children, and we know that everything must be done to have children in family-based care. For a percentage of children, I am told that therapeutic residential care is actually better because of their trauma and complex needs. However, family-based care is the best care if they can't be with their own family.

I have recommended to many people that they consider foster care. They would do that in the same way that anyone else would. They would register with an agency, go through the appropriate training and then they are matched up through the agency—nothing to do with me. I would advocate for anybody who is interested to do so.

FOSTER CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the minister ever advocated for the usual checks to be waived or for applications from her friends to be fast-tracked to enable them to be foster carers?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:00): Absolutely not. That's ridiculous. Everybody should go through the exact same checks. Certainly, in other regions—and I believe it was maybe Key Assets, mentioned in other countries; I believe they've got agencies in England—there are other ways of doing the training. There are some programs where there's intensive interviewing and psychological testing before you do the training, so that culls people early on, rather than going through extensive long courses in training.

There are many ways that we can improve the system, potentially having the training standardised and modularised so that, if you happen to ring an agency that doesn't have any proposed training in your area for six months, you could train with another agency so that we can fast-track and get people involved as soon as possible. I have met with—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —people who have told me it's taken 18 months—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —to become accredited as a foster carer. We can't afford for people to drop out of the system because it's an inefficient system. We need to look at how we make this a smooth professional transition from somebody interested in being a foster carer to accrediting them as a foster carer. I would never, ever suggest that anybody would skip that system and become a foster carer without the appropriate training. They may have other qualifications that could be considered, but there is a training level that is expected, and everyone goes through that same training.

GRANDPARENTS FOR GRANDCHILDREN SA

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Why is the minister providing only one year of guaranteed funding to Grandparents for Grandchildren, despite stating in this place and in the media that they would receive three years of guaranteed funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:02): I'm happy—

Ms Stinson: It's pretty simple.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to take that because it is an issue that I have been dealing with myself. My understanding of the agreement with Grandparents for Grandchildren is that it is a three-year agreement. There is one year with guaranteed funding, but we absolutely would envisage that they will meet performance requirements that are required after that.

Mr Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, they are a very good organisation—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we don't think there would be any reason to suggest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that they wouldn't receive funding—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —should they meet the requirements that are contained within the budget.

*Grievance Debate***ONLINE GAMBLING**

Mr MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:03): I rise to talk about a growing and substantial problem in the Australian and South Australian community, and that is the problem of increasing online gambling and sports betting. It is the fastest growing area of gambling in Australia due to, particularly, digital advancements and the growing number of smart phone-based and iPad-based applications. It is growing at 15 per cent per annum, and it is becoming an epidemic, particularly amongst young men and South Australians.

Advertising is targeting people between their 20s and 30s, who make up 75 per cent of the sports betting market; and the marketing is aggressive. In six months alone, Sportsbet spent a massive \$62 million on sales and marketing efforts in Australia in 2017. Research shows that it is hard to get away from Sportsbet advertising, with almost five solid minutes of a typical AFL broadcast taken up by gambling advertisements by up to seven different wagering brands. We have seen examples of high-profile people struggling with sports betting, including David Schwarz, South Australia's Ryan Fitzgerald and former South Australian footballer Brent Guerra. These are only a small number of the people brave enough to admit their problem.

It is a growing problem presenting issues very different from traditional forms of gambling. Indeed, sports betting has traditionally occurred in local pubs or TABs, where there is human supervision, where there are gambling limits, including ATM limits. None of this supervision and none of these limits are available on sports betting, particularly by individuals.

It is important to note that the Independent Gambling Authority approves markets for betting in South Australia, known as contingencies. South Australians cannot bet on markets that are not approved contingencies by the Independent Gambling Authority. However, many betting agencies—bet365, LiveBet and Sportsbet, to name just a few—offer markets on amateur sports here in South Australia, including Basketball SA, Premier League games, South Australian volleyball games, including a game recently between the Henley Hawks Volleyball Club and the Mt Lofty Volleyball Club, and the South Australian amateur soccer games, including SA women's national premier league and men's reserves league games.

This raises legitimate concerns about sports fixing. That is why nearly two months ago I successfully moved an inquiry to look at the growing problem of online gambling and sports betting in the parliament's Economic and Finance Committee. This inquiry was strongly supported by welfare agencies, including SACOSS. Not only did I move it but it was the first inquiry that was moved in that committee. It is unfortunate, as the member for Waite provocatively winks at me, that twice this inquiry has been delayed by government MPs.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite will cease interjecting and winking.

Mr MULLIGHAN: It has twice been delayed by government MPs. Today, it was delayed in place of a poorly attempted witch-hunt against the former Labor government's policies and investment attraction. Poor member for Waite could not have picked a worse day to kick off his inquiry. Why? I will give you three reasons. First of all, the Prime Minister of the country, tory Malcolm Turnbull, turns up to snip the ribbon on a company that Investment Attraction South Australia, the agency of the former Labor government, attracted to this state. There was a full-page article in *The Advertiser*.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point or order, sir.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Here we go. Run down the clock on a grievance.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, please be seated for one moment. Let's hear it.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: A very, very quick question: is it appropriate for a member—

The SPEAKER: What is the point of order, minister?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Is it appropriate for a member to discuss parliamentary standing committees, which are responsible to the parliament, in this way?

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully. Member for Lee, please continue.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Sorry, it was Tudge; I got the wrong tory 't' there. It was Alan Tudge, of course, who distinguished himself in his discussion of the Mayo by-election result on FIVEaa this morning. Not only did that occur today but we also had nearly a full-page report in *The Advertiser* of the success of fintech company Tic:Toc, which has been established here in South Australia to help South Australians gain home ownership. It is another company attracted by the former state government agency Investment Attraction South Australia.

Of course, the third thing that happened today is that we had a prominent report in *The Australian* quoting the growing problem of sports betting in Australia and online gambling, which found that the Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission estimates that, in 2015-16, \$9.7 billion was gambled on Australian sport alone—billions of dollars of which is coming from overseas punters.

It is a tremendous disappointment to me, but a grave mark on the behaviour of those members on the Economic and Finance Committee who seek to use its time and resources to try to rerun the arguments the Liberal Party ran at the last election about investment attraction. They are more than happy for their federal colleagues to come and cut ribbons. They are more than happy to make announcements about the successes of agencies they have now shut down and defunded while at the same time trying to conduct witch-hunts against the public servants and the ministers who were responsible for growing jobs here in this community. I realise it is important to the member for Waite. It cannot be easy sitting back there when he sees the quality of others sitting in front of

him, particularly during question time. If this is meant to be the big audition, well, it is not going too well, member for Waite.

Try as they might, the only little nugget of information is that out of the Northern Economic Plan we see a delay by the new transport minister, potentially shutting down a bus manufacturing operation which was attracted to this state and which is trying to win a tender to build Adelaide Metro buses. Of course, this raises the concerning issue of whether the Liberal Party of Australia, quite cleverly perhaps, might be responsible for twice shutting down automotive manufacturing in the northern suburbs within only five years. What a remarkable achievement; it is something that not even Margaret Thatcher could achieve in the United Kingdom.

Here we have the Liberal Party of Australia covering itself in glory by trying to shut down manufacturing jobs in the northern suburbs. That was the strategy today: trying to demonise a program that was designed to grow jobs in some of the most difficult suburbs when it comes to employment outcomes in our state, in the northern suburbs. They have tried and tried hard, and they have failed every time. It is an indictment on the government members of the Economic and Finance Committee that they are wasting the time of the committee and the parliament with this inquiry. I have to say, it is an indictment on the member for Waite and does not bode very well for his future career prospects.

NAIDOC WEEK

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:11): I am very grateful for the opportunity to inform the house about the very positive events that happened in and around Port Augusta for NAIDOC Week just recently. It is an absolutely outstanding nationwide celebration of Aboriginal and Islander people—our traditional and Indigenous First Australians. When I travel around my electorate and other places, it is a pleasure for me to recognise Aboriginal people as the First Australians.

This week is very important and very special. I particularly want to commend the organising committee in Port Augusta, which put on a fantastic program throughout the week. I was able to attend some of it but not all of it. I think that, over the past eight or 10 years, I have probably attended every one of the different events at one time or other, but only went to a few of them in any single NAIDOC Week.

This year, I was able to get to the celebratory breakfast in Port Augusta's Gladstone Square, which was a lovely coming together of local people and organisations, some government departments, some service clubs and some non-government organisations. There was a wide range of people, and it was lovely to see Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal people there enjoying a breakfast together. There was a sausage sizzle and some fantastic pancakes on offer and a range of other treats for young and old. It was a really lovely day and we were very fortunate to have good weather.

I was also able to attend the NAIDOC Ball, which I have done before. I encourage members to get to a NAIDOC Ball if they ever have the opportunity, as it is a lovely, fun celebration. One of the best things about the NAIDOC Ball is that it is typically the very last event of NAIDOC Week, so it is a celebration, a knees-up and an opportunity to relax. Most importantly, it is an opportunity for the people who have worked so hard throughout that week, and in the months prior to the event, as key organisers to relax. These are the key people who put forward the NAIDOC Week celebrations and it is their chance, at the last event, to actually relax and let their hair down.

It was great fun. We had fantastic food, wine and soft drinks at the tremendous new Central Oval facility in Port Augusta. Everybody thoroughly enjoyed themselves, and it was a lovely night of people getting together, having fun and celebrating. That is one of the fantastic things about NAIDOC Week. There are two key aspects: one is to recognise Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders within every community in Australia and the other is for everybody to celebrate together the important part that they play in our communities and the important place they have in our history, our present and into the future. It was a tremendous celebration.

There were other types of events. I mentioned what is officially called the NAIDOC Ball, but there is always a mini ball, which is one of my favourites. I have been fortunate enough to attend that twice before, where the real littlies come together for a fantastic night. It is a pleasure for these young

boys and girls to get dressed up, to have sashes, to be recognised, to learn at a very young age how much fun it can be for them to publicly embrace and share their culture and be very proud of who they are. Of course, it is wonderful for their parents, brothers, sisters, aunts, uncles and grandparents to be there with them, to see them do that, to encourage them and to share that pride with them.

Then, of course, there is the junior ball, which is targeted more towards teenagers. It is a good fun night out for them. They can get dressed up and engage in music, food and dancing together. Regardless of where you are or what your background, for any teenager that is a bit of a rite of passage to enjoy those sorts of things. It is very special for them to get to do that in NAIDOC Week.

Right at the beginning of NAIDOC Week there was what I think was probably the most important NAIDOC event of the week this year in Port Augusta's program. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the event because of cabinet. In fact, I considered missing cabinet for it, but that was not possible as I had submissions to put forward. The event was a very well-attended awards breakfast, recognising people from across Port Augusta and the surrounding districts who have made a really serious, genuine and important contribution to our community. I commend those award winners and I commend the NAIDOC Week organisers for their work.

MAYO BY-ELECTION

Mr BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:16): I rise today to congratulate Rebekha Sharkie on her wonderful win last weekend in the Mayo by-election. It was a tremendous win. Interestingly enough, it followed on from the loss at the previous general election of Jamie Briggs, who had been installed by the Downer family. The headline in *The Courier* in Mount Barker last week, after a poll came out, said that Georgina Downer was more unpopular than Jamie Briggs. Now, that is a pretty hard headline to get and it takes a fair bit of work because Jamie was not very well liked anywhere in the electorate. I do not think that he was that well liked even within the Liberal Party because he was quite offensive to people.

I guess it was a lesson in how you should go about your politics if you want to be a good local member and a good candidate. Rebekha Sharkie has worked tirelessly as the federal member for Mayo. I know people on Kangaroo Island, in Yankalilla, McLaren Vale and Willunga who speak—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BIGNELL: —very, very highly of Rebekha Sharkie and the work that she has done. I am getting some interjections from people across the other side. One of the interesting points that Georgina Downer made in her speech on Saturday night was that she thanked the state Liberal MPs in the area for all their help to get her to where she got to. Well, it was not a great spot to end up. It looks like she is putting her hand up again to go around. I wish her well.

I have to say that the people have spoken this time in the way they came out and have been relating to both of these candidates, Rebekha and Georgina, and in the poll results. I think Georgina may have won about six or seven booths across the whole electorate. People wanted to go for a candidate who had a proven track record in their area, not someone who moved in from Victoria and wanted to count on the family name.

Alexander Downer, who was the member for Mayo for 24 years, who served the country as the foreign affairs minister for a record length of time and who was the federal leader of the Liberal party at one stage, did not do Georgina any favours and probably not his own legacy any favours either by the way he carried on. Georgina Downer and her team were sending abusive messages to people on social media that we did not ask for. I was getting all this stuff. They were abusing Rebekha Sharkie, saying that she had voted with Bill Shorten this many times and all these things. There were all these made up things that they were sending out to people like me.

I do not follow Georgina Downer on social media, but the Downers themselves—Georgina's mum and dad—had to answer some questions in the chat group that they went into to pick a fight. Well, they came out very upset with the reaction that they received in there, with Alexander Downer saying, 'I agree with my wife.' He probably had a posher accent than this. He said:

We are Adelaide Hills people and been in politics here for decades and through multiple elections never come across such abuse. Sharkie supporters have brought horrible hate to our district. Never seen this before. You must all be new arrivals.

We go back to the 2001 federal election with the made up stuff about babies being thrown overboard and all the stuff that was repulsive about that federal Liberal government. Alexander Downer, of course, was a part of that. As to all this talk about new arrivals, the only new arrival that we had here was his daughter Georgina. She had come back after 20 years of living in Victoria.

I sent her a new elector letter last week, as I do for all new electors who enrol in the seat of Mawson. I was a bit confused, though, because it was sent to her mum and dad's beach house at Carrickalinga, yet she had told a forum the week before that she lived in the Adelaide Hills at Heathfield. There were more holes in Georgina Downer's story than in a teabag. Nobody could actually work out who she was. One thing you have to do is actually get your story right. You have to be a local person—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BIGNELL: —not rely on who your great-granddaddy was, who your granddaddy was or who your daddy was. You actually have to get out there and be a member of the community and do the work. I congratulate all the candidates who put up their hand for Mayo, like Reg Coutts, who ran for the ALP. Again, I congratulate—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BIGNELL: —Rebekha Sharkie on her outstanding win and I look forward to working with her.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BIGNELL: I see that Georgina Downer—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond!

Mr BIGNELL: —is putting her hand up for Liberal Party preselection again. She is the Andrew Ucles of Australian politics. If you do not know who Andrew Ucles is, google 'Andrew Ucles' and 'bull ant nest' and see what it is like to put your hand up to suffer pain when you know what the result is going to be.

The SPEAKER: The member's time has expired.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: What a joke.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, please. The member for King.

KING ELECTORATE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:21): Hashtag #listening. Over the past couple of months, I have held a series of listening posts to continue to engage my local community in King and have had some very productive conversations about their views on the state government's performance since 17 March. On Friday 15 June, Saturday 23 June, Friday 20 July and Saturday 28 July, I held listening posts at The Grove Shopping Centre in Golden Grove in King. These listening posts were advertised to my community through a flyer that was letterboxed by my dedicated and hardworking volunteers and through my social media platforms.

I would like to thank my volunteers for assisting me in reaching out to the whole of the King community. I would also like to thank the many people who called in with a copy of the flyer they received to provide feedback, to share their ideas and to have a conversation about the future of King and South Australia. I would further like to thank the many people who could not make the

listening posts, but who have contacted me via email and booked other one-on-one chances to catch up and share their feedback.

The main topics of discussion that were raised during my listening posts have included, in no particular order, power costs, council rate capping (many conversations on council rate capping), the emergency services levy saving that we have passed on, and the Modbury and Lyell McEwin hospitals. In fact, last Saturday I had a constituent who works in our hospital systems share with me how bad that culture and environment has been in relation to the pressure of Transforming Health that has been put on her and other hospital staff.

It is good to be able to tell people working in that system that we have plans to improve it. People have also raised the issues of jobs and youth unemployment, local roads, support for small business, child protection, domestic violence, mental health, the NDIS, aged care and decriminalisation of sex work. We have also had various discussions around supporting our local clubs and organisations.

I really appreciate the variety of conversations I have had with people and value their time and effort in putting their feedback on the table with me in having these conversations. I ask the rest of my community to continue to contact me to discuss your ideas and concerns so that we can make our community and state the best place to live. A special thankyou to minister David Pisoni who came out to a listening post with me and gave up a few hours of his time to speak with the local King community. On one of these dates, as I recall when he was out there once again, we had very in-depth conversations with a nurse on ideas to improve our health system.

I will be having some more listening posts in September and October, and these will be advertised to my King community in the near future. I wanted to be able to say to anyone who could be listening that I also have the Premier coming out to King on Wednesday 8 August and he will be hosting with me an afternoon tea community forum. A big thankyou to our Premier for giving up some of his time to come out and listen to our community. The afternoon tea community forum will be on 8 August at The Grove tavern in Surrey Downs from 3pm to 4.30pm. Also, I wanted to be able to touch today—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms LUETHEN: —on the Carisbrooke Parkrun. I would now like to take this opportunity to talk about local community events that I and my family have supported recently which are fantastic local community events. To start with, I will mention the Carisbrooke Parkrun, which is an event my family and I enjoy attending on Saturday mornings, which is a five kilometre fun run which occurs every Saturday at 8am in Carisbrooke. The beauty about this parkrun is that it is completely free to participate and you do not even need to register before you do your first run or walk or whatever suits you.

Another beautiful spot that I visited recently with my family has been the wonderful Tenafeate winery which recently held their vertical shiraz tasting event where you got have a chat with the local wine producer. In conclusion, thank you, Mr Speaker, for the opportunity to talk about the Premier coming to King very soon.

Time expired.

HOPGOOD THEATRE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:27): I rise today to talk about a matter of huge importance to my local community and our broader southern community. The Hopgood Theatre has long been a much-loved, integral and crucial arts community and social hub. The theatre is rightly named after Dr Don Hopgood, a former local member for our area and former deputy premier, and his late wife, Raelene, for their considerable service to our community, our state and the arts.

Our beautiful state has a rich and diverse arts sector. The arts have played such a strong role in our history, and the Hopgood Theatre and the art that is brought to life within its walls must play an innovative, strong and creative role in our future. The arts play a significant role in all our lives and in the fabric of our community. The arts bring us together, allow us to explore bold ideas,

pique our curiosity and create excitement. The arts give voice to emotion and experience, enable us to examine and shift our attitudes on the issues we confront, and they open our minds and fill our hearts.

Performance is a platform for people from every background and of differing abilities, ages, cultures and gender. It includes all and explores all, and the Hopgood is an exemplar of doing just that. For more than three decades, the Hopgood has brought local people and visitors together through the arts and in so many other ways. It is a fully equipped, multipurpose arts centre and year after year it accommodates a diverse range of events.

It is truly shocking for me to let the house know that the Hopgood is now at risk of losing its funding, state government funding, which had been consistent to this point and has enabled the Hopgood to house more than 100 community groups every year and host tens of thousands of community members for a plethora of events which have shaped individual memories and added to the rich fabric of life in our southern community. Should this cruel funding cut proceed, it will speak volumes about those opposite and about what and whom they do and do not value.

Our community is outraged that this valuable institution at the heart of our community is threatened. But, make no mistake, our community is rallying and they are deeply determined to save Hopgood so that generations to come can continue to perform, to gather and to create life-lasting memories there. So many groups use the theatre to support their activities, from Christies Beach High School and countless other schools for their graduations, to the council for citizenship ceremonies, to groups like the True Heights Dance Company, who performed there just a few weeks ago.

One of their young performers, Jenna Turner, said of this experience, 'Performing at Hopgood Theatre gives me a chance to build my confidence in dancing and to be with my friends.' Her mother, Kate, added, 'We really need to keep our theatre in the south. It would be such a devastating loss to our local community and would mean ticket prices for our families will rise.' These experiences are what our community will fight for until those opposite value our southern community, value the arts and value what our Hopgood Theatre means to so many.

Pages and pages of our petition are being returned to my electorate office. We cannot print them fast enough. People who love the arts, who love gathering at the theatre, who have watched their loved ones tread the boards, and those who simply can see how unjust this cut in funding would be, are clamouring for information about our community meeting next Thursday at 7pm. I hope to see the members opposite whose communities use the theatre attend to see for themselves how angry their constituents are.

I am so proud of our community's resolve, and together with my fellow southern MPs and our shadow arts minister we will fight alongside them for as long as it takes for Hopgood to be saved. Together, we will send a message to this out-of-touch government, a message that the arts matter, that our community venue matters and that every single person who performs, or speaks there or cheers on a loved one, matters.

I pass on my thanks to Harry Dewar and others from the Save the Hopgood group for their determination and hard work so far. He and others have led the charge, and I am certain they will continue to do so with us and thousands of members of our community by their side every step of the way. We cannot and will not sit by and let this happen, and the government should take notice of the growing momentum and voice from the south to save our Hopgood.

I urge the government to commit to ongoing funding and lease arrangements to ensure that the Hopgood can continue in the long term for the benefit of our community. I thank every community member for what they have created at our Hopgood for the past three decades, and I look forward to working with our community to create more memories for the future.

TREDREA, MR J.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:32): Today, I rise to give thanks to a true great South Australia, Jack Tredrea. Mr Jon (Jack) Tredrea passed away on 17 July 2018. To pay tribute to Jack, I would like to reflect on his life as a soldier and returned serviceman. Jack was born on 15 May 1920,

with his home town being Kent Town, South Australia. His service was during World War II when he was enlisted on 23 September 1942.

Jack was assigned to a whole lot of roles, but he was keen to do something exciting, so he enlisted in a role that he knew they would not knock him back on. Jack was a member of the Z Special Unit or Z Force, which was a joint allied special forces unit formed during the Second World War to operate behind Japanese lines in South-East Asia. Predominantly Australian, the unit was a specialist reconnaissance and sabotage unit comprising British, Dutch, New Zealand, Timorese and Indonesian members, mostly operating in Borneo and the island of the former Netherlands East Indies.

At just 24 years of age, Jack parachuted into Borneo in March 1945. At this time, he was armed with only a few maps, some guns and grenades and a cyanide pill in the event that he was captured. As part of the operation, Jack recruited a guerrilla force of about 30 Dayaks, travelling with them for more than six months through dense jungle terrain from the highlands to the east, as they cleared out the Japanese. When discussing Z Special Unit, Jack was quoted as saying:

Z was a different operation to anything else. You were never told what you were going to do. You weren't allowed to talk about what you were training for. We didn't know ourselves where we were going until the day we got on the plane. That was in case any of us were caught. You could have been tortured and divulged information but we didn't have it.

With the 30-year secrecy embargo, Jack was unable to march under the unit's banner until 1975. Jack could not even tell the Governor what he did when he was awarded the Military Medal in 1945 for Fearless and Gifted Leader, Central Borneo.

Upon returning from the war, Jack worked alongside his old boss, where he worked as a tailor, and ended up owning the business for 25 years before retiring at 65. Jack also gave great community service, particularly to the Broadview Football Club: Jack joined the club in 1947 and stayed there over 20 years. Jack played just over 100 games, including the 1948 and 1954 premierships. Jack served as club secretary, treasurer and president during his time at the club. Today, the club is still paying tribute to Jack with a bar at the club named in his honour.

Jack performed a great service for our country, and it is humbling to know that this was recognised when he received the Military Medal, and he continues to be honoured through the Australian War Memorial in Canberra, with the display of the silk map he carried with him, along with his notebook, which includes instructions for medical treatments, standard Malay phrases and a photograph of him wearing a Japanese officer's breeches and boots in Borneo in May 1945.

Soldiers like Jack are to be considered in the highest regard, and as a member of parliament and a brother of a returned serviceman I am truly thankful for the sacrifice they have made for our great country. I met Jack only several years ago at the Murray Bridge RSL, and, in his early 90s, as he was then, when I talked to him about the war and his exploits the words he was saying to me sounded like he was ready to parachute back into Borneo and do the job, he was such a man. He had never forgotten his service, and long may it be remembered. Vale, Jack Tredrea.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S PORTFOLIO) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:37): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017, the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013, the Surveillance Devices Act 2016, the Telecommunications (Interception) Act 2012 and the Young Offenders Act 1993. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:38): I move: That this bill be now read a second time.

The Statutes Amendment (Attorney-General's Portfolio) Bill 2018 makes miscellaneous amendments to various acts committed to the Attorney-General. It addresses a number of minor or technical issues that have been identified in legislation. In broad terms, this bill:

- allows for additional time for a prosecution to be commenced where an enforcement determination is revoked by a court under the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017 on the basis that the alleged offender did not have a reasonable opportunity to elect to be prosecuted;
- ensures that non-government bodies cannot refer a civil debt to the fines unit for recovery by them unless they are bodies prescribed by regulations;
- removes a redundant provision relating to extended trading hours authorisations in the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 due to reforms in the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Review) Amendment Act 2017;
- provides that, under the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013, an application for internal review of a decision of the SACAT, other than a decision made by a registrar, is to be made with the leave of a legally qualified member of SACAT, as recommended by the recent statutory review of SACAT;
- prescribes, to avoid the need for multiple appointments, the reviewer under Schedule 4 of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012 as the review agency for the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption;
- importantly, ensures that the youth Training Centre Review Board must furnish an annual report to the Minister; and
- deals with an operational anomaly regarding the interaction between the Young Offenders Act and the Correctional Services Act concerning parole arrangements for young people who are sentenced as adults.

Turning to the substance of the bill, part 2 makes two amendments to the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017. The first addresses a minor oversight in relation to processes following a successful appeal of an enforcement determination.

Regarding non-payment of an expiation fee, the Chief Recovery Officer can make an enforcement determination against an alleged offender. The alleged offender can apply to the Chief Recovery Officer on a number of grounds under section 22 to have the enforcement determination revoked. One of those grounds is that the alleged offender did not have a reasonable opportunity to elect to be prosecuted for the relevant offence. Pursuant to section 22(13), if the Chief Recovery Officer agrees to revoke the enforcement determination on that ground, the prosecutor will have six months to commence a prosecution for the offence. This ensures that, if the limitation period has already passed, the prosecutor is not prevented from prosecuting the offender.

If the Chief Recovery Officer decides not to revoke the enforcement determination, the alleged offender has an appeal right to the Magistrates Court or the Youth Court under section 23. If the application is successful and the court revokes the enforcement determination, there is currently no equivalent provision in section 23 to extend the time limit for a prosecution to commence. The bill amends section 23 so that, if the court revokes the enforcement determination on the ground that the alleged offender did not have a reasonable opportunity to elect to be prosecuted, the prosecutor will have six months to commence a prosecution in the same manner as under section 22(13).

The bill also amends the definition of a 'public authority' in section 48(1) of the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act. Part 8 of the Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act, which is yet to commence, introduced a new mechanism for a public authority to refer a civil debt owed to the authority to the Chief Recovery Officer to be recovered in the same manner as a fine.

It is evident from the second reading speech given on behalf of the former government in the Legislative Council on 28 September 2017 that the original legislative intention was for this to apply to government bodies. The definition of 'public authority' currently extends to any incorporated or unincorporated body established for a public purpose by or under an act. This is likely to capture a

broad range of non-government bodies. The bill limits the scope of the definition, consistent with the original policy intention of the legislation.

Part 3 of the bill amends the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 by repealing section 44 of that act. The Liquor Licensing (Liquor Review) Amendment Bill 2017, which amended the Liquor Licensing Act, passed the parliament in 2017. One of the reforms enabled the actual hours of trade to be nominated by the licensee at the time of application, removing the need for licensees to apply for extended trading hours authorisations.

Extended trading hours authorisations are dealt with in section 44 of the Liquor Licensing Act. A clause to delete section 44 was originally introduced in the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Review) Amendment Bill 2017, but was inadvertently deleted through an in-house amendment. This bill will cause section 44 to be deleted following the commencement of the relevant parts of the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Review) Amendment Act 2017.

Part 4 of the bill makes a minor amendment to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013. Section 70 of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act currently provides that an application for internal review of a decision of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal constituted by a registrar may only be heard with the leave of a presidential member.

Section 225 of the Statutes Amendment (SACAT No. 2) Act 2017 amended section 70 so that leave is required for all applications for internal review, not just for a review of a decision made by a registrar. The tribunal currently has just one presidential member, who simply does not have the capacity to hear leave applications for all applications for internal review. As a result, the commencement of section 225 has been deferred.

The bill retains the existing requirement for leave of a presidential member in reviews of a decision made by a registrar. It further provides that in any other case, leave may be granted by a legally qualified member of the tribunal. Parts 5 and 6 of the bill amend the Surveillance Devices Act 2016 and the Telecommunications (Interception) Act 2012. I will deal with these together.

The Surveillance Devices Act and the Telecommunications (Interception) Act prescribe functions to a review agency to review the compliance of SA Police and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (the ICAC) with the relevant legislative requirements. Under each of these acts, the review agency for the ICAC is 'a person who is independent of the Commissioner and is appointed by the Governor as the review agency'. The Hon. Kevin Duggan AM QC has been appointed by the Governor as the review agency until 4 March 2020.

For simplicity, and to avoid the need for multiple appointments to be made, the bill transfers the review agency function for the ICAC to the reviewer under Schedule 4 of the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption Act 2012. The reviewer under Schedule 4 must necessarily be a person who is independent of the commissioner and is well placed to perform this additional function. As a result of the amendment, the Surveillance Devices Act and the Telecommunications (Interception) Act will prescribe the same authority as the review agency for the ICAC and SA Police.

A further amendment is made to the Surveillance Devices Act to correct a minor drafting error. The bill amends section 31 of the Surveillance Devices Act, which mistakenly refers to the 'chief investigating officer' of an investigating agency rather than the 'chief officer'. Part 7 of the bill makes three amendments to the Young Offenders Act 1993. Firstly, the bill introduces annual reporting requirements for the Training Centre Review Board.

The Training Centre Review Board is established under the Young Offenders Act to review the progress and circumstances of youths sentenced to detention in a training centre, and to hear and determine matters relating to such youths. The bill requires the Training Centre Review Board to report to the minister not later than 31 October each year and for the Minister to table a copy of the report in each house of parliament. The reporting requirements are modelled on the existing reporting requirements of the Parole Board under the Correctional Services Act 1982 and are intended to increase transparency. The difference being that the Parole Board deals with adults and the Training Centre Review Board deals with children.

Such an amendment was flagged previously in this place after I attempted to receive copies of a report from the youth Training Centre Review Board from the former attorney-general. Lo and behold, they did not exist despite playing an incredibly important role in the life of a young person. Such data necessitates good policy and must be delivered by the minister.

A further amendment is made to section 36(4)(b) and section 63B of the Young Offenders Act to address an operational issue relating to the interaction between the Young Offenders Act and the Correctional Services Act regarding parole arrangements for young people who are sentenced as adults. The Youth Justice division of the Department of Human Services supervises young persons on parole until they reach 18 years of age, but part 6, division 3 of the Correctional Services Act applies with modification in respect of their supervision if the young person is sentenced as an adult or is serving a non-parole period.

Despite the modifications, there is currently no provision in the Young Offenders Act to transfer the power and functions of the chief executive of the Department for Correctional Services to the chief executive of the Department of Human Services. This limits the ability for the Department of Human Services to report directly to the Training Centre Review Board in relation to progress reports, recommended parole conditions, and reporting non-compliance with supervision requirements for young people being considered for, or granted release on parole.

The bill amends section 36(4)(b) and section 63B of the Young Offenders Act to provide that part 6, division 3 of the Correctional Services Act applies. References to the chief executive of the Department for Correctional Services will be taken to mean the chief executive of the Department of Human Services.

Finally, the bill corrects a minor drafting error in section 43 of the Young Offenders Act, which mistakenly refers to the 'presiding member' rather than the 'designated member'. I thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC in another place for her work on these amendments under her youth justice responsibilities as the Minister for Human Services. I commend the bill to members and I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery Act 2017*

4—Amendment of section 23—Review by Court of refusal to revoke enforcement determination

This clause amends section 23 of the principal Act to enable the commencement of a prosecution in circumstances where the Court has reversed a decision of the Chief Recovery Officer to refuse an application for revocation of an enforcement determination made on the ground that the alleged offender did not have a reasonable opportunity to elect to be prosecuted for an offence to which the expiation notice relates. The amendment authorises commencement of a prosecution within 6 months of the day on which the Court's decision is made.

5—Amendment of section 48—Interpretation

This clause amends section 48 of the principal Act to delete paragraph (b)(i) and (ii) of the definition of *public authority*.

Part 3—Amendment of *Liquor Licensing Act 1997*

6—Repeal of section 44

This clause deletes section 44 of the principal Act.

7—Transitional provision

This clause provides for transitional arrangements that are consequential on the deletion of section 44 of the principal Act.

Part 4—Amendment of *South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013*

8—Amendment of section 70—Internal reviews

This clause amends section 70 of the principal Act to provide for applications for review to be by leave of a Presidential member in the case of a decision of the Tribunal as constituted by a registrar or other member of the staff of the Tribunal or by leave of a legally qualified member in the case of a decision of the Tribunal in the exercise of its original jurisdiction.

Part 5—Amendment of *Surveillance Devices Act 2016*

9—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause substitutes paragraph (b) of the definition of *review agency*.

10—Amendment of section 31—Control by investigating agencies of certain records, information and material

This clause deletes the first occurring reference to 'investigating' in section 31 of the principal Act.

Part 6—Amendment of *Telecommunications (Interception) Act 2012*

11—Amendment of section 2—Interpretation

This clause substitutes paragraph (b) of the definition of *review agency*.

Part 7—Amendment of *Young Offenders Act 1993*

12—Amendment of section 36—Detention of youth sentenced as adult

In applying the *Correctional Services Act 1982* in the circumstances referred to in section 36(4)(b) of the principal Act, a reference in the *Correctional Services Act 1982* to the CE will be taken to be a reference to the Chief Executive (within the meaning of the principal Act).

13—Insertion of section 40

This clause inserts section 40 into the principal Act.

40—Reports by Training Centre Review Board

Proposed section 40 imposes a requirement on the Training Centre Review Board to report to the Minister annually.

14—Amendment of section 43—Special procedures for terror suspects

This clause amends section 43 of the principal Act to substitute the reference to 'presiding member' with a reference to 'designated member'.

15—Amendment of section 63B—Application of Correctional Services Act 1982 to youth with non-parole period

In applying the *Correctional Services Act 1982* in the circumstances referred to in section 63B of the principal Act, a reference in the *Correctional Services Act 1982* to the CE will be taken to be a reference to the Chief Executive (within the meaning of the principal Act).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:50): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 and to make related amendments to the Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Act 2017. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:51): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce this bill, which amends the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. The bill makes minor consequential, corrective and transitional amendments to the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 and Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Amendments and Related Amendments) Act 2017. These include:

- correcting a reference to the Marriage Act 1961 at section 18 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017;

- providing for a regulation-making power to describe the circumstances in which a reunification assessment is not required under section 50(4) of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017;
- clarifying that the information disclosure provisions at section 142 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 also apply to information gathered under the Children's Protection Act 1993;
- clarifying that where a child is removed pursuant to section 41 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 and cannot be returned home or into the care of another person, the child will remain in the chief executive's custody until the end of the fifth business day following the day on which the child was removed;
- amending section 92 to enable the status quo to be maintained for long-term guardians who are currently responsible for determining contact arrangements for children in their care;
- amending section 95 to broaden the scope of people who may apply to the contact arrangements review panel;
- amending section 161 to allow the chief executive to refer money received on behalf of children and young people to the Public Trustee to administer until the child or young person attains 18 years of age;
- amending schedule 1 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 to allow for the staged repeal of the Children's Protection Act 1993. This is necessary to ensure that the current regime for screening people who work with children in South Australia as set out in the Children's Protection Act 1993 can continue until the commencement of the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016;
- providing transitional arrangements for custody and guardianship orders made pursuant to section 38 of the Children's Protection Act 1993; and
- providing transitional arrangements concerning the management of children's money.

These additional minor amendments will ensure a smooth transition from the Children's Protection Act 1993 to the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 from 22 October 2018. I commend this bill to the house and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*

4—Amendment of section 18—Meaning of at risk

This clause corrects a typographical error in the reference to the *Marriage Act 1961* of the Commonwealth.

5—Amendment of section 43—Custody of removed child or young person

This clause inserts a new subsection (2) into section 43 of the principal Act. That new subsection clarifies that the Chief Executive (CE) may exercise powers under the Act in respect of children and young people delivered into the care of another person as if the CE had custody of them.

6—Amendment of section 50—When application can be made for Court orders

This clause amends section 50 of the principal Act to enable the regulations to exclude the need for the CE to assess whether a reunification is likely in specified circumstances when applying for prescribed Court orders.

7—Amendment of section 59—Onus on objector to prove order should not be made

This clause amends section 59 of the principal Act to allow the regulations to exclude certain kinds of application from the circumstances in which the onus of proving a matter is reversed.

8—Amendment of section 90—Long-term care plan to be prepared

This clause repeals section 90(3) of the principal Act, which is to be relocated as section 91(2a).

9—Amendment of section 91—Chief Executive to apply to Court for order to place child or young person under long-term guardianship

This clause inserts new section 91(2a) into the principal Act, and is simply a relocation of what was previously section 90(3).

10—Amendment of section 92—Application of Part

This clause inserts new section 92(2) into the principal Act. The proposed subsection excludes the specified children and young people from being the subject of contact arrangements determined by the CE.

11—Amendment of section 95—Review by Contact Arrangements Review Panel

This clause replaces section 91(1) of the principal Act to extend the persons who may seek review of a determination of the Chief Executive in respect of contact arrangements.

12—Amendment of section 121—Interpretation

This clause makes a consequential amendment of section 121 of the principal Act to reflect the replacement of the *Children's Protection Act 1993* by *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

13—Amendment of section 142—Disclosure of information

This clause makes consequential amendments to section 142 of the principal Act to reflect the replacement of the *Children's Protection Act 1993* by *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

14—Amendment of section 161—Payment of money to Chief Executive on behalf of child or young person

This clause substitutes subsections (2), (3) and (4) of section 161 of the principal Act to reflect a shift in who holds money on behalf of children and young people in care to the Public Trustee.

15—Amendment of Schedule 1—Repeal and related amendment

This clause amends clause 2 of Schedule 1 of the principal Act to enable the specified provisions to be repealed before the complete repeal of the *Children's Protection Act 1993*.

Schedule 1—Related amendments and transitional provisions etc

Part 1—Amendment of *Children's Protections Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Act 2017*

1—Amendment of section 12—Transitional provisions—foster parents

This clause amends section 12 of the principal Act to make clear that approved carers under the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017* are exempt from the specified provisions of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*. This reflects the earlier commencement of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

2—Amendment of section 13—Transitional provisions—licensed foster care agencies

This clause amends section 13 of the principal Act to make clear that licensed foster care agencies under the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017* are exempt from the specified provisions of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*. This reflects the earlier commencement of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

3—Amendment of section 14—Transitional provisions—licensed children's residential facilities

This clause amends section 13 of the principal Act to make clear that the holder of a license to maintain children's residential facilities under the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017* is exempt from the specified provisions of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*. This reflects the earlier commencement of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

4—Insertion of section 23A

This clause inserts a new section 23A into the principal Act, continuing the placement of a child or young person by the Minister under the *Children's Protection Act 1993* as a placement of the child or young person under section 77 or 84 of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017* (as the case requires).

5—Insertion of section 26A

This clause provides that proceedings commenced under the *Children's Protection Act 1993* but not determined before the specified date will continue as proceedings commenced under Chapter 6 of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

6—Insertion of sections 31A and 31B

This clause inserts new sections 31A and 31B into the principal Act as follows:

31A—Certain orders under section 38 of repealed Act to continue as orders under *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*

This section continues the specified orders of the Court under the *Children's Protection Act 1993* as orders made by the Court under section 53 of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

31B—Certain orders under repealed Act to continue as interim orders under *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*

This section continues the specified orders of the Court under the *Children's Protection Act 1993* as interim orders made by the Court under section 53 of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 2—Transitional provisions etc

7—Moneys held on behalf of child or young person

This clause provides that certain money received by the CE prior to the commencement of this measure and held on behalf of a child or young person will be taken to have been received, and must be dealt with, under section 161 of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*, as amended by this measure.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

Ministerial Statement

WATER PRICING INQUIRY

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:54): I table a ministerial statement made by the Treasurer in another place earlier today regarding the terms of reference of an inquiry into water pricing in South Australia.

Motions

AUSTRALIAN SPACE AGENCY

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:55): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the significant opportunity that space-related industries provide to the South Australian economy;
- (b) applauds the federal government for their decision to establish a national space agency;
- (c) condemns the federal Labor Party for having a policy that the agency should be based in Canberra; and
- (d) supports the South Australian government's bid for the space agency to be based in South Australia.

I am very excited about the incredible opportunity that Australia is taking with the establishment of a national space agency. I think it is fair to say that both sides of this house have been working on this for quite a period of time. I made a trip to visit NASA's Johnson Space Center in the US, I think in 2016, at the invitation of Dr Andy Thomas, an astronaut who hails from South Australia. Dr Thomas and others have been advocating a long time for the establishment of a national space agency in South Australia.

I was very pleased to champion that cause to Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull when he assumed office. Dr Thomas and I met with the Prime Minister, who then said that he would consider this great opportunity. I and many people in this state were delighted when the International Astronautical Congress was held in South Australia in September 2017 and the federal government announced that they would be establishing a national space agency.

The purpose of this agency is to support critical partnerships, to coordinate a national strategy towards space innovation, provide support for industry growth and lead international

engagement in space industries. What an incredible opportunity this will be for our nation, in many ways playing catch-up to other countries around the world that have been intimately involved with this opportunity for an extended period of time. In fact, I think it was a matter of national embarrassment that we were, as I understand, the only OECD country in the world that did not have a national space agency.

As I said, I do acknowledge the work of those opposite who, when they were in government, saw the need to have a space industry in South Australia. Indeed, they appointed Mr Nicola Sasanelli to a role in order to explore the opportunities for our state in the space industry going forward. This makes logical sense. As we are all aware, South Australia is the home of defence. In fact, for many years, our numberplates read, 'South Australia—The Defence State'. Defence companies and organisations have been based in South Australia for decades and decades. Weapons research was established, I think, certainly before the 1950s—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Before you were born.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Before I was born, as the Deputy Premier pointed out. That of course morphed into the DSTO, now the DSTG. We have many of the primes that operate in Australia domiciled right here in South Australia. I think we all appreciate the great benefit of having those defence companies here because we know that they create employment and, more than anything else, create opportunity for our next generation. I think it is important that we work in a bipartisan way as much as possible in order to realise the great economic benefit to our state from South Australia's space industry. We on this side of the house applaud the federal government for their decision to establish a national space agency.

I hope that what we hear later today in this chamber is applause from those opposite for the Coalition for establishing a national space agency in Australia. What we do know already is that the federal government has appointed Dr Megan Clark as the interim head of the Australian space agency, which commenced its operations, its early work, on 1 July this year. It is currently located within the Department of Industry, Innovation and Science under minister Michaelia Cash, who hails from Western Australia.

At the moment, this agency is based in Canberra. The work that it is doing at the moment is evaluating the various options for where this new space agency will be located. In the budget, which was handed down by the Coalition in May of this year, there was a total announced budget of \$300 million to go towards what was referred to as 'space expenditure'. Of that, \$41 million will be allocated towards establishing the agency. Of that \$41 million, \$15 million will go towards joining with international space agencies to enable Australian businesses to compete in the global space economy.

As I was saying before, I think that we have a great claim to house the national space agency here in South Australia. I think we will put in a very compelling and competitive bid. Let's make no mistake about this: there will be others. We hear now about other premiers around Australia who might have been wandering around the backblocks of their state and found a bit of old space junk from the 1980s and now they are claiming they have a space industry. The reality is that we have a space industry here in South Australia and we will be doing everything we can to put forward a compelling offer.

In recent weeks, we have welcomed Dr Megan Clark coming to South Australia to look at an early proposition for housing the national space agency on the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site. We believe that we could have that up and running, for the size that is envisaged, by the middle of next year. It is fair to say that the early information that we are receiving from the Coalition is that this is not going to be a massive bureaucrat-led space agency, but one which is actually focused on developing an industry, a private sector industry, which will be spending their money to create those jobs and those opportunities. It does not need to be based in Canberra. That goes without saying.

Only recently, I was in the United Kingdom, following on from the federal government's awarding of the Future Frigates contract, the SEA 5000 contract, to BAE. On that trip, I met with the head of the UK National Space Agency. Their agency is not based in London; in fact, it is based in Oxfordshire, and it is based around that industry hub. That is exactly and precisely what we could offer here in South Australia: an industry-led national space agency.

You can imagine how aghast we were on this side of the house when the federal Australian Labor Party announced that they (1) supported a national space agency—hooray—but (2) wanted that national space agency to be based in Canberra. It was a very disappointing announcement. What was even more disappointing was that we heard absolutely nothing from those opposite. We did not hear the Leader of the Opposition. We did not hear members of his shadow cabinet or in fact his caucus saying, 'No, sorry. Bill Shorten has got this wrong. Kim Beasley has got this wrong.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Well, Kim Beasley was advocating similarly and so was Chris Schacht recently advocating in Adelaide that the national space agency be based in Canberra. In fact, when Megan Clark was over in Adelaide recently my understanding is that Chris Schacht stood up at a public meeting saying that this has to be based in Canberra. We disagree. We believe that it should be based here in South Australia. We believe that we have the best opportunity to deliver outcomes, not only for the federal government but for the people of South Australia, by having it here in our state.

On this side of the house, we will do everything we can to advance the opportunity and put in the most compelling and competitive bid. What we would like to do, though, is do this in a collaborative and bipartisan way with those opposite. It is difficult to ascertain from them what their position actually is. We have not heard them condemning the federal Australian Labor Party for their moves to actually wipe out South Australia before the bid has even gone in. That is exactly what they have done. They said, 'Don't worry about putting your bid in, South Australia. Sit down and don't worry about it. We'll have it in Canberra. We want to have a bureaucrat-led space agency based in Canberra and you can pick up some of the crumbs.'

That is simply not good enough. We have a much greater ambition for South Australia than our getting a few crumbs from Canberra. What we want is the national space agency to be based here, and we would like to do that in a bipartisan way. Can I say that in recent years we have worked in a bipartisan way in areas like defence. We worked with the former government in South Australia to establish Defence SA. This was dealt with in a very bipartisan way for a very long period of time—until about two years ago, but we will leave that aside for this debate.

We worked in a very bipartisan way and much was achieved. Much can be achieved by working together in this way. I applaud the fact that the Leader of the Opposition has one portfolio, and I think I am correct in saying that he has only the one portfolio, which is defence and space. That shows his level of commitment to these important sectors. I have the defence and space industry portfolio because I know that this is critical to the future success of our state.

What we are not clear about is what the position of the South Australian Labor Party is regarding their federal colleagues saying, 'No, we don't want the space industry in South Australia. We want it to be in Canberra.' Today is an important opportunity for the opposition to put onto the public record their condemnation of Bill Shorten and his opposition's position to centralise the national space agency in Canberra.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (16:06): I rise to support the Premier's motion in an amended form. I move an amendment, as follows:

After paragraph (d) insert:

- (e) continues the bipartisan approach for South Australia to continue its leading role in the establishment and operations of a national space agency.

I am sure that in light of the Premier's recent remarks he will support the amendment.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Is that it?

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Yes, that's it. I think the resolution before the house presents a timely reminder that it took more than 33 years to push federal governments to establish a national space agency. Australia was once a leader in the space sector's global standings. South Australia has distinguished itself with a record of national and international success in space technology.

That is why the Weatherill government established the South Australian Space Industry Centre in September last year, the nation's first dedicated centre to grow the local space economy

and create future high-tech jobs. That industry centre has administrative responsibility for the Space Innovation and Growth Strategy (South Australia) Action Plan, taking this state through to 2020—of course, another Labor government initiative.

The strategy has three objectives: the first is growing South Australia's economy through space activity, the second is invigorating South Australia's space innovation ecosystem and the third is engaging international co-operation with lead countries. It was also a Labor government that commissioned and produced the *South Australian Space Capability Directory*, a guide to the existing South Australian space community. This publication highlights the enterprises, consultancies, associations, researcher organisations, educational institutions and government departments contributing to our state's vibrant space ecosystem. These are just some of the previous government's achievements.

We sought to build on our state's heritage in space. In the sector's early days, the Australian government established the Woomera rocket range in South Australia's north, starting operations in 1947. It was part of the Anglo-Australian Joint Project, at the time one of only four rocket ranges in the world. Woomera played an important role in the development of space technologies, and international collaboration was fundamental to its success. The first Australian satellite was launched from Woomera in November 1967. It was a joint project with the US government, the Australian weapons research establishment and the University of Adelaide.

The project, interestingly, made Australia only the fourth country to launch its own satellite from its own territory. Since then, Woomera has been used for satellite launches and tracking space craft, including the Mercury manned mission. A recent example is the Japan Aerospace Exploration Agency whose prototype supersonic jet was launched on the back of a rocket. That is 71 years of world-class work at the Woomera site. Meanwhile, in our national capital, the business of building on that heritage has been moving slowly, which takes me to the point of how South Australians, from both sides of politics, moved to advance the cause for a national space agency.

In July 1984, Australia's first minister for science, Mr Barry Jones MP, commissioned the Madigan report to report on space science and technology for Australia. In the foreword to his report, Madigan observed that in 1967 Australia was the third country in the world, after the USSR and the USA, to put a satellite into orbit. He said, 'It is incomprehensible that this leadership over most of the world could lapse.' His report concluded that Australia's 'space potential is fragmented and dispersed, and requires to be drawn together and fostered under a national space policy.' His was the first of many reviews that came to the same conclusion, culminating in a review announced by industry and innovation minister Arthur Sinodinos in late 2017 that admitted what most had known for decades: we need a national space agency.

Over the 33 years from Barry Jones' commissioning the Madigan report to Liberal senator Arthur Sinodinos' commitment, there had been a consistent theme of bipartisanship. It is on this basis that the Weatherill Labor government acknowledged the need for national coordination, as did the industry itself. We had waited 33 years. It was time to act and that is why we established the South Australian Space Industry Centre. We did so in the lead-up to Adelaide hosting the 68th International Astronautical Congress. At the congress opening, the federal government's Minister for Innovation, Arthur Sinodinos, announced that finally Australia would have a national space agency subject, of course, to another review.

The details of this agency were to be sorted out and that task was given to Dr Megan Clark, as the Premier referred to, as head of the CSIRO. In May this year, Dr Clark's report was completed and it was announced that the Australian space agency will begin operation from July, despite being without a place to call home. We are still awaiting the announcement but hope that action is close. National endeavours require national strategies. They require leadership. The motion moved by the Premier puts national endeavour aside in what appears to be an attempt to score a political point. I think that largely undermines the legacy that I referred to earlier.

The motion takes a rather cheap shot. The Labor Party in South Australia has a fine and proud record of our commitment to ensuring that South Australia is at the very centre of our national space industry. We have a 71-year record of success. We have geographical advantages, and just as we have always done, the South Australian Labor Party will not wait for Canberra nor bow to

Canberra. We will always stand up for South Australia. Our record for this is unparalleled, which is why I stand here supporting the amendment moved by the Premier.

I have no equivocation in making it known that where there are differences between the South Australian branch of the Labor Party and our federal colleagues, I have no hesitation, no equivocation, in always standing up for South Australia first. I will always put our parliamentary party's obligation to the people of South Australia over and above any perceived obligation to a federal body, which I think stands in stark contrast to our Premier. It stands in stark contrast to those members opposite because we know, as I am sure you well know yourself, Mr Acting Speaker, that our Premier is on a pretty short leash by the federal member for Sturt. I do not answer to anyone apart from my caucus colleagues and the people of South Australia, unlike the Premier.

I have no hesitation in standing up for South Australia against the federal Labor Party if I believe it is in this state's interests. So we support the resolution put by the Premier with a modest amendment to try to put bipartisanship at the centre of our state position. It is all very well for the Premier to come in here and espouse the virtues of bipartisanship, and then simultaneously try to make a cheap political point. Well, we are not going to stand for that.

We put a modest amendment that questions the seriousness of the government's commitment to bipartisanship, which is why we expect their support for this amendment. We can then pass this resolution, move beyond a cheap political point from the Premier and get on with the business of ensuring that this government delivers the space agency to this state, which we so absolutely deserve.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:15): I rise to support this motion and congratulate the Premier on his stance that South Australia should bid to host our national space agency. That is, notwithstanding the last speaker's contribution, in stark contrast to those opposite. We are only now becoming aware of the infinite opportunities—

Mr Malinauskas: Did you listen to what I said?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Calm down.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —increasing knowledge and use of space will present. In fact, we have just heard from the Leader of the Opposition of his support of the motion with an amendment, which I welcome, to indicate his ongoing bipartisanship approach, notwithstanding his fiery contribution trying to convince us that he will stand up to Canberra if he needs to, that he has some record of diligence in this regard and that he has no hesitation in doing that in respect of an important issue such as this.

Did he give us any indication at all that he has picked up the phone and said, 'Hello, Bill, we've got a bit of a problem here. We need to have your support on this in South Australia'? No. Did he give us any indication that he had gone over to Canberra, made an appointment with his federal leader and said, 'Listen, Bill, we really do need to sit down and talk about this. I am going to be making public statements, standing up for South Australia and this is our position'? Not a word.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not a word.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not a word. Did he say anything before the Mayo by-election?

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not a word.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Has he gone out there and—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Deputy Premier. The Deputy Premier will be heard in silence. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Did he go out and issue any public statement—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —prior to the Mayo by-election? Not a word. Now he comes in here faced with this motion and says, 'Let's be bipartisan about this.'

Mr MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Acting Speaker.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Deputy Premier! Point of order, member for Lee.

Mr MULLIGHAN: I think the member for Mawson is correct: there is no reason for the Deputy Premier to be yelling across the chamber in the manner in which she is. It is most unpleasant and disorderly.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I am not sure if that is a point of order, member for Lee. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Clearly, the Leader of the Opposition has had every opportunity since his federal colleagues have made a statement about the national space agency being in Canberra to speak up—when former senator Schacht was here putting his view, there was plenty of opportunity, but there is just deathly silence.

Mr Malinauskas: He is not a member of parliament.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Former senator—former. Are you listening? Do you want me to shout a bit louder so you can hear?

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! The Deputy Premier will be heard in silence.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Leader of the Opposition!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Stunning silence from the Leader of the Opposition. Well, we welcome him coming in today and saying, 'Look, I want to join forces with you guys. I want to actually stand up to my federal leader over there in Canberra'—whoever that is, Shorten, Albanese, whoever is going to deal with it in due course. However, I make the point that we need to have a continuous commitment. We need to have a loud commitment. We need to have a clear indication publicly of this, not just the Leader of the Opposition coming in here and saying, 'Well, let's all be happy together. We're all going to have a bipartisan approach.'

We commend the federal government's decision to establish the national space agency and we look forward to working with Dr Megan Clark AC, the former head of CSIRO, who will lead the new agency, and the Minister for Jobs and Innovation, Senator Michaelia Cash, on maximising the potential outputs for industry here in South Australia. Incidentally, if members have not noticed—and I only recently discovered this—we have an office of the national agency for jobs and innovation in South Australia. It is just across the road. There was nobody in it when I was last there; nevertheless, it is there next to—it had a different name actually.

Mr Mullighan interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: You did not know that? It is a new department. If the member for Lee—

Mr Mullighan interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): The Deputy Premier, the member for Lee—

Mr Mullighan: Yes, that's me.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I call to order the member for Lee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For the assistance of the member for Lee, it is in the old state taxation office, which was demolished and rebuilt and has the Prime Minister's suite on the top. Just next to it is the Minister for Jobs and Innovation's office and a small contingent of her department. We appreciate that and recognise Michaelia Cash's role in this.

The space industry here in Australia employs 10,000 people. It is worth almost \$4 billion, but recent capability reviews have found it could be worth as much as \$12 billion by 2030. The Space Activities Act of 1998 has been reviewed and a bill is now before the federal parliament to update that legislation, which will bring it into commercial reality, and I look forward to that being advanced. I understand that, on or about 11 August, it is due to report in the federal parliament.

I want to commend at this point the Adelaide Law School that has presented a submission in respect of the Space Activities Amendment (Launches and Returns) Bill 2018, which will include now amendments to the principal act to deal with the reduction of a maximum insurance imposition of \$100 million. This makes Australia a more cost-effective jurisdiction for commercial launch operations. The conversion of space licence to facility licence clarifies the position of the domestic launch facilitator operator, making legislation significantly more accessible for operations.

The inclusion of a reference to 'debris mitigation' brings the legislation into the 21st century, where consideration of space environment is essential. Also, the recognition of aircraft as valid launch platforms and the inclusion of an additional licence recognises the needs of these operators who may not necessarily intend to reach space, ensuring the continued viability as a rocket test facility.

South Australia can, of course, and should position itself as a centre for space law. As the industry grows, so too does the number of lawyers needed, particularly to resolve and in some cases develop complex areas of law. I can advise the house that I recently met with the Dean of the Adelaide Law School, Professor Melissa de Zwart, and Professor Dale Stephens of the Adelaide Research Unit on Military Law and Ethics.

The university has been working on the 'Woomera project', in concert with leading universities from Europe and the United States, to develop a manual that objectively articulates and clarifies existing international law applicable to military space operations. It is called 'Woomera' not because it has anything to do with the launching of rockets or weapons testing but to recognise that it was a site to successfully launch a satellite in 1967, which has been referred to by the Leader of the Opposition. That catapulted Australia into being the fourth nation to successfully do so.

Every advanced nation now is dependent on space. This may seem a far-fetched statement, but the internet, the ATM at the end of the road and my mobile phone require the use of satellites to fully function and relay accurate information to users. As a consequence of our dependence on such technologies, the risk of conflict extending to space has grown. That is why projects such as this that aim to make clear the obligations and the laws incumbent on parties are not just important now, eventually they may become necessary.

It is essentially a modern combination of a Geneva Convention and the San Remo Manual on International Law Applicable to Armed Conflict at Sea. This is world-leading research done right here in South Australia. I commend the University of Adelaide for its foresight and its work, which has practical implication for nations, for governments and for industry alike.

I wholeheartedly support this motion and commend the Premier for putting a strong bid to ensure our state is rightly placed not only to capitalise on the future jobs this entails but also to become an important legal centre for the space industry. For those members who may be representing in South Australia the future of space law in this state, I point out that we have a space course available at the University of Adelaide as part of the law degree. There are apparently some 60 students at the moment who are currently undertaking that course.

Mr Brown: No-one cares about the University of South Australia.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, the member might may call out that nobody cares about the university, but the point is—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I care about the University of Adelaide.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker, because—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am a graduate, actually, of the University of South Australia and the University of Adelaide. I am proud to be a graduate of both.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! The Deputy Premier will be heard in silence.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There are some 25 students who are currently undertaking postgraduate work in this area, and I think there are two PhD students and two on their way. I was thrilled to hear that recently because we are going to need to know what the rules of engagement are. How are we going to deal with space junk? Who is going to be able to sue who when we hit some piece of satellite in the space world?

It is a whole new frontier. It brings tears of joy to my eyes to think of all the litigation we might have one day, but what is important in the meantime is that our very own Law School is working with other universities around the world to ensure that we have a practical manual for the application of the rules in relation to this important frontier. Congratulations to the university, and I commend this motion to the house.

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (16:25): I rise today to support the amended motion. South Australia has a unique space sector heritage. We have the industry capability and workforce to build our nation's space industry reputation. It is a global industry worth an estimated \$430 billion. Currently, the Australian space sector produces annual revenues of \$3 billion to \$4 billion and employs up to 11,500 people from its 0.8 per cent share of the global space economy, according to recent data from the Space Industry Association of Australia.

This is an industry that represents a major investment and export opportunity for our state and that is why the Labor government acted. Labor acted when South Australia signed a memorandum of understanding with the ACT to advocate for the development of the industry, promote national capability and provide discussion on national space policies, programs and strategies. Labor acted when it developed a space innovation and growth strategy and established a \$4 million South Australian Space Industry Centre. Labor acted when Adelaide was selected to host the 68th International Astronautical Congress in 2017.

South Australia is home to a concentration of national defence and space assets and research organisations. We have also invested heavily in making sure that we have a workforce for the future. The South Australian Space Industry Centre is the nation's first dedicated centre to grow the local space economy and create future high-tech jobs. We successfully attracted Boeing, the world's largest aerospace company, to create 250 new highly skilled technical and advanced research positions in our state.

We assisted Fleet Space Technologies in their plans to construct a new mission control centre in Adelaide. We invested \$250 million to build new science and maths facilities in 139 public schools as part of the STEM Works program. I am very pleased to see that those STEM Works programs are starting to roll out and be opened in our schools. We know that this is the future.

But our space industry operational advantage did not happen by accident. We planned for it, fought for it and, on this side of the benches, we want to see the sector grow. We had a clear policy about creating these opportunities through entities that we created, like Defence SA and Investment Attraction SA.

This is quite a turn of attitude from the government. If it was not for the previous state Labor government, those opposite would have been quite content with Tony Abbott sending our plan for our future subs to Japan. Those opposite had no appetite to stand up for South Australia to

proactively advocate for our defence industry. It is only now, when getting the green light from Canberra, that they think it is time to advocate.

South Australia has its advantage in our operational capabilities, in particular our industry and workforce investments. Our state would make an excellent candidate to host the operational headquarters of the national space agency. This model is part of a national strategy, and it is a view that the industry peak body has held for some time.

South Australia is seen as a test bed for new ideas, with exciting developments occurring in future industries, such as space, artificial intelligence, cybersecurity and autonomous vehicles. We need to build on this reputation and take advantage of this opportunity as the global economy transitions to new industries and new ways of thinking and doing things. It is incumbent on this new government to continue this positive momentum, to fight for our state and not to turn its back on our local industry, as happened until there was a change of heart on defence. It must stand up for South Australia.

We know what our future is here. The future is the opportunity for high-tech and advanced manufacturing, building on our great history in this area. When we come together and look at these opportunities, we must be together on the same page. This is what the people of South Australia expect from us. This is what the people of South Australia want us to do: to work together, to be as one, to plan for this to happen, to educate our children and to make sure we continue to grow our great state.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:31): I rise to speak in support of the Premier's motion to establish the newly founded federal space agency in South Australia. In fact, this is so new that it does not even have an official name.

The space agency was announced in September last year by the federal Liberal government at the Adelaide Convention Centre during the International Astronautical Congress. The announcement was the latest milestone in the Liberal Party's history of supporting Australia in its space endeavours. It was during the leadership of prime minister Robert Menzies and South Australian premier Thomas Playford that the Woomera testing facility was repurposed from British munitions testing to rocketry, elevating Australia to world prominence in this field.

In 1967, Australia became the third country to launch a satellite into space from its own territory, following Russia and the United States, through research developed at the University of Adelaide. Prime minister Harold Holt continued his research and development through the Woomera deep space tracking station, which had a pivotal role in receiving the first images of the moon from NASA's Lunar Orbiter 1 in 1966.

The success continued during prime minister John Gorton's term of office, when a group of university students successfully launched a cube satellite as part of an international partnership with the United States of America. More recently, under the leadership of prime minister John Howard, Australia became the sixth country in the world to pass legislation to accommodate commercial and educational space endeavours with the Space Activities Act, a piece of legislation that has been further strengthened in promoting space endeavours by our very own defence industry minister, Christopher Pyne, while he was minister for industry, innovation and science.

Space activities are not science fiction. Space plays an integral part in our economy. We rely on satellites for our telecommunications, mapping, logistics, navigation, rescue services, weather forecasting, zoning, border protection, environmental management and even emerging practices for farming, as my regional colleagues will appreciate. My portfolios, you might think, are as far removed from space as one could possibly imagine, but no. They benefit from space technologies daily, and so do many other aspects of our lives that go unnoticed.

Our Country Fire Service volunteers rely on satellites for bushfire intelligence. Similarly, our volunteer coastguards depend on satellites for information on fogbanks. Our police and the Metropolitan Fire Service rely on real-time GPS mapping for dispatching. Road safety planning is reliant on ground truth data to help identify operational needs, and our children benefit from satellite

technology to predict heatwaves during sport carnivals. This is not technology that is exclusively reserved for either foreign business or research.

The capability for a space industry can be found right here in South Australia. Rapier Electronics is one of only a few companies in this country that can manufacture printed circuit boards that are space capable. Axiom Manufacturing and BAE Systems can provide machine tooling needs to assist in the production of space componentry. Our Customs agency services have a dedicated team for the supply and distribution of space goods.

This is of course is to say nothing of the companies leading the charge in new innovative practices that will allow for new jobs in this state—companies like Fleet, which is dedicated to providing a constellation of cube satellites that will allow for real-time geolocation of assets; Myriota, which, more ambitiously, intends to provide satellite internet services to end users; or even Neumann Space, which is leading the charge on the research and development of new classes of thrusters that will allow for low-cost station keeping, attitude control, on-orbit maintenance and active debris removal.

Beyond these innovative heavyweights are small enterprises that are only now emerging, such as ResearchSat and Fullartonbio's ambitious plan to produce 'bio-boxes', small containers capable of transporting organisms in outer space for biological and pharmaceutical related experience.

Our state also has direct access to launch capabilities through the Equatorial Launch Australia's construction of a launch facility in the Northern Territory, which will open the gateway for commercial enterprises. Adelaide based Southern Launch is also investigating options for the establishment of their own launch facility to provide a space port for future Australian endeavours. Should the need arise in the commercial sector, the government has the opportunity to cooperate with the federal government to potentially reopen the Woomera launch facility for polar orbital launches.

Our resources and facilities are not only restricted to the start-ups and companies of tomorrow; the Space Industry Association of Australia, more commonly known as SIAA, whose white paper on the need for a national space agency was tabled before cabinet early last year when the federal Liberal government was exploring the need to establish a space agency, is based here in Adelaide in Mile End, not 20 minutes drive from this house.

The SIAA provides guidance to industry and accommodates our researchers in participating in international conference and forums. The Defence Teaming Centre in Mawson Lakes provides vital links for our aerospace sector in partnering with new projects that will accommodate multisector collaboration. The Defence Science and Technology Group, based near RAAF Base Edinburgh, also provides input and guidance for technological obstacles and hurdles faced by our burgeoning sector, alongside the good work of our very own Defence SA.

Our capabilities do not stop at technological prowess. Professor Melissa de Zwart, formerly of CSIRO and now Dean of Adelaide Law School, heads a faculty that is training the next generation of lawyers to have the legal challenges faced by space at the forefront of their minds. Meanwhile, at Flinders University, Dr Alice Gorman, a leading scholar on the world stage, is investigating the cultural significance and historical preservation of decommissioned satellites and orbital debris, commonly known as 'space junk', to ensure that items of historic significance are prioritised for preservation, rather than deorbiting or recycling. Given this history, we must get behind this agency for our state.

Federal Labor leader, Bill Shorten, wants the space agency in Canberra. Well, we cannot let him get his way. Mr Shorten will place the agency in Canberra. We need to have it here in South Australia and must do everything we can to keep it that way. For that reason I say let's have a look at where the ACT's contribution to space activities is in comparison with those of our own. The ACT has what they believe is a silver bullet.

The ACT have a project that they believe out-competes our own industries. The ACT have the *Buccaneer*—a strange choice of name for a single cube satellite—which is a tiny test satellite that is roughly 10 centimetres by 10 centimetres by 10 centimetres, which has been designed by the University of New South Wales, Canberra campus, in conjunction with the Department of Defence.

It is a single cube satellite which was built by an interstate university and by federal government department in a restricted area and which was subsequently launched overseas.

The ACT had absolutely no contribution to this prototype. It was designed by an interstate university and a federal department before being launched elsewhere, but they are claiming that it is homegrown all the same. The *Buccaneer* is a commendable effort and undoubtedly will herald a new partnership between universities and government for space-related projects. However, a single government-funded cube satellite does not compare to the industrious efforts of South Australian start-ups and industry in new space that is geared towards the development of rapid manufacturing.

Why then would the ACT claim the *Buccaneer* as a sterling example of their aeronautical prowess? The answer is simple. The Australian Capital Territory wants the space agency based there because the Australian Capital Territory wants a bureaucracy-led agency, and so too does federal Labor leader, Bill Shorten. That is their bread and butter: a bigger bureaucracy to prop up the service sector in Manuka, Braddon and Dickson and to fund another roundabout somewhere in Tuggeranong.

The ACT has no further interest in the space agency beyond this. The Liberal Party and its predecessors have given the ACT space resources before. Prime minister Stanley Bruce gave the ACT the Mount Stromlo Observatory in 1923, and prime minister Harold Holt gave them the Honeysuckle Creek tracking station in 1967. Let's look at what happened to these two scientific marvels. Honeysuckle Creek tracking station, which was instrumental in the *Apollo* missions for tracking humanity's first visitors to the moon, was demolished and is now an empty lot. Mount Stromlo still has not been fully repaired after bushfire damage it sustained in 2003.

Our Labor counterparts in the ACT will have you believe that promoting innovation is solely the responsibility of the federal government, yet South Australia, unlike the ACT, has developed a thriving space sector that has blossomed with next to no input from the federal government. The ACT cannot create and sustain innovation even with federal government support, and South Australia cannot seem to stop making innovation, even with next to no federal government support.

This of course makes you wonder. If South Australia has pulled ahead of the other states in the space sector without support from the federal government, without having a space agency based here, what could be accomplished if we did actually have the support of the federal government by establishing the space agency here within our state? South Australia needs a space agency because South Australian researchers, universities, schools, industry and technology start-ups need direct access to government support to assist with fostering the development of Australian science on a world stage.

We have wonderfully bright people who can do wonderful things; we just need to steer them in the right direction. We have the best researchers, the best schools, the best universities, venture capital facilities, start-ups and emerging technologies in South Australia to accommodate a national space agency. Centred around our innovation hub as well, the future looks very bright. We have a great Premier who is committed to supporting these emerging enterprises. This government believes it is up to the task, and we are ready to go.

We on this side, unlike those opposite, firmly believe that the role of government is not confined to just shaking hands, kissing babies and pork-barrelling constituents leading to an election. The role of government is to provide the resources our people need to do the best they can. We are tasked with shaping our society to be accommodating to new practices and forward-thinking measures. To that end, we believe that a space agency based in Adelaide would help not only our community but also our state, our country, our allies and our trading partners.

I implore the opposition leader to get to the federal Labor leader, Bill Shorten, and to get him behind South Australia. He should back jobs for South Australians, not the ACT bureaucracy. I understand the case for having a space agency in the ACT. The ACT is already home to monolithic departments, numerous commissions and countless agencies. But to put the space agency in the ACT would condemn forward thinking and creativity. The baristas of Belconnen will survive well enough without a bloated bureaucracy ordering more flat whites.

I do not think it is going to be a long time for South Australia to be the world leader in space activities. Our space sector already knows where the potential lies and where the future will lead. The future of space for this country is not in the ACT but here in our very state. I implore everyone to get behind this motion. Condemn the Labor leader, Bill Shorten, who wants to put this agency in Canberra, and let's get the agency in South Australia.

Mr BROWN (Playford) (16:44): I rise to support the motion as amended by the Leader of the Opposition and note this is the third time I have given a speech in this parliament about our Australian space agency. Space has captured the imagination of human beings since time immemorial. Members of this house are clearly no exception.

Paragraph (a) of the member for Dunstan's motion reinforces the statements I have made in the past about the opportunities an Australian space agency presents for South Australia and I wholeheartedly support the paragraph. I also wholeheartedly support the sentiments of paragraph (b). The establishment of a national space agency in July this year is an extremely exciting development and is right to be applauded.

It was worth noting the chain of events set out by the Leader of the Opposition in his contribution. The development of an Australian space agency has not appeared miraculously out of the ether, but is due in no small part to the years of hard work by the former Weatherill Labor government. I must also absolutely applaud the statements of the member for Gibson. I agree that the commonwealth government, be it Abbott, Turnbull or possibly even Dutton, has done next to nothing to support the Australian space industry in South Australia.

Although there have been attempts by those on the other side to wreck the bipartisanship on this issue, I have acknowledged previously and I continue to acknowledge today that there is fierce agreement in this place about the suitability of South Australia as the home for the Australian space industry. Indeed, I hope I have set out in previous contributions a compelling argument for why the industry hub of the space agency should be centred in Mawson Lakes, in my electorate.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! Members on my right, the member for Playford has the right to be heard in silence.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Deputy Premier, nevertheless, he has the right to be heard in silence.

Mr BROWN: Is it going the way you anticipated? I bet it is not. Mawson Lakes in the wider northern suburbs already has a proud history of achievement in the space sector. Indeed, the WRESAT 1 satellite, Australia's first satellite and one of the first in the world, as mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, was constructed at the weapons research establishment in Salisbury in 1967. Countless other advancements in space and rocket technologies took place at the Weapons Research Establishment in Salisbury and at the Defence Science and Technology Group farther north at Edinburgh.

Building on this northern legacy, Mawson Lakes today contains a rare coincidence of the industrial and institutional elements which will be highly relevant to the work of an Australian space agency. I believe that locating the operational headquarters of the national space agency in this existing de facto space precinct makes perfect sense. It is the home of the operational headquarters which is the real prize in a national space agency, not mere bureaucratic jobs. It is here that the agency's innovation will be demanded, developed and refined. It is from this operational headquarters that lasting benefits for our state and the northern suburbs will flow.

The location of the Australian space agency's operational headquarters in Mawson Lakes will not only nurture the many existing space-related operations located there but also provide a focal point to attract such operations from around the country and even from around the world. This is how a national space agency can best benefit our state.

It is worth noting that South Australia's proud legacy in the space industry has been largely centred on the northern suburbs of Adelaide. This fact, along with the northern suburbs relative

geographic proximity to the wider expanses of our state, makes the case for a northern suburbs home for the Australian space agency's operational headquarters compelling, more compelling than any other sites that have also been suggested.

One such suggested site is the Tonsley innovation district, which does exceptional work but which lacks the space-related legacy, the existing industrial and institutional presence and makes much less geographic sense. The Tonsley district does have something going for it, though. It is located in federal and state electorates which are currently held by members of respective Liberal governments.

There have been whispers, even in the corridors of this building, of favours requested and deals done to shore up marginal members. It would be a disastrous shame if the hard-fought legacy developed in the northern suburbs was ignored in favour of petty, terrestrial considerations such as this. To seek to obliterate the proud legacy of the northern suburbs as the centre of South Australia's space industry for base political reasons would be a shame.

In closing, it is marvellous that members on both sides of the house are so eager to see our state reach for the stars. However, in this instance it is the Leader of the Opposition's amended version of the motion which more accurately articulates how we can best turn our journey into space from imagination to reality. I commend the amended motion to the house.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:49): I am really excited to speak on this motion and I thank the Premier for his advocacy in fighting for the space agency to be located in South Australia. We are excited because South Australia has an existing and growing space industry and we recognise that there is scope for even more. This fight for the space agency to be located in South Australia is so critical because our Marshall Liberal government is dedicated and committed to creating jobs and growth in South Australia, and I support the bid for the space agency to be located here.

Today, I am going to outline some of the reasons why it is such a great idea, and ask anyone who might listen to my speech to join in and advocate along with us for the space agency to be in South Australia. We even have the support of the Liberal Prime Minister. In September 2017, Prime Minister Malcolm Turnbull declared, 'The future is in SA,' because of our defence and space industries. The federal government announced a national space agency in 2017.

Why should the space industry be based in South Australia and not in Canberra, where the federal Labor opposition and Bill Shorten are proposing it be put? We believe we have the capability to deliver it right here in South Australia. We have a rapidly growing space innovation ecosystem and we are well placed to become Australia's hub for future space industry development.

Already home to over 60 space-related organisations, South Australia is committed to developing strategies to grow the local industry and to increase research and development collaboration as well as international engagement. Launched in September 2017, the new South Australian Space Industry Centre marked the creation of the nation's first dedicated centre to grow the local space economy and create future high-tech jobs.

The South Australian Space Industry Centre will build on the work of the previous space industry office at Defence SA to drive space industry innovation, research and entrepreneurial development. The team promotes an active network and enhances co-operation among the main stakeholders of the space innovation ecosystem, including facilitating opportunities for engagement with international partnerships. Locating the space agency in SA makes perfect economic sense for South Australia.

In June 2018, Steven Marshall announced that South Australia will be home to the first company in Australia with the capability to design and manufacture satellites and payloads of up to 300 kilograms, with Italian company SITAEL setting up its headquarters in Adelaide. The Premier said the establishment of SITAEL Australia will further cement South Australia's international reputation as a hub of innovation and an ideal environment to develop fresh ideas in the space industry. He said:

SITAEL is an innovative company leading the development of next-generation small satellites, and their decision to expand into South Australia demonstrates confidence in our state's growing space industry.

SITAEI's move into Adelaide will create high-tech jobs for South Australians, open up new collaboration opportunities with local companies and strengthen our state's reputation...We are focused on building our thriving space industry to make it a key contributor to the growth and diversification of South Australia's economy.

The growth of space and sustainable defence industries in South Australia plays a key role in the state's economic development. The main capabilities and expertise are concentrated on earth observation, satellite communications and space-based position navigation and timing. These space-enabling services support activities across a variety of sectors, including communication, environmental monitoring and mapping.

The space industry contributes to the development of other priority sectors for South Australia, including defence, agriculture, mining and tourism, as well as services for the community, such as health and education. The South Australian Space Industry Centre has carriage of the state's space strategy—the Space Innovation and Growth Strategy (South Australia) Action Plan—from 2016 to 2020. This strategy is underpinned by three key pillars:

- growing South Australia's economy through space activity;
- invigorating South Australia's space innovation ecosystem. The aspiration to inspire and support the next generation to develop skills that will push forward the frontiers of scientific knowledge; and
- engaging international cooperation with lead countries. Enhancing our competitive edge in export markets and targeting market-led investments in leading-edge technology where we encourage foreign investment as well as attracting entrepreneurs' talent, researchers and students.

This is a growth industry. We must seize this opportunity for our current and future generations. In recent years, the space economy has experienced exponential global growth. Revenue from space-related activities in 2015 was about US\$323 billion, growing at a compound annual growth rate of 9.52 per cent from 1998 to 2015. This is more than three times the annual growth rate of world GDP which was 2.87 per cent for the same period.

The president of the Italian Space Agency also welcomed the move of Italian company SITAEI to set up its headquarters in Adelaide and said that in the last two years the Australian space sector has grown very fast, with the new Australian Space Agency proof of a forward-looking political vision that puts space infrastructure at the centre of social and economic development.

Our Liberal government believes in creating the capacity of this wonderful state. We believe our role is to attract investment and further growth of the space sector in South Australia as it thereby will foster a sustainable industry. There are so many benefits of space-based applications. Some of these daily benefits include increasing efficiency in agriculture and fisheries. For example, satellite enabled applications improve the mapping of crop land in need of irrigation, harvest forecasts and fisheries control. This guarantees better food quality and security while safeguarding the environment.

Secondly, space-based applications help regions access knowledge and information. Telecommunications satellites support communication needs when earth-based solutions are limited. This reduces regional imbalances by serving communities in remote areas without internet access. Thirdly, they improve crisis response. Satellite services help shorten response times in emergencies. Swift damage images and assessment maps contribute to more efficient planning and relief efforts and help guide rescue services.

Fourthly, they protect the environment and help tackle climate change. Environment monitoring provides crucial information on vegetation, ocean currents, water quality, national resources, atmospheric pollutants, greenhouse gases and the ozone layer. Fifthly, they increase security. Satellite positioning, satellite communications and earth observation contribute to detecting illegal immigration, prevent cross-border organised crime and combat piracy at sea.

Globally, the space industry is worth more than \$450 billion. In Australia, it is worth about \$4 billion and employs 11,500 workers. The global space industry is growing rapidly and it is crucial that Australia, and more specifically South Australia, is part of this growth. What a wonderful thing for South Australia! It will bring new jobs, new investment and boost our economy, not to mention

that a space agency in South Australia really is super cool. This morning I ran this fight to have this space agency past my eight-year-old son and he agreed. He said to me that his dream is to fly through the air.

We can excite our students by the prospect of being the space capital. One of the most enjoyable tasks in my role as MP is taking students on tours of Parliament House and involving them in the learning of procedures by asking them to introduce and debate a bill. The next one will be to establish a space agency in South Australia and hear their ideas on why this is such a cool idea.

I commend the Premier for this motion, for his ongoing leadership and for doing all he can to advocate for the space agency to be located in South Australia. This will create real change, jobs and an opportunity for our next generation. It is certainly an opportunity that we hope to attract bipartisan support for, and I commend the motion to all members in the house. Hashtag #ourfutureisbright.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:59): I rise to support this motion moved by the Premier acknowledging that this house recognises the significant opportunity that space-related industries provide to the South Australian economy. Any mention of a space industry really causes one's thoughts to turn towards rockets to the moon and interplanetary missions to explore the solar system and beyond, all the province of large international players such as the United States, Russia and the former Soviet Union; however, in this modern world, everyday space provides essential data for banking, TV, satellite communications, internet access and, more recently, GPS simply to know where you are.

Space underpins almost every part of the broader economy, with space-related products and services being used in virtually every sector of the Australian economy. They are important to the ongoing economic productivity of industry sectors, including transport logistics, mining and agriculture. As early as 1960, the government recognised the value of space applications to the management and economic development of Australia and also to its national security. South Australia has a proud history in the area of space. From the late 1950s, the weapons research establishment commenced the Skylark sounding program at the Woomera rocket range. This would lead to Woomera becoming the hub of early space activities here in Australia.

Operating until 1975, this program was conducted in conjunction with the University of Adelaide. It carried out upper atmospheric research that made important contributions to understanding the factors governing Australia's meteorology. Australian and British researchers made substantial contributions to X-ray, infrared and ultraviolet astronomy using these Skylark rockets that took measurements in the upper atmosphere. Among those researchers was Professor John Carver from Adelaide University, and in 1967, the United States kindly and unexpectedly donated a Redstone rocket to Australia that was capable of launching a satellite.

With the launch vehicle suddenly available, the weapons research establishment satellite (WRESAT) was designed, constructed and launched in only 11 months—a very quick turnaround—and relied upon a collaboration between the weapons research establishment and the University of Adelaide, headed up by Professor John Carver. WRESAT's scientific instrument package was derived from the Australian upper atmospheric sounding rocket programs. This instrument package was designed, set up and built in the space simulation chamber in the physics department building in Adelaide University on North Terrace.

Launched on 27 November 1967, WRESAT gave Australia entry into an exclusive and limited number of countries that had orbited a national satellite launched from their own nation. The WRESAT lasted 10 days in orbit and confirmed the findings of the sounding rockets. So, by the end of the sixties, not only had the Australian space program launched a satellite but it was a crucial participant in NASA's space program, providing tracking stations including providing communications between the moon landing mission and NASA.

While Australia continued to be involved in the space industry, the level of investment from government has focused more on research capability and moved away from a launch capability, with the Skylark sounding program finishing in the 1970s. Professor Carver was the professor who invited my father to work at the physics department at Adelaide University and it was where later, in the

1980s, in that same room as the space simulation room, he began making mirror components for a gamma ray telescope.

Making use of the continuing relationship between Adelaide University and the DSTO, allowed the G-Range telescope to be located on a site in Woomera. As I spoke of in my maiden speech, this allowed me to visit the defunct and derelict launchpads and empty mission control buildings in Woomera.

This certainly gave me an interest in the space industry, and as a university student I was fortunate to spend eight weeks, between December and February, based at the Australian National University Mount Stromlo Research Facility, which of course predates that which the member for Gibson mentioned of what happened in 2003. This involved researching far-off galaxies in the infrared domain. Unfortunately, it is probably beyond me now to remember how we did that, but I think it involved doppler shifts.

Following on from this, my first undergraduate work was at British Aerospace helping in the design and construction of a digital test harness for a satellite, which was used to simulate the function of the satellite receiver for the RadioAstron project. So, for me, this announcement and this motion moved by the Premier to try to bring the space agency here to South Australia is exciting, and it is great that this government is once again pursuing the space industry in South Australia.

Australia became an early adopter of satellite technologies and is well recognised today as a sophisticated and extensive user of space-based services and space-related data. This space-related data is what is growing and driving the growth in the space industry at present. The international space industry is a rapidly growing market, averaging a yearly growth of approximately 10 per cent, and the global space economy now is worth around \$450 billion, growing to about a \$725 billion industry over the next 20 years.

Australia has so far captured only a very small percentage of the existing market. This future market is potentially worth an extra hundreds of billions of dollars, and it is expected that the new activities will make up a significant portion of this amount. This future market is likely to comprise downstream use of new satellite data, either positioning navigational or earth imaging, along with upstream opportunities in the area of small satellites and consumer electronics in space.

This is to the advantage of high-tech countries with less of an established space industry, as this new emerging market will depend less on establishing infrastructure and businesses and more on innovation and technology transfer, but we must act now to take advantage and compete in the space-based market in the future. It is a global industry and growing, and so how we use space will change how we live and work, including providing new opportunities for communication in regional and remote areas, and we have heard many members on this side of the house speak about how important the regions are.

There is huge potential for new players, and the time to act is now. More broadly, the Australian government is also looking to encourage and support the space industry in Australia. An expert panel review of Australia's space industry capacity was conducted in 2017, and one of the key recommendations was the establishment of a dedicated space agency. At the time of the review, only two OECD countries were without a space agency—Ireland and Australia—and so it is fantastic that we have now become one of the OECD countries to incorporate a space agency.

This occurred on 1 July 2018 and saw the recent establishment of the Australian space agency, with Dr Megan Clark being appointed as the interim head of the agency. I applaud the federal government for its decision to establish a national space agency. The agency itself will act as a coordinator of civil space policy across the government and will allow the government to develop the international networks needed to allow Australia's space industry to achieve its full potential.

The federal government estimates that Australia could triple its current income from the space industry towards \$12 billion and create 20,000 jobs through the establishment of the national space agency. These are jobs that South Australia wants and needs, especially for the younger generation. We have seen how important it is to try to provide employment to keep them within this state. The Australian space agency will support the long-term development of space technologies. It will grow our domestic space industry and allow businesses across the economy to prosper and enter new markets and create jobs.

The motion before us contends, and quite rightly so, that the Australian space agency should be based in South Australia as our state has a longstanding involvement in both defence and space-related fields and has demonstrated both capability and expertise in these industries. Our state has provided the industry with NASA astronaut Andy Thomas. Dr Thomas is a strong advocate for South Australia's bid for the national space agency. He has travelled to space four times and was the deputy director of NASA's Astronaut Office for a period of time.

It is worth understanding what forces are at play. Recently, I represented the Premier at the United Nations Association of Australia (South Australian branch) event, which hosted guest speaker, Flavia Nardini, from Fleet Space Technologies. An unheralded success story of the United Nations is the Outer Space Treaty, which is a rules-based international space order to make sure that outer space is peaceful and not contested. Since 1967, this has not been violated.

Flavia Nardini spoke about how new space technologies are changing industries in Australia and around the world. Flavia compared what is happening with satellite technology to the evolution of computing. Initially a computer used to fit in a room and now our modern day iPhones have as much computing power as those first computers and fit into our pockets. Similarly, satellites were large and expensive in the early days and also the most recent past. As an example, the National Broadband Network's Sky Muster satellites cost \$500 million each, weigh 6.4 tonnes, take five years to build and they operate in a high space orbit.

Expensive satellites such as this are mainly the game of governments and big businesses, but satellites are now going the same way as computers, with miniaturisation of electronics allowing instrumentation to be compacted into satellites the size of shoeboxes or nanosatellites. They weigh in the order of a few kilograms and, because they are so small, they can be launched in a lower orbit as they have less chance of collision.

The satellites have a short life expectancy and can re-enter the earth's atmosphere in between three to four years, where they burn up and are no threat to ground level. This low weight allows a launch rocket with just a few kilograms payload capacity spare to offer up a spot for a nanosatellite at a cost of \$200,000. In fact, responding to the surge in nanosatellites, there are a number of rocket companies looking to provide regular launch programs to provide a market similar to Uber, where the launch of a nanosatellite can be booked online.

At the same time, we are seeing the growth of a connected world via the internet of things. Over the last 20 years, we have seen the internet brought to people, with approximately three billion people worldwide connected, mainly through terrestrial based means; however, over 95 per cent of the earth does not have connectivity. This is occurring at the same time as we are living through the fourth industrial revolution, which includes bringing the internet of things, where everything that has a chip will be online, and this will grow the number of devices that are connected online towards 100 billion devices.

For this online connectivity, it relies on low bandwidth, low range and low cost connectivity that can be supplied by nanosatellites. These satellites are creating the next internet. At the same time, these nanosatellites will open up commercial opportunities, such as being able to be used to track illegal maritime behaviour. In agriculture, for example, there is significant potential, with the connection of things to benefit farmers deliver the food that we eat. One thing holding farmers back—and we have heard it in this chamber—is the connectivity and lack of communications they have on big landholdings.

This is what is fuelling the growth in the space industry and has seen growth in the space industry in South Australia as well. Fleet Technology was started three years ago by Flavia, who was a rocket scientist at the European Space Agency who moved to Adelaide. At the time of her moving, there was only one space start-up company, with most of the space work being defence related. Twelve months ago, there were 30 of these businesses and now there are approximately 60 companies employing approximately 800 people.

Recently, on 27 July this year, Fleet Technologies opened a ground station at Pinkerton Plains, 80 kilometres north of Adelaide, to complete the mission control centre that they have also built at their headquarters in Adelaide. This ground station will allow the company to track Fleet's two nanosatellites, due to be launched later this year, and also the ground station, which would allow

other space start-ups across Australia and the world to monitor their own nanosatellites and payloads at a fraction of the cost of the larger operators. Flavia Nardini stated:

We're democratising space and advancing global collaboration!

...The ground station launch cements our commitment to driving quicker access to data to help transform billion-dollar industries, from precision agriculture on isolated rural farms in Tasmania, maritime monitoring in the middle of the Pacific Ocean and food supply chain management in Asia.

This is the first piece of commercial space infrastructure that has been built in Australia since the creation of the national space agency.

Additionally, in June this year the member for King and I attended the eNVIe awards for the Flinders University 2018 Venture Dorm graduates. Before us were start-up businesses, and included amongst them was Ping. Ping is a software and service platform business in the acoustic sector, which has developed a unique acoustic surveillance tool. It has developed a patented listening device that is set to solve a \$5 billion industry maintenance problem. By measuring acoustic signatures, its technology is able to record turbine damage and then advise turbine owners of this damage. The tool aims to transform how wind farms are managed and maintained.

At present, it is necessary for wind farm owners to keep a close eye on their wind turbines to identify when a fault or damage occurs. By identifying faults early, it is possible to reduce the severity of the damage and so reduce maintenance costs. Ping has partnered with another local company, Myriota, to deliver wind farm monitoring. Myriota connects huge populations of long battery life Internet of Things devices by sending small packets of data at an ultra-low cost from any location worldwide. These examples and others that members in this house have spoken of previously show the vibrant commercial space industry that is currently underway in South Australia.

In September 2017, the previous government created the South Australian Space Industry Centre (SASIC) to drive space industry innovation, research and entrepreneurial developments. It shows its commitment to this bipartisan approach that we are taking today. The SASIC will support space entrepreneurs and create an environment where new space technologies can be rapidly developed.

This Marshall Liberal government is committed to maximising the benefit to the South Australian economy by investing in space-related industries. The space industry in this state has enormous capability in terms of the space sector, and enormous potential going forward to be self-sustaining and operating close to business. The national space agency needs to be located near a business hub, not locked away in the rarefied air of Canberra, surrounded by bureaucracy and public servants. It would be a dangerous step to isolate the agency in Canberra, as federal Labor's Bill Shorten proposes should he become the next Prime Minister.

Just as South Australia was the cradle for this country's first foray into space in the 1950s and 1960s, the state is now the cradle for what promises to be transformational—Australia's next big industry. Dr Megan Clark is currently investigating the location of the national space agency, and the Premier has said publicly many times that this government will provide a clear, competitive and compelling case for locating the national space agency right here in South Australia. This government will devote all resources and time necessary to convince the selection process that Adelaide is the ideal location for the new space agency. I call on all members in this house to support this government's bid for the space agency to be based here in South Australia.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (17:18): I take this opportunity to thank all those members of this house who have made a positive contribution to the debate and supported this motion.

It is very important that we recognise the opportunities of the space industry; that we applaud the federal government for their decision to establish a national space agency; that we condemn the federal Labor Party for having a policy that the agency should be based in Canberra, when it should be here; and that we support the South Australian government's bid for the space agency to be based in Adelaide. Of course, we are very pleased to continue the bipartisan approach for South Australia to continue its leading role in the establishment and operations of a national space agency. This house should stand in unity on all these matters, and I therefore commend the motion to the house.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

Bills

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 3, page 3, after line 8—Insert:

principles of competitive neutrality has the same meaning as in the Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act 1996.

No. 2. Clause 3, page 3, after line 8—Insert:

referring authority, in relation to a matter referred to the Commission for inquiry, means the Minister or a House of Parliament (as the case may be).

No. 3. Clause 5, page 3, after line 36 [clause 5(2)]—Insert:

(ab) to hold inquiries and report on matters referred, by resolution, by either House of Parliament;

No. 4. Clause 5, page 4, lines 3 and 4 [clause 5(2)(d)]—Delete paragraph (d) and substitute:

(d) to conduct, on its own initiative or on the referral of the Minister, research and policy development;

No. 5. Clause 5, page 4, after line 4 [clause 5(2)]—Insert:

(da) to hold inquiries, either on referral by the Minister or on its own initiative, on the implementation of the principles of competitive neutrality in relation to South Australian government businesses and business activities and to report to the Minister on such inquiries;

No. 6. Clause 8, page 4, after line 19—Insert:

(2) A person may only be appointed as a Commissioner if, following referral by the Minister of the proposed appointment to the Statutory Authorities Review Committee established under the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991*—

(a) the appointment has been approved by the Committee; or

(b) the Committee has not, within 21 days of the referral, or such longer period as is allowed by the Minister, notified the Minister in writing that it does not approve the appointment.

No. 7. Clause 14, page 6, lines 10 to 26—Delete clause 14 and substitute:

14—Disclosure of pecuniary or personal interest

(1) A Commissioner who has a pecuniary or personal interest in a matter being considered or about to be considered by the Commission must, as soon as possible after the relevant facts have come to the Commissioner's knowledge, disclose the nature of the interest at a meeting of the Commission.

Maximum penalty: \$25,000.

(2) A Commissioner who has a pecuniary or personal interest in a matter being considered or about to be considered by the Commission—

(a) must not vote, whether at a meeting or otherwise, on the matter; and

(b) must not be present while the matter is being considered at the meeting.

(3) Subsection (2) does not apply if—

(a) a Commissioner has disclosed an interest in a matter under subsection (1); and

(b) the Commission has at any time passed a resolution that—

(i) specifies the Commissioner, the interest and the matter; and

(ii) states that the Commissioners voting for the resolution are satisfied that the interest is so trivial or insignificant as to be unlikely to influence

the disclosing Commissioner's conduct and should not disqualify the Commissioner from considering or voting on the matter.

- (4) Despite section 15, if a Commissioner is disqualified under subsection (2) in relation to a matter, a quorum is present during the consideration of the matter if at least half the number of members who are entitled to vote on any motion that may be moved at the meeting in relation to the matter are present.
- (5) The Minister may by instrument in writing declare that subsection (2) or subsection (4), or both, do not apply in relation to a specified matter either generally or in voting on particular resolutions.
- (6) The Minister must cause a copy of a declaration under subsection (5) to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 14 sitting days after the declaration is made.
- (7) Particulars of a disclosure made under subsection (1) at a meeting of the Commission must be recorded—
 - (a) in the minutes of the meeting; and
 - (b) in a register kept by the board which must be reasonably available for inspection by any person.
- (8) A reference in subsection (2) to a matter includes a reference to a proposed resolution under subsection (3) in respect of the matter, whether relating to that member or a different member.
- (9) A contravention of this section does not invalidate any decision of the Commission.
- (10) Section 8 of the *Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act 1995* does not apply to a Commissioner.

No. 8. Clause 20, page 8, lines 3 and 4 [clause 20(1)]—

Delete 'the Minister, by written notice, refers to the Commission.' and substitute:

—

- (a) the Minister, by written notice, refers to the Commission; or
- (b) either House of Parliament, by resolution, refers to the Commission.

No. 9. Clause 20, page 8, line 5 [clause 20(2)]—After 'written notice' insert:

or resolution (as the case requires)

No. 10. Clause 20, page 8, line 6 [clause 20(3)]—Delete 'The Minister' and substitute 'The referring authority'

No. 11. Clause 20, page 8, line 7 [clause 20(3)(a)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'referring authority'

No. 12. Clause 20, page 8, line 14 [clause 20(4)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'referring authority'

No. 13. Clause 21, page 8, after line 18 [clause 21(2)]—Insert:

- (aa) the referring authority; and

No. 14. Clause 21, page 8, line 25 [clause 21(3)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'referring authority'

No. 15. Clause 22, page 8, line 29 [clause 22(1)]—Delete 'Minister' and substitute 'referring authority'

No. 16. Clause 23, page 8, lines 35 and 36 [clause 23(1)]—

Delete 'to the Minister' and substitute:

—

- (a) in the case of an inquiry referred by the Minister—to the Minister; or
- (b) in the case of an inquiry referred by a House of Parliament—to the presiding member of the relevant referring House.

No. 17. Clause 23, page 9, after line 4—Insert:

- (3) The Minister must, within 90 days of receiving a report delivered to the Minister by the Commission under subsection (1), provide a response to the Commission on its report and the Commission must publish the Minister's response on its website.

No. 18. Clause 23, page 9, after line 4—Insert:

- (4) The Chair must, at least once in each year and at such other times as is required, appear before the Economic and Finance Committee established under the *Parliamentary Committees Act 1991* in relation to a report on any inquiry conducted by the Commission.

No. 19. New clause, page 9 after line 24—Insert:

26—Review of Act

- (1) The Minister must cause a review of this Act and its administration and operation to be conducted on the expiry of 3 years from its commencement.
- (2) The review must be completed within 6 months and the results of the review embodied in a written report.
- (3) The Minister must cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after receiving the report.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will move that this house agrees to amendments Nos 1,4,17 and 19; disagrees with amendments Nos 2,3, 6 to16, and 18; and disagrees to amendment 5 and makes an amend in lieu thereof.

This is an important bill before the house. It is something that we on this side of the house have talked about for an extended period of time. We have a desire to improve the overall productivity of our state. We have put forward a model. We have consulted widely regarding various other bodies of its type that exist around the rest of the country. I am convinced that what we have put forward is a model which will work well and serve the people of South Australia extraordinarily well.

I thank everybody who to date has made a contribution to the debate both in this house and in the other place. We have now received some amendments from the other place. We have already indicated that some of these we are prepared to agree with, in particular amendments Nos 1,4,17 and 19. There are others, though, that we are not prepared to accept.

We make it clear that this is a body without an exceptionally large budget. Having members of parliament with the right to refer a range of issues to this body could end up with a very significant workload that is not envisaged by the government in this first instance. We believe that this is the right body with the right format that has been put forward and so, for the reasons that I have outlined, we will not be supporting the appointment process from the parliament. We will not be supporting other amendments that have been put forward, in particular, as I said, those amendments Nos 2,3, 6 to16, and 18.

With regard to amendment No. 5, we are putting forward an amendment in lieu, which I understand has been discussed with the Hon. Mr Darley of the other place. We put that forward as an alternative that provides some clarification regarding issues that he has raised regarding competitive neutrality. I would make the point to the house that this is not a piece of legislation that will determine whether or not a Productivity Commission exists. We can establish a body like this without it going through the parliament, and we will if we are required to. We are 100 per cent committed to the establishment of a body like this.

We would ideally like to do it via legislation, but if that is not possible we will make other arrangements. Executive government, of course, establishes a range of inquiries on behalf of the people of South Australia. We see this in various formats already: royal commissions and other commissions of inquiry. The previous government did a lot of work seeking an inquiry on a range of issues where they would go and appoint a person to do that work. We believe that the model we have put forward will ensure that in many circumstances the work of these individual inquiries can be done by the productivity commission. They can be done cost effectively, and they can be done in a more timely manner.

Under the previous arrangements, governments would have to essentially decide on the scope and appoint a commissioner. That commissioner would then have to go and organise their staff and their office. Invariably, those inquiries were not peer reviewed. I think there are a lot of advantages in having a productivity commission in place. It provides another opportunity for the government to send an issue for inquiry to that productivity commission.

That means that the inquiry is not stalled while the office and its researchers are being established, and I believe that it will yield more cost-effective, timely results for the people of South Australia. For those reasons, as I said, we will accept some of the amendments proposed by the other place, but we will be disagreeing with others.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk): The member for Lee.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Chairperson, I think—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Chairman.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Sorry; the politically correct term offends you, does it, member for Morialta?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk): Order! Chairman is fine.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Chairperson. I am happy to make some general comments before we get to each amendment in turn, as the Premier has done. I indicate that the opposition will be seeking to support those amendments which have been made in the other place. They have been done, as far as I am aware, from a genuine willingness by the opposition and the crossbench to enhance the transparency of the productivity commission, as well as some of the roles that it can undertake on behalf of the government and, given the nature of some of the amendments, undertake on behalf of the parliament. This would occur if either house on motion should choose to refer an inquiry to it.

I must say that I am a little disappointed to hear some of the language that has come from the Treasurer and the Premier. Without wanting to be inflammatory, I would say it is almost churlish. Both have made reference to the fact that, unless they get the bill they demand from the parliament, there is no point setting up a productivity commission legislatively, and they will do one by virtue of the powers vested in executive government.

It is an important point to make, because that was the very first question I asked in this place in the committee stage of the bill. Why is the government seeking to establish a productivity commission in the way in which the original bill envisages, with an exclusive relationship between the minister and the commission? There are all the interactions from the appointments of the commissioners, or any declaration that might need to be made by a commissioner about whether any other remunerated employment is being undertaken, the referral of inquiries from the minister to the commission, if it is established, and the receipt of the work of those inquiries by the commission back to the minister, and that is it.

I asked: why not just establish it through executive government? The first words from the Premier's mouth while we were in committee stage—the first reason—was 'transparency'. You do not need to read too deeply into the *Hansard* of the other place while this bill was in the committee stage to understand that that is precisely what the crossbench and the opposition were seeking in the amendments that were moved.

I tried to keep up with the relatively swift recollection of the Premier as to which were being supported and which were not, but it is a little disappointing, based on those which are not being supported. However, I will go into a little bit more detail as we come across each amendment for debate.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk): As the member for Lee has indicated, it looks like we might have to go through this amendment by amendment.

Amendment No. 1:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 be agreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: I will speak to the amendment. I think this is an entirely reasonable amendment from the Hon. Mr Darley of the other place. Those who have paid keen attention to this bill might perhaps know that the establishment of the federal Productivity Commission under the commonwealth act was principally for the purpose of investigating complaints regarding competitive neutrality of government agencies.

I spoke at some length in my second reading contribution, as the bill originated here, about why it was the case that had come at the end of what was not quite finished, but what had been a reasonably extensive program of competition policy and trying to ensure that government business enterprises at both the federal and state levels were operating competitively and without unfair advantage over their private sector counterparts. It was still necessary at that point to establish this commission to undertake those sorts of complaints because states, including South Australia and just about every other jurisdiction, still had many government-owned enterprises which were, from time to time, subject to those complaints.

The Hon. Mr Darley's experience as a public servant, let alone as a member of parliament, predates most, if not all, of us. You always have to qualify that, given the presence of the Hon. Rob Lucas in the other place. The Hon. Mr Darley would remember quite well, particularly from his time as valuer-general, the sorts of complaints that can be made against public authorities. In particular, in his former role as valuer-general, the office responsible for setting valuations for properties, people would complain about those from time to time to the valuer-general, if not about their council rates then about their water rates, which rely on those property valuations.

At the same time, over the last 30 years from time to time we have had institutions that have sought the opportunity to compete in the provision of potable water to South Australians, whether it is industry, business or residences. As to that issue of competition for what is clearly, I would argue, good public health and safety reasons, a single market operator, there would be from time to time complaints. With this first amendment, the Hon. Mr Darley seeks to enable the productivity commission in South Australia in this bill to undertake investigations of complaints of competitive neutrality.

In a later amendment, amendment No. 5, which I appreciate the Premier has indicated the government will move an alternative amendment to—and we will wait to see what that alternative amendment is—the government has attempted to dissuade the Hon. Mr Darley and say that the Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act is a more appropriate regime for those complaints to occur. Unsurprisingly, The Hon. Mr Darley, as well as the opposition, disagrees with the government on that point, and for good reason—because any such inquiries undertaken under the auspices of the Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act are creatures of the minister responsible for that act.

It is easy to see how there can be a lack of both transparency and independence if an investigation was to be undertaken under that regime, as opposed to a body like the South Australian productivity commission, which demonstrably should be at more arm's length than the investigation which could be held under the Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act. That is the very point with which the Hon. Mr Darley has been most concerned.

I must admit that the requirement of the Hon. Mr Darley to impose this task on the productivity commission, as it is to be established here in South Australia, was not front of mind to the opposition. I have given the example of SA Water and the provision of potable water to South Australians because that is one of the very few government business enterprises that is left. Perhaps from time to time others might crop up about the Public Trustee or so on, which may be of interest to some members, particularly those familiar with operating in the area of wills and probate.

Given that the Hon. Mr Darley has put this amendment, it is of no burden much at all for a productivity commission to be conducting that task. It also mirrors quite closely one of the key roles of the federal Productivity Commission. The government's move to strike out this amendment—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: We haven't; we are supporting it.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Sorry, to support this. It is one we support greatly as well. When it comes to amendment No. 5, the related amendment—thank you for reminding me—that is where we will take umbrage because the—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard: Once you get there. I'm waiting.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Yes, we will get there, and you will be waiting a long time, Corey.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk): Order!

Mr MULLIGHAN: That is where we will take umbrage. Amendment No. 1, the enabling amendment for amendment No. 5, is reasonable. The government, inasmuch as it supports it, should support amendment No. 5 as it has been put by Mr Darley.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 2:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The government will not be supporting this amendment. I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 2 be disagreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: This is an amendment made in the other place which should stand, and it is disappointing that the government will not be supporting this particular amendment. This is one of a number of amendments that are related to one another, and together, in effect, they give the opportunity for either house of parliament to refer an inquiry to the productivity commission.

This is not a great ask of the commission; in turn, it is not a great ask of the government to agree to this amendment. There have been all sorts of excuses that have been offered in the other place by the Treasurer. He claims that this would be too resource intensive and that this would be too expensive. He has tried to give the illusion that there would be many referrals that could be made by either house of parliament and could bog down the work of the commission and detract from the work the government of the day refers to the commission.

Nothing could be further from the truth. It is a very rare beast, indeed, that there can be sufficient support in this place for the house to move a referral to the commission. Of course, it would not originate from the government's side because the executive would have already made its referrals to the commission. It then becomes, in this place, whether an opposition would be successful in moving such an inquiry and, of course, it would not be. If we were successful in doing that, we would probably be on the other side of the chamber, rather than on the side that we occupy.

So it is not a problem for down here. If you turn your attention to the capacity of the other place to refer an inquiry to the productivity commission under this regime, relating to amendment Nos 2 and 3 and many of the others that the Premier indicated the government will not be supporting, they give moreover the opportunity to the other place to refer inquiries. I said it is a rare beast down here, but it is almost as rare up there. The parallel, which the Treasurer drew in his remarks as he opposed this amendment and this series of amendments, is that it is open to the council to establish all manner of select committees to inquire into matters in which it is interested.

That does not happen that often. It did not happen very often under the previous Labor government, despite the efforts of the then Liberal opposition, and it is unlikely to happen this time unless there is a particular issue which is of broad concern to the council. I say 'broad concern' because you would need more than just the opposition and one crossbencher or more than just the opposition and one party in the crossbench. You would need at least the opposition and at least two parties across the crossbench to establish a referral against the wish of the government. That is why it is likely to be rare.

I also raise it, and it is timely that we have the Minister for Local Government in here for this part of the debate, because one of the crossbench parties has indicated that they are particularly interested in having the commission do some work around the bill which has been presented on rate capping. If a member of parliament who is finding themselves under considerable pressure to support a government bill on something like rate capping makes entreaties to the extent that they would like an independent external panel of people who are either economists or economically minded to thoroughly research and provide advice to them on such a bill, that is not such an unreasonable request.

As I have already pointed out, it will not be a frequent request. You can see that if the government is genuine about wanting to pursue both this bill and bills like the rate capping bill where members are asking for that sort of support which is not available to them and is not available to the parliament outside of this sort of body, then it is clear to see why the government should support it.

This is, I think, when these amendments were being moved in the other place where the Treasurer said that the government will need to reconsider whether we have one of these bodies in the first place. I think that is a disappointing attitude because it indicates that a government is only interested in the parliament rubberstamping its legislation, not genuinely being involved in its development or formation and not genuinely interested in the views of the opposition or more particularly the crossbench.

It is not a very positive message to send members of the crossbench, particularly those who are relatively new to the role of MP, that the government is disinterested in their views or disinterested in the contributions they can make to improving legislation. We support the amendment as it stands and we will be opposing the government's efforts to remove it.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 23
 Noes 20
 Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

McBride, N.	Weatherill, J.W.
-------------	------------------

Motion thus carried.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.

Amendment No. 3:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 3 be disagreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: As I indicated with regard to amendment No. 2, we will oppose the government's efforts in trying to knock off this amendment. For very good reason, there is a strong desire by the crossbench to have the opportunity to refer matters and seek advice from the productivity commission. Just about all members of the crossbench and opposition made it clear that they support this measure, and the assertion from the government, first via the Treasurer and the Premier, that this makes the commission unworkable is just simply not true.

I would urge the Premier, if he does want this body established and he does want it to be a genuine agency that can conduct inquiries not just on the whim of the minister or the government of the day but as a broader service to the people of South Australia as they are represented by members of parliament, to support the retention of this amendment and not seek to oppose it.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 21
 Noes 18
 Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Habib, C.	Close, S.E.	McBride, N.
Weatherill, J.W.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Koutsantonis, A.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 4:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 4 be agreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: I am glad that this amendment is being supported by the government. It is a relatively simple and straightforward amendment, and it means two things: not only will the commission be able to be in receipt of requests for inquiries by the commission but they can conduct research and policy development, which I suspect is pretty much in line with what the government's expectation—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Lee, take your seat for a minute. I am going to ask that all other members will listen to the contribution from the member for Lee in silence. Member for Lee.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Thank you for your protection, Mr Chairperson. As I was saying, it means two things: not only can they just receive inquiries referred from the minister but the minister can also ask them to conduct research and policy development, which I am sure is going to be of use to the minister and the government of the day. It also means that they can do that at their own behest. That is positive and a step not too far away from what we were previously discussing about either houses of parliament being able to make requests of the commission. I will not go on. I am pleased that the Premier and the government are supporting this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 5:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the House of Assembly disagrees with the amendment made by the Legislative Council and makes the following amendment in lieu thereof:

Amendment No 5—

Page 4, after line 5 [clause 5(2)]—Insert:

- (ea) to conduct investigations on receipt of complaints alleging infringements of the principles of competitive neutrality under the *Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act 1996*;

New Schedule, page 9, after line 24—Insert:

Schedule 1—Related amendments

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Amendment provisions

In this Schedule, a provision under a heading referring to the amendment of a specified Act amends the Act so specified.

Part 2—Amendment of *Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act 1996*

2—Insertion of section 15A

Before section 16 insert:

15A—Interpretation

(1) In this Part—

Chair means the Chair of the Commission;

Commission means the South Australian Productivity Commission established under the *South Australian Productivity Commission Act 2018*.

(2) For the purposes of this Part, a reference to a *Commissioner* includes a reference to a Commissioner appointed under the *South Australian Productivity Commission Act 2018* (and sections 6(2) and 7 apply to such a Commissioner for the purposes of an investigation under this Part).

3—Amendment of section 17—Complaints

(1) Section 17(1)—delete subsection (1) and substitute:

(1) A person that competes, or seeks to compete, in a particular market alleging an infringement of the principles of competitive neutrality by a government or local government agency may make a complaint to the Minister or the Commission.

4—Amendment of section 18—Assignment of Commissioner

(1) Section 18(1)—after 'neutrality' insert 'received by the Minister'

(2) Section 18—after subsection (1) insert:

(1a) The Chair may assign a Commissioner appointed under the *South Australian Productivity Commission Act 2018* to investigate complaints of infringements of the principles of competitive neutrality received by the Commission.

(3) Section 18(2)—after 'the Minister' wherever occurring insert 'or the Chair'

5—Amendment of section 19—Investigation of complaint by Commissioner

Section 19(3)—after paragraph (a) insert:

(ab) the Commission; and

6—Amendment of section 21—Annual Report

(1) Section 21—after 'this Act' second occurring:

by a Commissioner appointed under Part 2

(2) Section 21—after its present contents (now to be designated as subsection (1)) insert:

(2) The annual report of the South Australian Productivity Commission under the *South Australian Productivity Commission Act 2018* must include a report on the investigations carried out under Part 4 by a Commissioner appointed under the *South Australian Productivity Commission Act 2018* for the relevant financial year.

Long title, page 1—After 'Commission,' insert:

to make related amendments to the *Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act 1996*

The CHAIR: Do you want to speak to that, member for Lee?

Mr MULLIGHAN: I will do my best, given that I do not have a copy of the amendment, which is unfortunate.

The CHAIR: We will get that for you, member for Lee.

Mr MULLIGHAN: My guess, and I am happy to correct this in the next moment or two once it becomes available, is that the amendment is similar to what the Hon. Mr Lucas of the other place was discussing. I have just been handed a copy of the amendment. Indeed, it is a facsimile of the amendment that the Hon. Mr Lucas was discussing in the other place when this issue which the Hon. Mr Darley raised previously was being discussed; that is, is there a mechanism for complaints about competitive neutrality to be investigated and where best does that investigation take place?

The Hon. Mr Darley makes the very reasonable point that, given the requirements of the federal Productivity Commission Act, which was established, amongst other purposes, to investigate such complaints, that a South Australian productivity commission, if one is to be established, would be a good home for it and that it would provide a degree of independence that locating such a complaint within the auspices of the Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act 1996 would not provide such an inquiry.

Understandably, it is of great concern to Mr Darley that, if a complaint was to be made under the regime which has been proposed by the Premier in this alternative amendment, insufficient satisfaction can be provided about the independence of that inquiry because an investigation being conducted under that Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act is a creature of the minister. It would not be a creature of a more independent body such as the South Australian productivity commission, where people quite separate from the minister would be undertaking investigations into those complaints and reporting appropriately.

I do not really understand why the Treasurer, and hence also in this place the Premier, is not accommodating the Hon. Mr Darley's quite reasonable request. I might guess that they might worry that that opens the door to some consideration that the government would be amenable for references to be made to the commission by members of parliament in the guise of the amendments we have just been discussing and considering. But I do not think it does that. This is quite a discrete, quite separate and quite well-understood term of reference for a productivity commission in the Australian context.

Given that this is the role of the federal body, I agree with Mr Darley that, if the ability to consider such complaints were to be established, then it should be within the productivity commission. It is unfortunate that the government does not agree with the Hon. Mr Darley. I think it is a strong whiff of belligerence by the Treasurer, and now being echoed by the Premier, in not accepting the Hon. Mr Darley amendment to have the commission do this work.

The other body which reasonably could consider this sort of complaint might be another advisory agency which is more independent than the minister. That might be the Essential Services Commission of South Australia. But, given the name the objects of the enabling legislation, the emergency services commission act, it is understandable that neither the government nor Mr Darley has sought to locate it in that process.

Let us be very clear: the Government Business Enterprises (Competition) Act was established to provide legislative guidance to the conduct of government business enterprises. It is there for the benefit of the business enterprises that are being complained about when a competitive neutrality complaint is made. So you can quickly understand the discomfort that the Hon. Mr Darley has with the government's position. We, like Mr Darley, do not agree with the government's position on this, and we do not support the government's desire to knock this amendment off.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 21
 Noes 18
 Majority 3

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

McBride, N.	Weatherill, J.W.	Sanderson, R.
Koutsantonis, A.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Close, S.E.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No 6:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 6 be disagreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: It is of great concern to the opposition, and of great concern to crossbenchers in the other place, that the government is choosing to withhold its proposed commissioners away from public scrutiny. I remind the house of the first comment the Premier made during the committee stage about why the need for the productivity commission—and his response was transparency.

That comment from the Premier is littered throughout *Hansard* in response to the reason why the original bill had been drafted in the way it was. What this amendment from the other place seeks to do is enhance the transparency around those people who are proposed to be commissioners on this productivity commission. It is not at all an unreasonable request. It comes after a succession of comments from the Premier about the status of the commissioners.

The first comment we had from the Premier was that the commission and its membership would be announced within the first 30 days of this government, which by any reckoning would place it at 18 April. That certainly was not achieved. It was not until we had the first sitting week back at

the beginning of May to try to gloss over that unmet election commitment from the Premier, that he said the commitment was actually to introduce legislation into the house—which is not what was said.

In that comment to the parliament, in that ministerial statement, the Premier was quick to say that one of the first things he did in becoming Premier was to contact people and get cracking on inviting people to become commissioners for the productivity commission. This is surprising not only for the fact that we have already had some disagreement both in this place and publicly about how the government could go so far as to advertise for members to its health advisory boards without the enabling legislation starting, but in this instance how we could have the Premier saying that not only would the membership be announced within the first 30 days but that from day one of the formation of his government from 19 March, people were being spoken to and people were being invited to become members of this commission?

During the committee stage of this bill, I asked whether any people had been given an undertaking or had been invited to be commissioners and, somewhat worryingly, the Premier declined to answer that question. It was also interesting that in a related matter the Premier declined to offer any advice to the house about the level of remuneration that would be offered to these commissioners.

Given that we are going through this whole process, with the government choosing to bring legislation to the parliament to establish this productivity commission, it is not only expected that we would want some opportunity in either house of parliament to ask for some advice or some work to be done at the request of members of parliament on motion but it is not unusual, given the importance of this particular role—and particularly if you look at the context of the federal Productivity Commission and the significance of their role in providing advice on key issues to both the government of the day and to the Australian community—that the parliament would want to know who these people are and who the government is going to choose.

Is this going to be a body populated by the past 'greatest hits' of the Liberal Party? Is this going to be a body populated by people who are actually quite practised, skilled and adept in fields of public policy development, economics or understanding what it is to operate within Australian industry or business in South Australia? Or, as are the requirements within the federal act, which have been negated by amendments which were lost in the other place, will there even be particular skill sets and experiences required of commissioners of the productivity commission?

I raise that in reference to those clauses in the commonwealth act that require a diversity of experience and skill in the productivity commission. That includes not only people who are experienced in operating in Australian industry but also those who are familiar with and experienced in ecologically sustainable development. It also requires people who are experienced in the social and welfare impacts of economic change and development. These are all critical issues and skill sets likely to be required or traversed in the conduct of the work of the commission if their body of work is indeed to do what the Premier has advised this place; that is, advise on microeconomic changes for the benefit of improving the productivity of the South Australian economy.

Let us put this in context. We have had a federal Productivity Commission inquire into and require the end of automotive industry assistance. That has impacted South Australia and Victoria to a great extent, although fortunately not as significantly as the Premier was worried about. He was running around telling people we were going to have double digit unemployment rates in the not too distant future. Fortunately, through the good work of the former Labor government, we have avoided that.

What we are concerned about is if we have a number of commissioners who are to be appointed to this body whom we know nothing about, whom we have no comfort that they have sufficient skills or experience and whom we may not know whether they have particular preconceived views or predilections about what changes should be made by a state government when it comes to those matters that influence economic policy. This is perhaps not a usual requirement of a body, but it is a necessary requirement given that the stature and the role of this commission is quite different and quite separate from what the parliament has been asked to enact previously.

This is a body that will operate separately and above and beyond those other economic advisory bodies that governments and, indeed, this new government, will also have. This includes bodies such as its Economic Advisory Council, which is replacing the economic development board. It also includes the advice which comes from a frank and fearless independent Public Service in the Department of Treasury and Finance and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, as central agencies, or even advice which is provided on request from agencies such as the Essential Services Commission of South Australia.

Rather than rely on those three groups of economic analysis and advice, we are seeking to establish something quite separate above and beyond that. It is not unreasonable that the opposition and the crossbench have deliberately sought some transparency—and I use the Premier's word again, 'transparency'—about who these commissioners will be. We do not support the government's moves in trying to knock this amendment off.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 21
 Noes 18
 Majority 3

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.	Marshall, S.S.	Murray, S.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.	Tarzia, V.A.
Teague, J.B.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

NOES

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

PAIRS

Gardner, J.A.W.	Close, S.E.	McBride, N.
Weatherill, J.W.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Koutsantonis, A.

Motion thus carried.

Amendment No. 7:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 7 be disagreed to.

Mr PICTON: I have to say that the opposition is very disappointed that the government has said that they are going to oppose this particular amendment.

The CHAIR: Member for Kurna, could you take a seat for a moment, please. The member for Kurna is speaking to the house. The house is in committee. I ask that all listen intently. Member for Kurna.

Mr PICTON: Thank you. If not intently, then leave the chamber, I am sure. The opposition is very disappointed for a number of reasons that the government is not supporting this amendment. One is that it should be quite clear for obvious reasons that members appointed to the productivity commission should have to declare particular interests that they may have.

The advice that the productivity commission will be giving to the parliament of the people of South Australia will be in regard to a number of very important economic features and recommendations for our state, and it is inherently important that people know that that information, and that advice is not being guided, or that there not be any perception that it could be guided by particular interests that that person may hold or may have. This is very important for people's confidence in the productivity commission and their work.

The genesis of this is that the opposition recommended a broader range of disclosure requirements that should be in place, akin to what is in place for members of parliament and what is in place for members of local government at the moment. Unfortunately, we were not able to get the upper house to agree to that, but we were able to get agreement to what this regime is.

Funnily enough, this regime is almost identical to what the government had previously agreed to in another piece of legislation only days prior. The government has agreed that this clause should be agreed to for the health boards, so all health boards will have to agree to disclosure arrangements as detailed in our amendment No. 7 for all those 10 health boards across South Australia but, unfortunately, the government is saying that they will not agree to that for the productivity commission.

Why is it important for the health boards to have to disclose this but not for the productivity commission? Why should the people of South Australia not be assured that the productivity commission does not have conflicts of interest attached to it? As I said, we would like this to go even further than it does. We have accepted this compromise akin to what the government has promoted. I think the government introduced it themselves in relation to the health boards. If there is nothing to hide, I think there is no reason whatsoever why the government should not be supporting that in this regard as well.

Mr MULLIGHAN: I was inspecting the vibration monitor in the north-western corner of the building, Chair, so I apologise for being momentarily out of earshot of the member for Kaurna's comments. I will not try to repeat all of them except to say that I would argue, even more so than for the health boards, given the matters the productivity commission is likely to consider, a disclosure regime of pecuniary interests or personal interests is most important here.

For example, if you cast your mind back to the discussion I had about competitive neutrality and the role of productivity commissions on the back of reform in competition policy, states were required to review the regulation around particular industries and identify ways to encourage competition within those industries. That might be the government ceasing to be a sole provider of goods or a service, or it might be to remove red tape or provide some sort of facilitation for expanded market opportunities.

Industry reviews were required to be carried out on a consistent set of industries amongst the jurisdictions. Of course, there were industries that for many years were not in the view of the then federal government—the Keating government and the subsequent Howard government—and also the Productivity Commission, which was established from 1998 onwards. They took the view that not every industry was thoroughly enough reviewed, and I will give a couple of examples of those: the pharmacy industry, the taxi industry and the liquor industry.

Industry reviews took place, but there were—and there remains to this day—strong arguments about whether a sufficient change, either in South Australia or in other jurisdictions, was enacted to remove red tape or to enhance or facilitate greater competition. The reason I raise all that is that it is conceivable that the government would seek the services of an individual to become a commissioner on the productivity commission.

Without an appropriate disclosure regime, let alone a transparent disclosure regime that extends beyond the minister seeking the appointment, what is to say that somebody might not have an interest in a pharmacy? What is to say that somebody might not have an interest in an industry, for example, pubs or clubs, which may be the subject of red tape review and reform? The member

for Kaurna has already pointed out, because he has a personal and direct interest in this matter, given his involvement and stewardship of the—

Mr Picton: Not a pecuniary interest.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Not a pecuniary interest, I should say. It is a legislative interest.

Mr Pederick: We will check that.

Mr MULLIGHAN: That's right. Is it declared? We will find out soon, won't we? We will find out, 'Name him!' There are disclosure regimes going through the bill that established the health boards. The original regime that was put in the consideration of that bill is the same as the regime proposed initially as an amendment to this bill, which was the same disclosure regime for pecuniary interests that members of parliament offer.

It was put as an amendment for two reasons; one is that it is pretty thorough, I think we would all agree. Some would argue that it is not quite thorough enough. Some would argue from time to time that it might be too thorough, but it is thorough and transparent and it also avoided an effort to try to contrive an alternative model, which in itself would be endlessly debated in the council or indeed in this place, so this was taken as a proxy because there had been some precedent for it.

It is funny now that we see that this is important for a health board but not important enough for a small group of people who will have direct influence over a minister and a government of the day on any stewardship or superintendence of the state economy. I think that is remarkable. I actually assumed—and perhaps I misheard the Premier—that he would be supporting amendment No. 7 because it was a compromise that was reached on the floor in the council after the opposition withdrew its original amendment and replaced it with this one, based on what was in that health board bill, but I am extremely disappointed that he is choosing to oppose this amendment.

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 21

Noes 18

Majority 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.

Cregan, D.

Habib, C.

Luethen, P.

Patterson, S.J.R.

Sanderson, R.

Teague, J.B.

Chapman, V.A.

Duluk, S.

Harvey, R.M. (teller)

Marshall, S.S.

Pederick, A.S.

Speirs, D.J.

Whetstone, T.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.

Ellis, F.J.

Knoll, S.K.

Murray, S.

Pisoni, D.G.

Tarzia, V.A.

Wingard, C.L.

NOES

Bedford, F.E.

Boyer, B.I.

Cook, N.F.

Hughes, E.J.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Rau, J.R.

Bettison, Z.L.

Brock, G.G.

Gee, J.P.

Malinauskas, P.

Piccolo, A.

Stinson, J.M.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Brown, M.E. (teller)

Hildyard, K.A.

Mullighan, S.C.

Picton, C.J.

Wortley, D.

PAIRS

Gardner, J.A.W.

Weatherill, J.W.

Close, S.E.

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

McBride, N.

Koutsantonis, A.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Amendments Nos 9 to 16 are, essentially, all consequential upon amendment No. 8. I am happy to deal with these individually or en bloc, whichever the opposition would prefer. Certainly, from our perspective we will be moving that we disagree to amendment No. 8.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Indeed, amendment No. 8 is related to—

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Amendments Nos 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 16. In other words, you could not agree to amendment No. 9 if amendment No 8 is lost.

The CHAIR: We will deal with amendment No. 8 now.

Mr MULLIGHAN: —Amendment No. 3, which we have already decided. If the Premier can contain himself, as a result I understand that we are permitted to deal with consequential amendments on the same clause, so I am happy to deal with amendments Nos 8 to 12, which relate to clause 20.

The CHAIR: That seems reasonable. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am happy to do that. I agree that amendments Nos 13 and 14 deal with clause 21, but it is still the referring authority.

The CHAIR: So amendments Nos 8 to 12 relate to clause 20.

Amendments Nos 8 to 12:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 8 to 12 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendments Nos 13 and 14:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We can deal with proposed amendments Nos 13 and 14 en bloc because they both refer to clause 21. I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 13 and 14 be disagreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: I think the Premier can guess our position. We are happy for that to be put.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 15:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 15 be disagreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 16:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 16 be disagreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: I obviously indicate my opposition to what the government is proposing here in not accepting this amendment. I will not speak at great length, but I will perhaps note here that clause 23 in the bill relates to reports of the commission.

During the committee stage of this bill, the Premier made it clear that it was his expectation that the commission, in its conduct of an inquiry, would produce interim reports amongst other reports such as discussion papers and so forth, which is not dissimilar to the practice of the commission as established by the commonwealth parliament.

Those draft or interim reports provide an important opportunity for the public—let alone any other interested parties, members of parliament and so on—to have an understanding of the work that has been undertaken by the commission, the evidence which has been presented to the

commission and even some draft or early recommendations that the commission is likely to make to the body or to the authority that has asked it to conduct the inquiry.

Based on those comments from the Premier, where he said that he envisaged that the commission would produce interim or draft reports—my recollection was that it was in relation to this discussion or a related discussion in the committee stage—the Premier invited me to move an amendment, so we did in order to give effect to the commission being able to, indeed to be required to, issue draft reports. I think it is disappointing that clause 23, we find now, in discussing reports, does not have that capacity.

Nonetheless, the intent of the amendment as it has come back from the other place is really an enabling amendment so that the conduct of inquiries can be not just at the behest of the minister but by motion of either house of parliament. We have discussed that in some detail previously, so I will leave my comments there, except to note that, despite the Premier giving an indication to this place that he expected draft reports to be provided by the commission and an invitation from the Premier to move an amendment to that effect, we have seen from the government a rejection of that after the opposition and crossbench have put that amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 17:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 17 be agreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: I am pleased that there is some support for some modicum of transparency from the government, particularly in the part of the commission's work where it has conducted its inquiry and it has provided a report to the minister. Of course, what we are concerned about is a circumstance in which a minister has asked for an inquiry to be done, a report has been delivered in return to the minister and then the public never hears anything about it. Not only does the public not hear anything about it but there is little opportunity for an understanding on the part of the public of what the minister proposes to do in response to it.

A number of amendments were put in the other place to address these concerns, and most were not supported, but this one was, and it is the lightest possible touch of transparency of the government which could be provided to it. It is at least some small fig leaf, perhaps we will call it—or perhaps we will call it one part of one cloverleaf—of decency that the government is supporting this amendment to ensure that there is some level of transparency.

Ninety days is an extraordinary period of time. We initially thought that something more along the lines of 30 days or perhaps even landing somewhere in the middle, 60 days, might be more reasonable. Under this regime, it is quite possible for the commission to deliver a report at some point in time, like early December, and for it to lie unaddressed for several months before it is considered actioned, let alone disclosed to the public.

Nonetheless, the government has at least chosen to support this small level of transparency; however, I note that the amendment that was put by the Hon. Mr Pangallo was rejected. I think that is a shame because that level of transparency would have greatly assisted the parliament and the public to understand what the government intended to do and why. Obviously it can sometimes be difficult for the public to understand why a minister chooses to make a decision and then gives no reason for it, particularly when recommendations and reports are not followed. At least the Premier is supporting amendment No. 17.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 18:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 18 be disagreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: Once again, this was an amendment which was put by the opposition to try to live up to the heady standard of transparency which the Premier intimated in his initial comments during the committee stage of this bill. I think it is reasonable that the parliament, or some

organ of it, would have the opportunity to understand the work program of the commission on a periodic basis. This is an arrangement which was established for the Auditor-General through the Economic and Finance Committee.

I disclose this to my colleagues in the other place and I also disclose it to members of the crossbench: I am not particularly wedded to which committee would have the opportunity to meet with the chair of the commission to discuss matters that may be of interest to the committee—principally, what work is being undertaken, what references have been made by the minister to the commission, how that work is being conducted and in what sort of direction that work might be heading. It might also be an opportunity for the parliament to understand how the commission's resources are being used.

We heard from I think it was the Premier during the committee stage that what used to be the simpler regulation unit is to be transferred from the Department of Treasury and Finance into the control of the productivity commission. It will basically be the arms and legs and do work on behalf of the commissioners. That in itself is understandable; they need staff to assist them with their work.

However, when we look at some of the other economic advisory agencies which have been or will be brought into existence by the new government—those bodies like the Department of Treasury and Finance, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the Essential Services Commission and the new economic advisory agency—it is likely that if they are doing a particular inquiry, if they are looking into a particular industry or if they are looking at, for example, the economic impact of particular policy changes or changes in taxation regimes, they might want the assistance of external professionals.

For example, they may wish to utilise economic modelling agencies or agencies with various types of economic models to test the different policy reforms or taxation regime changes the commission is considering. That work is not cheap. A simple approach—which to my memory some years ago was called the input-output economic modelling effort—can be quite reasonably priced. However, if you use a computable general equilibrium model, as the gentleman assisting the Premier would understand, that is very expensive indeed. There might be some interest in the parliament as to which is being used, but more to the point, what is being spent and who is doing the work.

As with most concerns with agencies and their expenditure on consultancies, there wants to be some satisfaction that there has been some sort of process in selecting those organisations that provide external support to an agency like this, the cost of it, and also, what the end result is. If modelling is undertaken, for example, what does the modelling show? It is not just how that modelling is represented in the midst of a finding by a commission about a particular policy reform proposal or industry reform proposal or a taxation regime change.

That is of great interest, and that is why we have seen over many years members from this side of the chamber—the former Liberal opposition and now members of the government—repeatedly make requests and FOI consultant documents and economic analyses that were being made to make sure that there was no dislocation between those reports that were being provided to the government and what the government was subsequently representing to the public. That is of great interest.

I say that I mention the Economic and Finance Committee because that is where the Auditor-General finds himself or herself once a year to answer questions. I am somewhat biased because, like the member for Finnis, I happen to be a member of that committee, and as a result of this bill coming to the house I would have a keen interest in those sorts of questions that I have just mentioned. Equally, I would be relaxed with another standing committee of either this place or the other place having the opportunity.

It is important—it is just an organ of the parliament—that those members of that committee, and by extension the members of the parliament, understand what is going on. I think it is regrettable—this is the entreaty—that the government is opposing this amendment.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 19:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment No. 19 be agreed to.

Mr MULLIGHAN: And I say, 'Good on the Premier.'

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL PROCEDURE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:58 the house adjourned until Thursday 2 August 2018 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***HEAVY VEHICLE INSPECTION SCHEME**

In reply to **Mr BROCK (Frome)** (31 May 2018).

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

1. Stage 2 is currently in the procurement phase. The scheme is yet to be introduced dependent on many factors contingent on the procurement outcomes.
2. The tender closed on 1 March 2018. Procurement is underway and once a tender is awarded, the government will be in a position to release further details. These details will include the start date of the scheme, locations where inspections will be undertaken, when these locations will become available and transition details including what vehicles will be required and by what date.

This information will be circulated through all known and available stakeholders and means, including association contacts, social media, to subscribers of Heavy Vehicle Inspection Scheme updates and printed on the heavy vehicle registration renewal papers.

CLARE VALLEY BRIDGES

In reply to **Mr BROCK (Frome)** (4 July 2018).

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): I have been advised of the following—

The bridge upgrades are being delivered as a part of a larger package of works.

Both bridges referred to are currently in the design stage.

Preliminary utility service locations and site establishment works are expected to commence later this year.