

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 1 May 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:31 and read prayers.

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

Bills

MOTOR VEHICLES (MOTOR BIKE LICENSING) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:32): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Motor Vehicles Act 1959. Read a first time.

Second Reading

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise, with no great pleasure really, to introduce the Motor Vehicles (Motor Bike Licensing) Amendment Bill 2019. I say that because this bill contains measures that have been well flagged for over 14 months now. Something like this bill should have been introduced last year, or at least debated last year, and it should have been debated publicly. We should be in here voting on a government bill that contains at least most of these measures. We in the opposition are acting on motorbike safety because the government has not.

I will go over a little of the history for you. Following quite a long period of shall we say improvements in the road toll—any road death, as is well flagged, is never a good thing—through better design, through better design of motor vehicles and through the work of the Motor Accident Commission and road safety experts, in 2017 there was, as we all know, a spike in motorcycle road trauma and motorcycle deaths in particular.

In response to this spike in road trauma, the then minister, the member for Kaurana, convened the Motorcycle Reference Group, which brought together road safety experts and motorcycle groups like the Motorcycle Riders Association, the RAA, the Ulysses Club, the Centre for Automotive Safety Research at Adelaide University and even health professionals, such as trauma specialists, who are the type of health professionals who give a perspective from the health sector about the trauma that can occur in motorcycle crashes.

The preliminary consultation was thorough. The sector involved was well consulted and well engaged and it resulted in a report that has now been well aired in the media, entitled 'Recommendations for a graduated licensing system for motorcyclists in South Australia', by M.R.J. Baldock from the University of Adelaide. This report made a whole series of recommendations for reforms, of which many but not all—and I will go over why that is the case—are reflected in this bill today.

The consultation went over the election period, as you can imagine. I think the closing date for the consultation period was officially June 2018. Since that report was released, until very recently there has been absolute silence from the minister and silence from the government. There has been increasing frustration from motorcycle rider groups and road safety experts not only at the inaction on licensing reform, which is what this bill intends to tackle, but also on the inaction of the government in terms of bringing together the reference group, which seeks to apply a holistic approach to motorcycle road safety.

It is worth noting at this point that many of the deaths we have seen on our roads on motorcycles this year have not been young people or new licensees; they have been people who have been riding for a considerable amount of time. That underlines the need for a holistic approach

to motorcycle road safety and a constant dialogue between road safety experts, motorcycle rider groups and the government in terms of making the roads safer for motorcyclists.

This bill attacks licensing. It is a start and it is what the experts tell us is necessary in order to create a generation and cohorts in the future who ride safer and protect themselves against road trauma. Earlier this year, in relation to another spike—indeed, from the first week of this year, there was a spike in motorcycle road trauma and motorcycle deaths; I believe something approaching one-third of road deaths this year have been motorcycle riders—the motorcycle groups came to us frustrated with government inaction.

They came to see me, they went over this report with me and they told me some of the problems they had with the report. We threw around a few ideas about how it could be improved. We then went to see the leader, the member for Croydon. At that meeting, we decided then and there to act where the government would not act. We resolved to act on this report because the minister and the government simply have not acted.

I suspect, as is often the case with private members' bills I bring to this place, that this bill will not pass. I hope that it does and I hope, in fact, that if the minister has sensible measures he wants to introduce as well he can append them to this bill. Even if that is not the case, I would welcome a government bill that reflects the measures outlined in this report because it is about road safety. We want this done, motorcycle groups want this done and road safety experts want this done. It is a start; it is not a panacea, as has been flagged often in the media, but it is a start. As I said, it will create cohorts into the future with a better approach to road safety.

So far, all we have seen this year in response was a hurried announcement from the minister that he was looking at the proposal that motorbike riders should first hold a car licence. I am not sure who was advising him, but he claims it came out of this report. This report recommends no such thing; in fact, it says that this measure would be unnecessary should the other recommendations of the report be adopted. I am not sure where he is getting his advice from, but it seemed an odd thing to announce in response to the road deaths we have seen. It may seem to be a perfectly reasonable suggestion, but it is not one that the experts recommend.

What do the experts and the motorcycle groups recommend? I will go through what this bill essentially does. We already have in this state a graduated licensing scheme. We start from a learner's permit at the minimum age of 16 at the moment, we go through what they call an R-Date endorsement, then an R class endorsement and then go on to a full licence. This bill essentially extends the minimum tenure periods on those classifications of licence. This, indeed, was the central recommendation of the report from the University of Adelaide.

The central recommendation is to extend the tenures to increase the age first of all. It is worth noting that in Victoria the age at which you can get a motorcycle licence is now 18. The report recommended an increase in the age at which you could get a learner's permit. It did not specify the age; it merely pointed out the Victorian example. From discussions with particularly the Motorcycle Riders Association and the Ulysses Club, we believe that the age of 17 would be a good starting point, as a 17 year old is a slightly more mature rider than one at the current age of 16. With the current set-up, if you have a full licence already, you do not need to spend any particular time on that learner's permit before you graduate to an R-Date licence.

The bill would ensure that, whatever licence you currently hold, you need to spend at least 12 months on that learner's permit, and it adds some particular measures to the learner's permit on top of the advanced RiderSafe course and on top of what they call the LAMS restrictions. As I understand it, the LAMS motorcycles are the lower powered motorcycles. It adds measures like no pillion passengers, no towing, a night curfew and the wearing of high-visibility clothing.

It mandates a minimum 10-year period of 12 months for the learner's permit and then it combines what is currently the R-Date and the R class endorsement periods into one sort of provisional period (which I will call for shorthand a provisional period) of three years, which encompasses a whole lot of other safety restrictions as well, including the use of mobile phones. Again, there would be no pillion passengers and zero alcohol for the entire tenure of that period.

The end result is that a rider cannot graduate to a full licence—a current unrestricted motorcycle licence—until at least the age of 21. That is the minimum age, assuming you get your

learner's permit on your 17th birthday. That is essentially what it does. It is not a complex bill in the sense that the measures are not complex, but they provide an environment in which novice motorcycle riders spend far longer learning to ride a motorcycle. It also incorporates a motorcycle hazard perception test before the learner's permit can be issued. This is important. It happens in other jurisdictions now and it prepares the rider for the real world on the road.

As I said, this is not a panacea for motorcycle road safety; this is merely a start. This creates cohorts in the future who are better prepared for riding motorcycles on our increasingly busy roads. What the motorcycle fraternity and road safety experts really want going forward from this is more regular engagement with the government such as happened under previous ministers, particularly under the member for Kaurua. They want a reconvention of the Motorcycle Reference Group so that they can have a holistic approach to motorcycle safety.

As I said at the beginning, this year's spike in motorcycle road trauma and motorcycle deaths has seen many people in older age groups suffering and dying on our roads, so we need an overarching holistic approach to motorcycle road safety. However, this is a start. I hope the government sees fit to support it. I am happy to entertain any sensible amendments and, as I said at the beginning, I am more than happy to entertain supporting a government bill that comes in here and reflects these measures. In the absence of a government bill, I urge members to support this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEES (PETITIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 April 2019.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (10:44): I rise to indicate the government's support for the Parliamentary Committees (Petitions) Amendment Bill introduced by the member for— I was going to say the grandmother of the house. Is that allowed these days? Is it politically correct to say that?

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The most senior of our members in contributing years.

Ms Bedford: The grandmother of the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think 'the mother of the house' is more suitable. It is fair to say that when the member for Florey does introduce matters of importance to the parliament we should listen because she has had an extraordinary amount of experience. She has been a dedicated advocate for the people of her electorate, notwithstanding fending off charges from left field—

Ms Bedford: Right field!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes. Notwithstanding that, she has prevailed and stands strong, continuing to advocate for her community. Consistent with that has been the introduction of this bill, which the government has considered and reviewed and supports. In summary, it proposes the obligation of a parliamentary review, via the Legislative Review Committee, in respect of petitions presented to us as a parliament once they achieve a defined threshold of 10,000 physical signatures.

I will comment on the process shortly but, in short, it will require a state government minister to respond to the petition as a transparency measure. When I first looked at this bill, I thought the member for Florey must have been reading the Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division) Constitution, and—

Ms Bedford: Perhaps I was.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If she was, I would be pleased to make sure she is given a full copy, along with membership forms and everything else. We on this side of the house take very seriously the pleas that are presented to our hierarchy in our political organisation, so much so that

when the state council of the Liberal Party of Australia (SA Division) makes a determination that may be inconsistent with the parliamentary representatives' position on a matter, there is an expectation of accountability back to the state council to identify their position and the basis upon which they may have formed their view. We support democracy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and we support a process of accountability in relation to our democratic structures. Congratulations to the member on raising this matter. She does so because of what I think is at least a perceived lack of recognition of community concerns via the current process. I think what is implicit in that has been a circumstance where, when our petitions are quite rightly read out to this parliament before the commencement of business of the day, the number of petitioners is identified for the consideration of members, and to alert members to the seriousness of matters that are of concern to those particular signatory lists.

Those petitions are of course kept in the records of the parliament, and in some circumstances may not be revisited with any application or response they may duly deserve. Introducing a mandatory process of review and response essentially says that this is a serious process and that it is a matter that needs to be recognised. Where there is a mandatory model of accountability, a threshold of 10,000 signatures is not unreasonable.

I am sure all members would be aware of this, but I hope to remind them of this: those signatures must be of people who have identified an address in South Australia, so they are South Australian petitioners and not a list of people who might be advocating for a cause from another country or jurisdiction elsewhere in Australia. They need to be South Australians, at least identified by their address, for the purposes of the petition to be valid for the counting of signatures.

Secondly, the current process we have in respect of petitions requires a physical signature, not an electronic one, or registration by pressing a button. We all know that there are certain polls, surveys or petitions now commonly applied that give people a voice through our electronic mediums, and that has often concerned me.

The old days of having a strong and passionate protest about something has translated into today's younger advocates on public policy having the responsibility of pressing a button on a survey on a computer rather than actually taking up the challenge past that. There is some absolving of responsibility to say, 'I think that's a pretty good idea; I'm going to press that button. I'm going to be one of a number in a survey to indicate my support or objection to a particular initiative.' They feel as though they have been relieved of their responsibility by doing that and do little else.

It is very important to ensure that the message gets through and that the public voice and the community concern about matters do actually translate. So it is very important that we have a process here in the parliament where there can be a direct public voice via a petition and at a certain threshold. This bill, with 10,000 signatures as the threshold, imposes an obligation on us as a parliament to respond.

The process that the member has highlighted in this bill is one of referral to the Legislative Review Committee, which is a standing committee. It has a continuing role and a certain charter. From our perspective, in the first instance that is the appropriate referral body. One matter that we may need to consider in the future is the question of whether the parliament or, perhaps more appropriately, the Legislative Review Committee has the power—if it does not have the power now, that is something for us to consider—to delegate or re-refer that matter to another committee.

I raise this because the member quite rightly points out that some of our other committees, such as the Social Development Committee in the parliament, frequently have quite an overload of references. The Social Development Committee is also a standing committee that provides valuable work to the community. It may be that that committee, for example, is one that is either currently charged with a similar charter in respect of a term of reference that has been referred to it or has already done some work on something that is the same subject matter that may be, on further consideration, best or better able to deal with the review of the concerns raised in the petition.

I think we need to keep an open mind as to whether we might need to provide some added power to the Legislative Review Committee to refer the matter to another committee if, in their view, they consider that there could be some more valuable consideration or update provided on advice to us here in the parliament and, in due course, any minister can respond in the parliament to be fully briefed and informed.

Perhaps the most important thing about referring to a committee is the opportunity for committees of the parliament to take evidence and to receive further submissions in respect of the matter raised. We are yet to see how that is going to work. Again, we would need to see how that might operationally occur.

The member for Florey has introduced issues, as she is the sponsor of this legislation, regarding areas of interest in her electorate, including Modbury Hospital, an important health service in her electorate. It services a very large region statewide but is also used by others in her electorate. We need to support the sorts of issues where there is a big response, so we support the bill.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (10:54): I rise to indicate my support on behalf of the opposition for the member for Florey's bill, the Parliamentary Committees (Petitions) Amendment Bill 2019. I think it is appropriate that in this 125th year of commemoration since women were granted the right of universal suffrage in South Australia and as we look up upon an extract from that petition in the tapestry that was signed by 11,600 South Australians—a huge percentage of the population at that time—we acknowledge the importance and the right of South Australians to petition to their parliament, how those petitions can and should often lead to us considering matters and ministers considering the views of the public and making changes where appropriate.

This is an important piece of legislation. I am glad it has the support of both sides of the parliament. It makes an amendment to the Parliamentary Committees Act to require that petitions above 10,000 people be referred to the Legislative Review Committee, and that committee must then report on the petition, to which the minister must respond within six sitting days and explain to the parliament what action, if any, is to be taken.

We see a number of petitions tabled in this house; obviously the member for Florey has been a very prolific bringer of petitions recently to this parliament in relation to the issue of the closure of the Modbury Service SA centre, which was announced in the September 2018 state budget and has caused numerous concerns in her community, and it is appropriate that those petitions be brought to the parliament. But, at the moment, there is no mechanism by which the minister, in this case the Minister for Infrastructure, can respond to that petition and have to explain to the parliament what action he has taken.

Obviously, there are a lot of times when petitions are raised in the parliament and debates flow from there, through private members business, grievances, question time or other elements of debate, but this sets an important standard whereby it would be necessary for such a response to be provided by the minister after examination of that matter by the Legislative Review Committee. Potentially, there could be issues where large numbers of people have a view about something, but that view is not supported by members of parliament to the point of bringing it up in debate in any form here.

This piece of legislation gives the people of South Australia the ability to do that, but it also means that the minister who has responsibility for that area has to respond. There are many times, obviously, when the opposition or minor parties have a particular view about something, but that does not necessarily mean that the minister has a responsibility to respond to those issues.

I think that the member for Florey in her contribution gave an excellent outline of some of the history of petitions and also what is happening in other states in relation to petitions in standing orders across both Australian jurisdictions and across the world as well. There has been a lot of progress in the last five to 10 years to update those provisions, and I think it is appropriate that we do that here. I hope that is not the last step along that line.

I know that you, Mr Speaker, upon taking your lofty position, outlined your support for e-petitions, electronic petitions, being a mechanism by which people can have a say. I note your

comments in *The Advertiser* at the time that you wanted to modernise the parliament and make it more appealing to a high-tech generation, and I quote:

There are so many great opportunities for the Parliament to become more widely accessible to the public as technology progresses.

You also said:

A lot of young people are using petitions online, on websites such as Change.org, but they're not really using the ancient system of personally signing the ones that are submitted to our Parliament.

In a time when the growing preferred method of communication is texting and emailing, you further stated:

I firmly believe making e-petitions available would improve the ability of [individuals and groups] to raise awareness on issues important to them. It makes it easier for people of all ages to better engage (with lawmakers).

That is obviously something that you, Mr Speaker, held dear upon your ascension to high office. It was not quite supported in the comments that we heard earlier from the Attorney-General dismissing e-petitions. The Standing Orders Committee probably has not been that busy over previous months, but now that I am a member of this committee, replacing the Hon. John Rau SC, I think it is going to be the hardest working committee of the parliament and it is really going to step up a notch. We will see the advent of a whole range of the Tarzia reforms to our standing orders to improve e-petitions and accessibility and accountability from ministers of the parliament.

I digress; back to the proposal from the member for Florey. Since August 1992, there have been 33 occasions when petitions or cumulative petitions rather than individual petitions presented in the House of Assembly and four occasions when petitions or cumulations presented in the Legislative Council have reached more than 10,000 signatures.

As I understand it, the petition regime proposed by the member for Florey is not hugely dissimilar to that in the New South Wales parliament, where standing orders state that a petition with over 10,000 signatures shall be automatically set down as an order of the day for 4.30pm on the Thursday of the next sitting week. The member for Florey has set an identical threshold for action.

There is different action that would happen in these circumstances, given the nature of amendments to the Parliamentary Committees Act rather than to standing orders, but a response is still generated. No doubt through our hardworking Standing Orders Committee, we will then consider what follow-on changes need to be made to facilitate this through the standing orders of this house after this legislation has passed.

The Leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Council, the Hon. Kyam Maher (shadow attorney-general), has been leading the majority of work on this subject and has outlined a number of areas where we think there are still some issues we need to consider, namely, what should the form of the response be? Should it be in writing or a speech of some sort? That is something we will need to consider through standing orders. Also, what remedy or penalty do members believe would be appropriate for a minister who does not provide a response within the appropriate time frame?

That is something that the Standing Orders Committee is currently considering in relation to the sessional order that states that responses to questions on notice should be provided within 30 days, which is regularly breached by ministers of this parliament, and there is currently no penalty provision and no follow-up action that occurs in the sessional orders. That is being considered in relation to that sessional order, and obviously what follow-up action would occur will need to be considered in relation to this legislation as well.

With those words, I indicate that the bill has the full support of the opposition. We thank the member for Florey for bringing the bill to the attention of the parliament. We hope that it brings a positive change whereby members of the public are more able to bring their issues to the forefront of the parliament and have them debated but, most importantly, have ministers respond to those issues on the floor of the house. I welcome the legislation.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:03): I thank the Attorney-General for her welcome remarks on democracy and other things and her wise counsel, of course, on the bill, and also the member for Kaurana and for his agreement to the bill. As he said, the number of people who have petitioned the

parliament in such a way that might require some action is very, very small. Perhaps we will see a flurry of democracy—you never know—but I do not envision that it will place a great strain on the Legislative Review Committee.

As mentioned by both the Attorney and the member for Kaurna, defined instructions on debate of the petitions report will all be done through standing orders. I am hoping that will be done sooner rather than later so that the full impact of this amendment can be felt immediately, as there is a petition very close to the threshold at the moment. This is the only real way for our electors to have a say in anything that happens in parliament between elections. Their voices will be heard by the 10,000 signatures or more that they lodge on a petition.

I thank all the speakers for their contributions today and, of course, the people who live in the north-eastern community who brought this idea to me and were so passionate about making sure that it actually came to pass. I commend the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES (DRUG OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 December 2018.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:05): I rise to speak on the Controlled Substances (Drug Offences) Amendment Bill, presented to us as a private member's bill by the member for Elizabeth, and indicate that the government on this side of the house has considered the matter and formed the view that the amendment does not justify the proposed law changes outlined in it, and we will be opposing the same.

Let me start by saying that the sponsor of the bill, the member for Elizabeth, has called on his own experience as a police officer, and I commend him for that because it is always helpful to have firsthand assessment by people who have been on the front line to actually provide to us real circumstances. What he has conveyed to us is that, whilst in his day—which I am assuming is not too far in the past, as he is such a youthful looking member for Elizabeth—alcohol was the biggest single issue for policemen and policewomen on the beat, now in contemporary times drugs, particularly ice, are problematic for those who are patrolling our streets and protecting us.

That is an important piece of information. It highlights to us that there is a new form of drug out there that apparently has effects that promote some aggression, particularly when the effects of it are wearing off, and that can cause real problems in the community. That is not just for the safety of our police officers, those at the front line, but obviously for other members of the public. All those things are important. I accept his suggestion that therefore we have to do whatever we can as lawmakers to ensure that the flow of ice is arrested and that the police, as front-line officers, are given sufficient authority and resources to ensure that we minimise its effect.

They have to be able to seek out and discover ice, as he says, and that is part of their charter and part of their commissioned responsibility. What he is seeking then in the legislation is to avoid the current legal obligation for police to be able to search properties, people and vehicles for drugs, which they have in the latter but not so much in the former. In other words, under our current law there has to be a reasonable suspicion of the police officer before entering a property for the purpose of identifying the sale or manufacture of drugs in a particular dwelling—a drug house as we often refer to it.

Mr Odenwalder: This isn't about searching a drug house; it's about searching a vehicle.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I understand, and I am coming to that. The capacity for us to support police in their endeavours to protect us means that they do need to have access to search powers to be able to deal with the issue. The law also requires, though, that there be certain thresholds that they reach. To be able to identify the ill that is here, one has to be able to, I suppose, assess whether it is reasonable for that threshold to be required. The promoter of the bill also outlined to us that:

...if you live near a drug house—and I hope for your sake that you do not—you know about it. There are people coming and going 24 hours a day at all hours of the day or night. The people who live near these drug houses live with anxiety all the time. Knowing that these people may be criminals only adds to that anxiety. I believe that the police need clear authority to search those people coming and going from these houses, both to stop the spread of drugs and to help gather evidence to shut down the businesses of the drug houses.

Here is the problem: there are situations where police do enter property, for example, on the reasonable belief that there have been some drug sales on the property, and they sometimes cause damage in actually doing so.

In fact, just in the last couple of months, a claim was submitted—it was a very public case—for \$1,000 arising out of a raid by police on what was purportedly a known drug house on information that had been received by police. They broke down the gate, door and various other things and entered the property only to find that there was some cryptocurrency mining computer set-up on the property. There were no drugs found. I am not sure what particular drugs they were looking for but, in any event, they found that no offence had occurred or was occurring in relation to the belief that they had. Obviously, as a result they were then called upon to provide for the damages of such an action.

The police can make mistakes, like everyone else. Sometimes, though, we as the taxpayers have to pick up the cost where mistakes are made, including by the police, so it is important that we have a threshold in relation to the obligation of police to be able to search, seize and of course then prosecute where appropriate. Arming police with toolbox options is important. On this side of the house, we think there is a balance and this is a threshold that we think is appropriate.

In the course of legislation previously put by the former government relating to the automatic search of people who are coming to and from drug houses, a number of other instances were raised as to concerns over who might be captured by such legislation. I make the point that—and I hope this is very clear—the police have extraordinary powers because they have a job to do. They have certain thresholds that they have to meet to be able to do that, and we think that that is a reasonable position.

At the moment, they can search people and houses in circumstances where there is a reasonable belief and they frequently do, as they should be able to. We traversed this issue previously in the parliament. I do not think there has been anything that has changed since. Our side of the parliament bears in mind the importance of protecting people and that a certain standard be there.

That is not to say that we have not acquiesced to the police request to deal with, for example, modern encryption protection against potential evidence. Unfortunately, the opposition in that area, whilst they have been willing to look at a number of areas, have not been fully supportive of our position. I will not say any more on that because it is a bill that is still currently before the house and I do not want to in any way interfere with that debate. I just make the point that I do not understand the opposition's desire to rush into the parliament when in this case—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —no—an experienced former member of the police force thinks it is a good idea—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to support the police yet his party is prepared to be quite objectionable to the police request to deal with serious crime, including child protection matters, which we have been fighting for decades in this parliament to enlighten the protection of. So please

do not come into the parliament with ideas that might be a good idea at the time. You think it might be a good idea to say that police have to have every piece of armoury they need to be able to deal with this and yet on the other hand say, 'Over here in the child protection category, we don't care.'

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order: the Attorney-General is repeatedly referring to another bill before the house in order to make a point about this bill.

The SPEAKER: I think she has completed.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:16): I want to thank the Attorney-General for her contribution to this debate, despite her repeated references to a bill in another place. It is tempting to respond to those comments about the bill in the other place, but I would not do something so unparliamentary. As I said in my remarks all those months ago, ice is a particular problem. We have seen some measures brought in. Before the last election, the then opposition made a big deal about prosecuting a war on drugs.

Apart from upping some penalties and a rather ill-fated foray into imprisoning cannabis smokers, there has not been much done in terms of reforms to drug enforcement law. I have this bill, and there is another bill, which of course I will not refer to in any detail, about giving police reasonable search powers that they think will help them to uncover drugs, and the police and I do not think that those powers are too much of a stretch on the already existing reasonable suspicion provisions.

I am disappointed that the Attorney and the government will not be supporting this. I think there is some confusion about what this bill is about. It is not about searching houses. The Attorney went into quite some detail about the police power to search houses, which we are all familiar with. This is about searching persons and vehicles coming and going from those houses that are known to be drug houses. I do not quite understand the comments around the cost of damages incurred. Unless the police are called on to perhaps forcibly open a car door or something like that, I cannot imagine there would be extreme costs involved with this kind of law enforcement.

I was not expecting anything different. This government talks tough on drugs, but then it comes in here and repeatedly votes down perfectly sensible measures to give police better powers to fight the scourge of ice in our community. I continue to commend this bill to the house.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes 19
Noes 25
Majority 6

AYES

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

NOES

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

Second reading thus negatived.

MOTOR VEHICLES (OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 March 2019.)

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:24): I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak on the bill. I know that the member for Reynell has raised this matter because it is an issue of concern to her and to many people in our community. As the Attorney-General previously outlined to the house, the government is concerned that in dealing with such a matter we are able to do so in a way that will ensure that it is effective, taking into account community concerns and community standards and also the fact that in Australia we do have vehicles able to traverse state lines, and we are obviously in a position where we would like to have a national outcome on this.

The Minister for Transport has been pretty clear in talking about that, and I expect it will be a matter of discussion again at a national level. Something that has sometimes been raised with me in my electorate is what we do about the idea of offensive materials that clearly cause concern to many people. We already have on the statute legislation that deals with some of these matters.

Whether confining the registration of these cars in South Australia when they are able to go elsewhere resolves the issue without reference to our interstate colleagues and whether that is the best way of handling the issue is where the parliament has not yet progressed this legislation until some of those matters are resolved. The exploration that has been done by the government to determine the best methodology to deal with this issue in light of advice from departments, ensuring that we do not have unintended consequences, is worthy.

I am sure that the member for Reynell's first concern is for the good of the community and not just to have a bill for the sake of having the statute. I am certain that is the case, so I know that she will understand that the government wishes to have a bill that is effective. The government wishes to have an outcome that is effective. This is not a situation that has developed since 17 March last year.

These campers have been on the roads, and people have been displaying offensive material for longer than 15 months, so I do not think that it is necessarily something that you want to get an outcome for this week as opposed to two weeks from now or a month from now if the outcome a little bit down the track is going to be better and more effective and more meets the needs of our South Australian community and indeed the national community.

One of the particular recent incidents that was deeply concerning to the member for Reynell, and to many people in the community, particularly involved plates being on a vehicle in a different state. I think the first mover on this interstate saw registrations moved from one state to another. The Labor Party's argument so far has been that if each one does it one after the other, then eventually you will capture everyone. That sounds great, but it does not actually mean that the problem will be resolved in South Australia any more speedily than if we can all come to the same national landing together.

The benefit of having a national solution, if it is a national solution that can be reached, is that everyone then has the same solution, where you have the legislation reflected in every state so that there are not then cracks that can be sorted through and then we just have to come back here again down the track. The point I make is that passing the bill today in its current form, which we are not convinced is as yet in the best form, will not solve the problem the member for Reynell seeks to solve at this stage. A national solution will be better.

The second point I make is that, if there are particular opportunities to enhance the South Australian legislation, absent that national reform, then the Attorney-General has suggested that there may be some enhancements that can be achieved there. I do not make any criticism of the member for Reynell in this speech for bringing this matter to the parliament. I think it is a matter that

is worthy of our consideration, and it is receiving active work within government to explore the best way to deal with a solution that will ensure our community standards are upheld.

I think of the impact on young women in particular not only because it is not offensive to all people but because I think the impact on young women can potentially be greater. Indeed, it can impact young men, who can be led to think that this sort of casual, inappropriate and offensive attitude is normal. I seek leave to continue my remarks at a later stage.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Motions

STATE BUDGET

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (11:31): I move:

That this house—

- (a) condemns the 2018-19 Marshall government budget of cuts, closures and privatisations;
- (b) acknowledges the substantial increase in state debt under the Marshall government, despite increased revenues and the budget's cuts, closures and privatisations;
- (c) recognises the fall in South Australia's employment growth rate since the election of the Marshall government; and
- (d) recognises that six months after the election of the Marshall government, fewer people are employed in South Australia.

It is worth considering at the outset what we were promised by the Liberals at the last state election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The costings that were provided by the then shadow treasurer, the Hon. Mr Lucas of the other place, essentially said that the Liberal's election commitments would be funded from existing government resources, existing capacity within the state budget and the implementation of a 0.7 per cent efficiency dividend on the health operations in SA Health and a 1.7 per cent efficiency dividend across other agencies, particularly exempting impacts on front-line services. Indeed, he was at pains to explain that the number of people who would be separated from the public sector in pursuing these budget savings would be no more than was already factored into the forward estimates through previously announced savings.

That is far from what the 2018-19 state budget, the first of the Marshall Liberal government, delivered. It was broken election commitment after broken election commitment. We were promised more jobs, lower costs and better services, and we have seen this government fail on all three counts. In the Liberal Party's costings before the election, we were promised:

Front line services such as doctors, teachers, nurses, police etc will be quarantined from the efficiency dividend in a similar way to that announced by the Weatherill Government in the Mid-Year Budget Review (MYBR).

What did we see in last year's budget papers for this current financial year for the Central Adelaide Local Health Network? We saw that 880 full-time equivalent staff were to be separated from that organisation, that is, front-line workers. That includes doctors, nurses and other ancillary health staff who are providing those front-line health services.

We were promised a \$75 million cut over three years in consultants and contractors. What do we see? A contract for up to \$37 million for KordaMentha. We have also seen an increase in the number of consultancies and contracts that have been provided across portfolios, some of which have not been let yet, of course. I spoke at some length about the ethereal GlobeLink project, which seems to exist only in cached Google documents; nothing in existence at the moment. In fact, the only other place it is in existence, apparently, is in the federal member for Boothby's mind. However, there is apparently a \$20 million consultancy for that project.

We were also promised a cut of \$15 million in government advertising and communications, but what did we see in March of this year but a payroll tax advertising campaign for cuts that had already commenced, cuts that small businesses did not even need to apply for. When it came to the

budget settings, we were also promised there would be no impact on net debt estimates outlined in the 2017-18 Mid-Year Budget Review. Well, all those promises made by the Liberals at the last state election have not been delivered.

We also heard from the Premier himself, in the week leading up to the last state election, that there was 'no privatisation agenda', but what have we seen under this government but privatisation after privatisation. On that promise of more jobs, lower costs and better services, as I said jobs growth has slowed to a near stop, costs are now set to massively increase with the news two weeks ago of a very large increase in fees and charges and services are being slashed.

Let us look at some of the individual cuts. There is \$46 million from bus and train services in the state budget—\$46 million. The \$3 million that has already been rolled out, the ghost buses carrying no patrons—no patrons, of course, defined by the member for Schubert as up to 27 passengers—are bus cuts that are impacting people already, and we have had only \$3 million out of the \$46 million that needs to be delivered.

I have already mentioned the 880 FTEs being cut from the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. Of course, those FTEs are being cut while interstate corporate liquidators are being flown in on a weekly basis at a cost of up to \$6,500 a day to administer our health system.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think the member for Chaffey said that he would not get out of bed and travel for under \$6,500 given his sojourn off to Texas. Well, that would not surprise us at all, would it? It seems that ministerial travel has escalated through the roof as well.

Speaking of regional matters, we have had a \$26 million cut to regional road funding, we have had a cut to the *Overland* train service subsidy and we have also had the dishonouring of a \$1 million funding program for Crime Stoppers. We have had a \$70 million laptop program for high school students scrapped by the government, and the female facilities program has been scrapped. We have had 29 job creation and job support programs cut, and it is no coincidence at all that with that cut to those job creation and job support programs we have seen a huge double foot on the brake of jobs growth here in South Australia.

Then you look at the closures. We have three Service SA centres allegedly closing, although we have a minister who does not quite know yet how they will be closed and how the services are going to be alternatively provided. We have seven TAFE campuses to close, and we have two sexual health clinics to close. Of course, we do not yet know how many SA Pathology branches are going to close under the \$110 million of savings that organisation has to deliver, let alone if it is going to lose any of those sites if, indeed, it becomes privatised.

We have that privatisation plan for SA Pathology, and we have the privatisation of the Adelaide Remand Centre, which one would have thought would be going a bit more swimmingly than it is at the moment—after all, it is being superintended by Mr Lucas, the master of privatisation. One would have thought that after privatising the state's electricity assets 20 years ago this year he would understand the basic legal requirement that a government would have to consult with its workforce. Unfortunately, according to the Employment Tribunal he failed to meet that legal requirement, yet we hear him on radio celebrating that fact, such is his contempt for public sector workers.

We also have the privatisation of Modbury health patient transfers, which will impact those patients requiring transport and receiving treatment at Modbury Hospital. We also have the privatisation of the regional road maintenance effort currently being undertaken by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, finishing the job of privatisation that was commenced by Diana Laidlaw and Rob Lucas in the 1990s.

It is a real shame that those arrangements for road maintenance in metropolitan areas were privatised back then. I remember, on my first site visit as minister in early April 2014, heading out to one of the DPTI depots, that the workers told me how much those cuts and privatisations in the 1990s had decimated the capacity of the state to maintain the regional road networks. They said that they would go out all day every day surveying the state of the roads. They had the equipment and the

capacity to patch up those sections of road which needed to be done upon inspection. That will no longer happen under a privatised model for those regions.

The Treasurer has announced that a privatisation task force is going to be established in the Department of Treasury and Finance. That department, of course, is suffering from more than \$80 million worth of cuts over the next four years. He is 'actively encouraging' Department of Treasury and Finance officers to identify ways to further privatise and outsource operations and assets of the South Australian government.

I have to wonder what it must feel like to be a backbencher on the government benches, particularly one elected in their first term of parliament, one who perhaps came to the election in 2018 thinking that they could make a positive difference for their community. They would have thought they were going to be different from the divisive and apposite-type politics that we see so much in today's media, that they could just be connected to their community and focus on their local community because they want to deliver for their community. Someone perhaps like the member for King or someone perhaps like the member for Newland, what have they been able to deliver in the first 13 or 14 months?

We see the Modbury Service SA centre slated to be closed, although as I have just mentioned we have a minister who does not quite know how to do that, let alone provide alternatives for the services at that location. We have the funded expansion of the Tea Tree Plaza park-and-ride cancelled. We have the Golden Grove park-and-ride delayed. We have the Tea Tree Gully TAFE closed. We have bus routes in those electorates axed. We have the privatisation of Modbury patient transfers and we have cuts to SA Pathology services. I agree, I would not want to hear it either, if that was my record of delivery. I would not want to hear it either.

I would want to turn and get away from that awful abject tale of woe about how those two north-eastern suburbs members of the Liberal Party have let down their constituencies. Cuts, closures and privatisations, when they go to their constituents in 2022, that is what they will be asking for a second term on the back of. 'Look at what I have delivered—fewer bus services, no Service SA centre, delayed park-and-ride upgrades.' It is extraordinary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will have a chance to rebut.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What action have they taken? None. They have done nothing to try to stem the overwhelming tide of cuts and closures and privatisations to their community. It is absolutely extraordinary.

Then, of course, we turn our minds to the extraordinary increase in state debt under this government. The budget experienced a windfall in GST revenues—\$991 million over four years. They raided South Australian government businesses, with \$128 million extra from SA Water, \$81 million extra from the South Australian Government Financing Authority. But, despite these windfalls, they have massively ramped up debt. The Premier promised no impact on the debt estimates in the Mid-Year Budget Review (MYBR).

So what were the debt estimates in the Mid-Year Budget Review? Let's have a look. We have had an explosion in debt from the 2017-18 MYBR figure for that year of \$4.9 billion of net general government sector debt or a net debt to revenue ratio of 25.6. Well, that debt is now forecast to reach \$8.98 billion by the end of the forward estimates. That is an extra \$4 billion, or an extra 82 per cent, increase in net debt. Not increasing net debt? Not by much—it nearly doubles it!

What is all that being spent on? There are some things to spend it on, of course. There are all those infrastructure projects the former Labor government funded in the forward estimates, which are to be rolled out and which the laughing member for Schubert continues to take credit for, such as opening up new interchanges on the Northern Connector, for example. He boasts about how much money is locked into the forward estimates for infrastructure expenditure on schools. These are all proud Labor projects. They are investments in infrastructure, transport and education. That does not explain the \$4 billion of extra debt being ramped up by this government.

To the last point, we were promised employment growth. What did we see? After the first six months of this government, jobs actually decreased in the South Australian economy. In the last year of the Labor government, trend employment growth sat at 2.4 per cent, with over 20,000 jobs created. Under the Marshall government, the annual trend employment growth rate sits at 0.8 per cent, one-third of what Labor had achieved, with only one-third of the jobs created.

It is a shameful record. This was a disgraceful budget that withdrew support from the South Australian community and withdrew support from the South Australian economy. I bet that, at the next election, the South Australian community will withdraw its support for this dreadful government.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:46): I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete all the words after 'That' and insert the following words in lieu thereof:

That this house—

- (a) congratulates the Marshall government for delivering a 2018-19 budget that meets its election commitments, introduces a modest range of responsible savings while maintaining per annum growth in average operating expenditure across the forward estimates;
- (b) acknowledges the substantial operating surpluses delivered, and that the projected increase in state debt reflects the significant boost to infrastructure spending;
- (c) recognises the growth in South Australia's employment since the election of the Marshall government; and
- (d) recognises that, 12 months after the election of the Marshall government, there are 14,900 more people employed in South Australia.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, do you have a point of order?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I do. I was hoping to see a copy of the amendment because, as it was read to the house, the member for Schubert said, 'Delete all words after "that".' I presume the next words were the amendment, which commenced with the word 'that'. Does the motion now read, 'That that this house'?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I take your point of order. Very perceptive of you, member for Lee.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Lee, you have had your turn.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries!

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Hold your fire, everyone, please, just for a moment. I have a copy of the amended motion. As far as I can see, the word 'that' does not appear twice. The motion has been seconded. The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure can now speak to his amended motion.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I am glad to see that members opposite are really dealing with the big issues when it comes to the state of the budget here in South Australia as we saw it and as we were left with in the lead-up to the 2018 election. What our first budget did was reverse some of the very cruel decisions that the former government had put in place. At the outset, can I say that the tirade from the member for Lee was fundamentally flawed in minor parts and dishonest and misleading in major parts.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Minister, could you take your seat for a moment. Member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The remedy for an allegation of misleading the parliament is to move for a matter of privilege to be established. If that is what the member for Schubert indeed implies, I ask him to either withdraw what he just said or move to establish a matter of privilege.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, we are just a bit unsure of exactly what you said then. What I am going to suggest to appease the member for Lee—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, could you listen to me, please? What I am going to ask you to do to appease the member for Lee is be very careful about the words you use in this chamber. Thank you.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Certainly, sir. In doing so, I say that it is not the house that is being impeded in this regard, but essentially what is being represented by the member for Lee is a very selective version of the truth, which, if taken in its entirety, could suggest something different from what the reality is to the South Australian people, especially with regard to this government's ability to deliver on its election commitments.

Before we come to that, can I say that what we were left with was a budget mess. We were left with a budget that was in structural deficit, that without the flogging off of significant assets would have looked far worse than what was presented during budget time, a budget that also had a savings task that was a significant burden on the agencies that were required to deliver on it.

What is more interesting about the member for Lee's speech is really that he could not decide on which side of the fence he sat. He basically was making the broad assumption that anything we do is bad and anything they did was really, really good. That manifested itself in a speech that attacked us for making savings on spending and also then attacked us for spending too much money. What I find most interesting about the member for Lee's speech is that he could not decide from which angle he wanted to attack us to maintain a level of internal logical consistency, except using a very basic argument that Liberal is bad and Labor is good.

It is in that light that we heard a tirade that bore very little resemblance to the truth. This budget delivered on the promises that the Marshall Liberal government made at the 2018 election. It delivered payroll tax relief for 3,200 businesses right across South Australia to stimulate growth in jobs in our economy. It delivered \$360 million worth of relief in the emergency services levy that we promised to the people back in 2015.

If we want to take a contrast on that point alone, the hike in the emergency services levy was not something that the Labor Party took to the 2014 election. It is something they inflicted on the people of South Australia after the fact. We were up-front about what our election commitments were and we delivered on them. We delivered land tax reduction. More than that, we also forgave some of the cruel savings tasks that the former government had in place.

When the member for Lee talks about what we are seeking to do to turn around the health budget, he conveniently forgets the \$800 million worth of health savings that we forgave in last year's budget. If in this alternate universe the Labor Party would have been re-elected, there was \$800 million more worth of cuts that they had in their forward estimates planned to be delivered within the health budget. To stand up and suggest otherwise is disgusting and disingenuous.

The same can be said about TAFE. This government forgave \$100 million worth of savings and revenue targets given to that organisation, an organisation that the former government could not manage. I know that the Minister for Education and the Minister for Innovation and Skills are doing a whole lot of work to turn it around so that it can deliver the education outcomes that we need to support jobs growth in our state.

We also saw a \$30 million forgiving of savings in the child protection department. I do not necessarily need to go down that path; I think the South Australian public are very well aware of the former government's record on child protection. This budget also delivered on the central tenet that we took to the last election, and that was to deliver a budget that is in surplus. This year's budget—a \$48 million surplus in the 2018-19 budget—was the delivery of that commitment. It is something that, again, we took to the South Australian people.

What is also interesting is that we did tell people that we needed to achieve a savings task to deliver that budget surplus. By contrast, there was another major political party that simply did not release election costings before the last election. They told you about everything that they were going to spend, but they did not tell you how they were going to pay for it. Again, to suggest anything other than our having been up-front with the South Australian people is disingenuous at best.

This budget delivered on our election commitments. It delivered \$200 million into the Skilling Australians Fund so that we can reverse the decline of some two-thirds in the number of apprenticeship and traineeship starts in South Australia. It delivered a record \$11.3 billion worth of infrastructure spending over the forward estimates to deliver a project pipeline that gives certainty to that sector. In that \$11.3 billion are the electorate commitments that we made to the South Australian people, all of which—with one exception, which is the right-hand turn on North Terrace—are on track to be delivered. When the member for Lee tried to suggest anything other than our commitment to delivering park-and-rides in the north-east, he was being disingenuous.

There is more. We delivered on our commitment to turn Lot Fourteen into an innovation and research hub that is going to drive jobs growth in South Australia. We also delivered a record \$515 million more into the education budget. That is \$515 million into the education budget. So we have been able to balance the books. We have been able to cut taxes. We have been able to deliver on our election commitments, and we have been able to forgive the awful savings task in areas central to delivering good services in South Australia.

It is a budget that we are proud to stand behind and stand up for. It is one that we will continue to build on in this year's budget. I think it starts to reverse some of the very damaging work that the former government had been dealing with. I can also say that it has actually delivered jobs growth for the people of South Australia: there are 14,900 more people employed under the Marshall Liberal government than under the previous government.

We have also seen some real green shoots in our economy in relation to the level of commercial construction growth and investment into plant and equipment. These lead indicators show that we are moving forward as a state and that there are positive signs for further employment growth into the future. We are very proud to stand behind this budget. It delivered exactly what, at time of the election, we said it would. We have kept faith with the people of South Australia and we will continue to do so. We will continue to point out that the budget has driven jobs growth within our economy, which is providing a brighter future for all South Australians.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:57): I rise to support the original motion by the member for Lee that condemns the 2018 Marshall government budget, which is a series of cuts, closures and privatisations where the debt for the state has increased and unemployment is actually worse.

As the shadow minister for human services, I want to ensure that South Australians who are vulnerable, those who have a disability and those who are facing homelessness receive the support, advice, funding and all the help that they need. Under the cruel Marshall Liberal government, it is becoming increasingly hard for these members of our community to make ends meet. It is becoming increasingly hard for people to travel, either on a bus or in a taxi, to necessary appointments, to go to study or to go to work. It is becoming even harder for them to pay their rent.

Thousands of South Australians have had enough, and so have I. This cruel and cold-hearted government has no financial excuses for its cruel cuts, closures and privatisations. The cruel government has received a nice, healthy increase in GST revenue. Last Friday, I attended a rally organised by a community group called 'Keep the South Australian taxi subsidy scheme'.

This is a group of people with a disability and their supporters who hold grave fears about isolation and skyrocketing transport costs when their taxi vouchers are removed in the second half of this year. Add to this the cutting of transport routes and the recent announcement of allegedly improving the public transport journey by further cutting low-patronage routes and facilitating people to hop on and hop off other forms of transport by using connector-type services. You have the perfect storm of disadvantage appearing over the horizon for people in our community living with a disability.

Prior to the NDIS being introduced, the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme was available to those eligible to attend medical appointments, work, study or job interviews. They also were provided with a transport supplement payment from Centrelink. Of course, under the agreement

with NDIS, things were changing. Sadly, however, the flexibility and the agility within NDIS seems to be absent, so these people who used to receive that amount of support will see change.

A lack of action by the Marshall government and the federal Abbott/Turnbull/Morrison regime means that after 30 June this year, some time in the second part of this year, 5,500 people who are on the NDIS or transitioning to the NDIS will be left out of pocket for between \$2,000 and \$5,000 at least.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Point of order: the motion is quite clearly in respect of the 2018-19 Marshall government budget. The issues being enunciated by the member for Hurtle Vale actually have no relevance to the 2018-19 Marshall government budget.

Ms COOK: What a bogus point of order.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale, please take your seat. Minister, I take your point of order. I think the motion itself, even though it mentions 2018-19 specifically, is broad-ranging in its scope. I will listen carefully, but I am happy enough with the member for Hurtle Vale at the moment. I ask you to continue on and for the interjections to cease between the Minister for Transport and the member for Badcoe.

Ms COOK: Thank you, sir; I was ignoring them. I will reiterate: prior to the NDIS being introduced, the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme was available to those eligible to attend medical appointments, work, study or job interviews. As well as that, they were provided with a transport supplement payment from Centrelink. A lack of action by the Marshall government, which includes the Minister for Transport in this place, means that during the second part of this year, in partnership with the federal Abbott/Turnbull/Morrison regime and their history, these people will be worse off.

Around 5,500 people who have transitioned or are transitioning to the NDIS will be left out of pocket for between \$2,000 and \$5,000 a year. Those opposite may snicker and may believe what the Minister for Transport wants to say about this, but those people started their own group because they know that under this state government and the federal Liberal government they are between \$2,000 and \$5,000 worse off and they cannot afford it.

It is cruel and unjust. People with a disability need that support and they need people to listen. The system, if it is not agile enough, needs to be changed. Under the federal government, which trickles down, similar to the right-wing trickle-down economic rubbish that we have to put up with from this state government, these people will suffer.

Members interjecting:

Ms COOK: I appreciate that the Minister for Transport in this place, who continues to interject, has been the person who has taken some accountability for this and announced one voucher book of 80 vouchers for these people as a stopgap measure into the second part of the year, and the group is appreciative of that. However, I would welcome the minister clarifying just how many people will get that book out of the 5,500 people transitioning to the NDIS. Just how proactive is this government going to be in marketing it to all those people who are eligible to make sure that they get that book?

A lot of people who are eligible for that book are contacting us, saying that they know nothing about it and that they have just heard on the street. On this side of the house, I am sure I am not the only person who would be happy to talk to all our constituents, do a mail-out and support that information going into the community. I would urge the Minister for Transport to do the same. The provision of the book is a stopgap measure. It only kicks the can filled with pain down the road to Christmas and it says, 'Merry Christmas. You're all on your own. You're unfunded, isolated, unable to participate and engage in our community. It's a good job that Santa home delivers.'

The Minister for Human Services did not turn up to the rally when invited, but I understand that because it is a lot harder to cut the hell out of people if you know them and if you have had to look them in the eye and meet them. The agenda of not meeting with anyone works if it is going to be too painful to cut their budgets.

There are also a whole range of other cuts in the state budget that hurt vulnerable people, including increasing Housing Trust rents on people with fixed incomes. The federal Liberals have no agenda to review Newstart, no agenda to provide a higher proportion of increase to pensions, people on welfare benefits, people who cannot afford to keep up with the rising cost of living. They have cut \$46 million from public transport routes used by people who, by their own admission, the federal Liberals said 'cannot afford cars and do not drive'.

We have the abolishment of the Mental Health Commission. People who are vulnerable need those voices. We have cuts in hospital beds and SA Pathology closures. Minutes save lives when you are talking about emergencies. These people are vulnerable. In addition, seven TAFE campuses are being cut in areas of need, such as the north-east, Port Adelaide, Wudinna, Roxby Downs, Coober Pedy, Urrbrae and Parafield. CCTV programs are being cut—community safety measures. Young people are disproportionately affected by crime. Vulnerable people are disproportionately affected by crime.

I have always been an advocate for social justice, and I strongly believe it is a requirement to allow people to live as normal a life as possible with access to as many vital services as possible. All these cuts disproportionately affect vulnerable people. These groups are represented in every one of our electorates, and we will not stop talking about them and we will not stop listening when those groups come to us.

Respect and human dignity should not be options for political parties to make decisions about. Labor's priorities could not be any more different from those of Premier Marshall and his penny-pinching Treasurer in the other place. Every day I listen to the grave concerns of the community and I am frightened by what I hear. This government is decimating the most vital services in South Australia. It is appalling. The cruel and punishing cuts must immediately be reversed.

I will briefly address the amended motion that the member for Schubert, the Minister for Transport, has brought into this place and talk about paragraphs (c) and (d), in which they puff up their chests and say how wonderfully they have done in employing South Australians. I can tell you that that is not young people because since you came into power in March 2018 the youth unemployment rate has gone up from 11.5 per cent to 15 per cent. This is not giving jobs to young people.

You cried crocodile tears about the brain drain, about youth leaving this state, and then you cut employment programs and you cut the programs supporting young people. You talk about green shoots. Well, shoots need water and food; everyone is starving. And you could not give a damn about the River Murray.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Innovation has the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (12:08): I stand to support the transport minister's amendment to this motion. While I am doing that, I would like to correct the record on some of the claims about employment figures over the last 12 months. There have been exciting things happening in employment in the last 12 months here in South Australia. I will start with my first point, which is the last point made by the member for Hurtle Vale. When people are not aware of how the system works, they get it wrong.

The correct way to measure youth unemployment is to look at the annual average unemployment rate. That is a more detailed and reliable figure than the monthly rate, which bounces around. It is a very small statistic. Any statistician will tell you that small statistics are unreliable, whereas bringing that out to an annual figure—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister for Innovation, could you just take a seat for a moment. Minister, I am going to congratulate you; you are one of the few members who actually addresses your comments through the Chair, and I appreciate that. I am going to ask the member for Lee and the Minister for Transport to desist their conversation across the chamber while the minister is speaking. Minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: May I say how attentive you are, sir, when you are in the chair. The average unemployment rate for young people over the past 12 months (to March 2019) was 13 per cent. In the first year of the Marshall Liberal government, the average was 13 per cent, compared with the last year of the Weatherill Labor government, when it was 15.4 per cent. That is a reliable figure. That is a figure that we can rely on because that gives us a much bigger picture as to how things are trending and where things are going. Guess what? Things are trending in a better direction under this government because of the levers—the change in direction—that we have put in place since coming to office.

It is always very important to read all the information the ABS releases every month because it gives us a much bigger picture of what is happening within the South Australian economy. After doing so month after month, as the minister responsible for employment in South Australia I can tell you that things are getting better. There is greater confidence in the business community, which means that employers are prepared to invest in their staff, and that is exactly what they have been doing. Over the past 12 months, more than 7,700 additional people were employed full-time.

It is a big commitment by an employer to go from employing part-time or casual staff, which is what happened under the previous government when we saw a boom in part-time employment at the expense of full-time employment. Employers are saying, 'We can see more than a light at the end of the tunnel. We can actually see that the economy is improving in South Australia.' They are investing in their existing staff and giving them the opportunity to transfer from part-time or casual work to full-time work.

That is great for employees because that means they can start planning their lives. They can go to the bank and say, 'I have a full-time job. This is what I'm earning. I would like a loan to buy a house; I would like to actually start planning for the future.' Not only are employers and businesses planning for the future by investing in full-time staff but staff who are joining those businesses in a full-time capacity are much more confident with their consumer spending and saving for the future.

This is great news for the longer term outcomes and the shift in policy levers that the Marshall Liberal government has put in place. There are now 552,000 full-time workers in South Australia. That is an all-time record—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, do you have a point of order?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No; I draw attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: As I was saying, there are 552,000 full-time employees in South Australia. That is a significant improvement in full-time jobs and an all-time record in the number of South Australians working. In trend terms, that is 848,300 South Australians in jobs. We have never had that many people working in South Australia. On top of that, in the month of March we actually saw the participation rate increase by nearly 1 per cent. What does that tell us? It tells us that the optimism within the business community is now filtering down to the general community. They are now saying, 'I'm going to go back into the workforce applying for a job because I can see that jobs are being created because of the confidence in the business community.'

We are seeing more participation in the job sector and we are seeing more hours worked by South Australians. As a matter of fact, if you look at the last 12 months, there were 2.7 million additional hours worked in South Australia from March 2018 to March 2019. There were 116 million hours worked by South Australians—an all-time record—and that has generated an extra \$865 million in salaries being paid to workers in South Australia since Steven Marshall became the Premier of this state. That is a tremendous achievement in such a short time.

The opposition is not happy about that. Their whole focus is about destroying any good news and any confidence in this economy because they know that business confidence is a key driver of business growth in South Australia, and business growth is a driver of more jobs and more salaries for workers. The member for Lee could not have designed a motion that was more wrong about the situation we are in today, and that is why I support the transport minister's amendment to his original motion.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (12:17): I rise today to support the original motion from the member for Lee. In its first year in government, the Marshall Liberal government cut the budget for the Tourism Commission by \$11 million and this has sent the industry backwards. This cut represents a reduction in activity that has serious ramifications for our local economy. The results of this cut led to the closure of the commission's representation in India.

This cut meant a reduction in international marketing and direct flight attraction. This cut meant a reduction in sector development activity—projects that help small business. It is important to remind ourselves that 40 per cent of expenditure in the visitor economy is in the regions. It was a short-sighted decision. I think, at the time, the Treasurer thought it was an easy decision: 'I'm going to cut \$11 million out. No-one will really notice.' It was clearly driven for quick cash savings but without thinking about the long-term benefits that the industry provides. The numbers speak for themselves.

Recent figures from Tourism Research Australia show that the cuts to our international presence are already impacting. International visitors are down 3.2 per cent, international visitor spend is down 3.5 per cent and international visitor nights are down 9 per cent. The raw fact is that 96 per cent of international tourists coming to Australia do not visit South Australia. That means that we have to get out there and market ourselves. We know that we are one of the most livable cities, and we know that we have beautiful ecotourism opportunities and that we have great food and wine. But it is a competitive world and people have choices on where they spend their money. We must make sure that we are in market, selling ourselves to the world.

If we look closer to home, this has also impacted on our regional day trips. In the last 12 months, South Australian regional day trips are down \$70 million. That impacts McLaren Vale, it impacts the Barossa, it impacts the Limestone Coast and it impacts Port Lincoln. This is real money that is not coming into the economy. What we have to understand is that tourism equals jobs. The Labor government got this, but for some reason the Treasurer in the last budget thought, 'This isn't going to have an impact; I'll just take this money out.' Do you know what we are hearing? That he has another \$5 million on the chopping block to come out again!

There are 36,000 South Australians employed in tourism. If you put in more money, more people are employed very quickly. We knew that, and that is why we supported tourism. It is a labour-intensive industry; it brings economic benefits to Adelaide and our regions. Tourism is a super growth industry. Industry experts have calculated that the current value of economic contribution to the South Australian visitor economy is \$6.8 billion. This is a decrease. It is down \$100 million from earlier valuations. An \$11 million cut has led to a \$100 million economic impact—a negative impact.

We can talk about unemployment rates, but how about we talk about how we turn them around. We know that tourism is a fantastic employer. Tourism employs people at entry levels, university education, trade qualifications. We hear this government talk about Lot Fourteen: fantastic, we are going to have a tourism/hospitality school. That is great, but if we do not put more money into the tourism budget there simply will not be growth there.

Let's talk about tourism in Australia. We know that we are down on international visitors, and I have talked about those figures. What is happening in every other state? Victoria had an increase of 13 per cent in international visitor spend; Queensland had an increase of 13 per cent in international visitor spend. Everyone else is going great guns. Let's talk about overnight trips in South Australia. We have seen some increases here, a 7 per cent increase in spend, I will acknowledge that, but what is happening in every other state? Queensland had a 16 per cent increase in overnight visitor spend, New South Wales is up 13 per cent, Tassie is up 16 per cent and WA is up 14 per cent—double the spend increase for every other state.

The tourism pie is great and it is increasing and growing, but our share of the tourism pie is shrinking. The Treasurer, in the lead-up to this state budget, must not forget tourism. If we are concerned about unemployment and concerned about the regions, let me tell you that we know they are suffering with the drought. I was in Clare only a few weeks ago—it takes your breath away; it is dusty and it is dry. But tourism diversifies the regional economy. Clare is a beautiful place, with the Riesling Trail, wonderful B & Bs—

Mr Cowdrey: Great wine—

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The wine is okay, and the people are fabulous, but, most importantly, it is about the diversity of the economy. If you take \$11 million out of the tourism budget at a time when the regions need it most, as the Minister for Primary Industries has eloquently spoken about in the house many times, diversity of the economy is great. Only a few weeks ago we were at the opening of the Barossa Valley Chocolate Company, a recipient of a regional development grant under the Labor government, because we know that tourism equals jobs, and diversity of tourism product and diversity into regional economies are the goals we all share.

If the government are serious about backing the industry and the economy, they need to think about how we can further South Australia's branding and marketing efforts. Subsidising a new hotel at Adelaide Oval is not a tourism policy. While the government has watched on the sidelines, we have seen the Kangaroo Island Visitor Centre close. People get off the ferry in Penneshaw and there is a big sign that says that the Kangaroo Island Visitor Centre is closed. Every bit of tourism marketing contains Kangaroo Island: a seal at Seal Bay and, for those of us who like gin, fantastic Kangaroo Island gin and beautiful honey. What message are we giving people who arrive in Penneshaw and see that the visitor centre is closed?

I think this government have their priorities wrong when it comes to tourism. They think that this new hotel is more important. South Australia needs to get its fair share of the national tourism market. It is a competitive field and other jurisdictions across the country are turbocharging their tourism efforts. Federal Labor understands this. Hopefully, we will see a Shorten federal government, intent on delivering \$95 million in grants to improve infrastructure around existing tourism attractions.

Across the country, we see different states add to their tourism budget. Western Australia has recently announced an additional \$9 million towards international marketing. Queensland has a \$36 million commitment to growing tourism infrastructure. On this side of the floor, we say that you got it wrong. You thought you could make this cut and that no-one would notice. We cannot afford any more cuts to tourism in South Australia.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:27): I rise to support the motion of the member for Lee. The last budget had a significant and real impact on the people in my electorate of Badcoe. I have heard from my colleagues here this morning about the cuts to Service SA. The Mitcham Service SA closure will definitely affect the people in Badcoe. The TAFE cuts, particularly Urrbrae TAFE, which is one that people in my area go to, will have a real impact on the people in Badcoe and certainly that is something they have been raising with me.

The bus cuts are constantly raised with me. On the weekend, while I was doing street-corner meetings with Mark Butler, people were raising the fact that they are going to find it so much harder to get to where they need to go with bus services being cut right across metropolitan Adelaide.

The subject of female facilities comes up quite a lot. At the last election, the area of Badcoe was quite fortunate to receive quite a lot of investment from the previous Labor government into sporting facilities, with some benefiting from the previous government's female facilities fund and others being able to provide, through the support of the previous Labor government, female facilities, which are in the process of being built and which includes the major project about to get underway at Goodwood Oval.

Cuts to school zones have been raised with me, and I have been quite surprised by the level of feedback I have received from parents, home owners and the wider community. We know those cuts have only happened because this government failed to budget its own election promise of putting year 7 into high school.

It is not necessarily a policy that people in my electorate are opposed to; it is just that it was not made clear what the impact of that would be for them. While they may agree with year 7 going into high school, it would mean that it would come at the cost of their children, and their children would not be able to go to Adelaide High or Adelaide Botanic High when they had been told for five years that they would be able to. That is incredibly disappointing and yet another impact of the previous budget and the inability to actually budget for the things that were promised.

Another area that I want to particularly draw to the attention of the house is the portfolio area of child protection. We have seen a range of cuts across the child protection portfolio; however, a

particularly cruel cut has been to the financial counsellor service, which has existed for quite some time within the department. There are 59 full-time equivalent positions—59 is a lot of staff doing a lot of work helping people who need financial assistance.

They operate on three different levels. For those who are not aware of the what the financial counsellors do in the Department for Child Protection, their role is threefold: firstly, preventing families who are at risk of entering the child protection system and, indeed, the wider government welfare system. If a red flag is raised and someone needs financial assistance, needs help budgeting or needs help understanding how to set up accounts, how to manage their bills and how to pay for food for their children, they can use these financial counsellors to assist them in getting those things under control and give them a chance to stay out of the child protection system, care for their children themselves and create a bright future for their families and their children. They will not be doing that anymore.

Another role is to assist those who have come into the child protection system; either child protection workers are keeping an eye on them or, indeed, their children have been taken from them and are now wards of the state. Work is done with those families, and should be done increasingly, to ensure that, if their children are on three-month, 12-month or longer orders, these families might get themselves into shape and might be in a position to take their children back into their care and provide them with a loving home and a home where they are given all the necessities of life.

However, the area that financial counsellors look after that is dear to my heart is where they help young people who have been in care and who are leaving care to get a financial education. They help them to learn how finances work, how they should manage their own budget, how they should manage the rent and the bills that will come in and how to be financially independent. Of course, one of the greatest gifts we can give young people, whether they are in care or not, is the ability to be able to look after themselves, go out into the adult world, start up a great life, be able to do well and not be dependent on the state for their entire lives. That is an important part of what the financial counsellors do.

Those 59 full-time equivalent positions have already started to dwindle, as I understand it, but they will all be gone on 30 June. What is replacing this service? That is a big question. We certainly tried to get some answers from the Minister for Child Protection in estimates last year but, quite frankly, the responses either made no sense or were completely confused. At one point, under questioning about whether a tender would be put out, there was an indication that there would be a tender, yet all these months later we have seen no tender for financial counselling services. In fact, I understand that there will not be a tender at all. That is a bit of a problem because what was promised was that a \$1 million tender would be put out to provide financial services and that it would be provided by the non-government sector.

Then we were told that actually \$1 million had already been provided and items were listed off, including an app for young people leaving care as some sort of replacement for these financial counsellors. Everyone knows that an app cannot replace face-to-face advice from a financial counsellor. In fact, that response in estimates was left wanting because the list of things that was produced was actually something that the previous Labor government put in place in response to the Nyland royal commission, so it was no replacement at all for the financial counselling service that is being removed.

The sector is still a bit baffled as to what this government is going to put in place to replace the financial counselling services that previously cost somewhere in the vicinity of \$4.9 million and supplied 59 specialist staff who were skilled in the area of providing financial and budgeting advice to people from a range of backgrounds. That is just non-existent now.

I do not think it is the government's argument that people in need, people coming into the child protection system or indeed exiting the child protection system, do not need assistance when it comes to financial matters. I do not think that is the argument at all, yet they have provided absolutely nothing to replace the financial counselling service that they have just completely axed.

Certainly, the not-for-profit sector is not going to pick up the slack there. They are not going to hire 60-odd new financial counsellors and provide that service without government assistance and certainly not with the \$1 million or so dollars that has been spoken of to replace the \$5 million-odd

that was previously spent on providing these services, although no detail was given about it. It is incredibly disappointing when you look at the fact that the rate of children coming into state care under this government has risen more than 9 per cent.

There has been an increase of more than 9 per cent in children coming into state care and we are heading for about 4,000 children in state care under this Liberal government. That definitely flies in the face of the rhetoric that we were hearing for years before the last election that this government was going to reduce the number of children in care and that they had some grand plan for how they were going to get the number of children coming into care under control and, in fact, decrease the number of children in state care.

What we have actually seen from this government is pretty much nothing. They have been missing in action on child protection. We have seen cuts—absolutely. We have seen cuts like the financial counselling service, but we have seen no plan whatsoever and that is an absolutely abhorrent situation. It is a terrible situation for the almost 4,000 children who are currently in state care who expected more of this government. I think the community expected more of this government, listening to the rhetoric that they were so freely putting out there in the years before the last state election.

I call on the state government to look at the cuts they have made in child protection and not only restore the money that they have cut, particularly from the financial counselling service, but actually look at some proper investments and do something—anything would be a good idea in child protection—because so far absolutely nothing has been delivered. No change has been delivered in child protection at all. In fact, the terrible shame is that it has actually got worse under this government. We have seen an almost 10 per cent increase in the number of children coming into state care.

Now that you guys are the ones who are in government, you are the ones who have to deliver on those promises. There were some pretty big promises made in child protection. What we have seen are cuts and an increase in children coming into state care and relying on the state for assistance, and that is simply not good enough. I support the motion from the member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (12:37): I will address some of my remarks towards the amendment that was put by the member for Schubert. Of course, he tried to continue the charade that the Liberal government has met all its election commitments. I made it perfectly clear in my earlier remarks on this motion that they have not met their election commitments. They have not met them at all.

They have not met them specifically with regard to breaking their commitment to the people of South Australia around privatisation, they have not met their commitments with regard to budget management, they have not met their commitments about delivering better services to South Australians and they have not delivered their commitment to creating more jobs in our economy. I will use that as a convenient segue to talk about jobs and employment growth because in both the amendment that we have here from the member for Schubert and the contribution from the member for Unley we see this continued vacillation—flip-flopping—between the use of seasonally adjusted employment figures and trend employment figures.

The member for Unley is very clear about this. Quoting him from *Hansard*, he says that trend figures are the ones to be relied on. That is what he has previously told us, yet the figures used by the member for Schubert quite sneakily try to use seasonally adjusted figures. The member for Unley's contributions move between trend and seasonally adjusted and back to trend and back to seasonally adjusted. Here are the figures. Let's have the facts.

In March 2018, on trend terms there were 841,200 people employed in South Australia, an increase over the previous 12 months to that date of 20,400 people. In the 12 months since that time, we have had 848,000, an increase of only 7,100. We have had an employment growth rate drop in annual terms from 2.4 per cent per annum to 0.8 per cent per annum. They are the facts. As the member for Unley says, 'Don't ask me: ask the ABS.' That is what the ABS is telling us. The brakes have been applied to jobs growth in South Australia.

Of course, the member for Unley also says, 'But we are delivering an extra \$200 million towards industry and skills.' No, he is not. Half of that money is coming from the commonwealth. Yes, it is being filtered through the state government, but we do not quite know how, because when we have asked the member for Unley how many more training places that is going to provide there has been no answer. When we have asked him how many are going to be provided in this financial year, there is no answer. It seems that this money is all dressed up with no place to go.

To go back to the member for Schubert's comments that the \$4 billion increase in debt is for the additional infrastructure investment, let's put that to bed as well. If you look at page 23, from Budget Paper 3, you see the sum of the new investing initiatives from the 2018-19 budget and what is the total? It is \$900 million. It is not \$4 billion. It is \$900 million. Where is the rest? Well, as the member for Schubert said, 'We were trying to repair a structural deficit.'

Has the structural deficit been repaired? Not according to Rob Lucas. Rob Lucas's measure of a structural deficit was making sure that the state's own revenues were able to cover the state's own expenses and that a budget receiving commonwealth infrastructure grants as operating revenue to plump up the net operating balance, while spending that money on investing initiatives, is a budget that is in structural net operating deficit.

So to what extent is the 2018-19 financial year in structural deficit? The member for Schubert says we have a surplus of \$48 million, yet there is \$750 million coming in in infrastructure grants from the commonwealth. I make that a structural deficit, on the Liberals' terms, of \$700 million in this budget. They really need to think through their arguments a little better.

It is unfortunate, I think, that the government has put this amendment to this place, congratulating themselves on their budget. What they are congratulating themselves on are the cuts to the Service SA centres, the cuts to the bus and train services, the privatisation of SA Pathology, the privatisation of Modbury patient transfers, the privatisation of the Adelaide Remand Centre and the privatisation of regional road maintenance.

These are all the things that the member for Schubert's amendment congratulates this government on. Is that worthy of congratulation? Absolutely not—not in the face of those other broken election commitments. The GlobeLink project, which according to Mr Ridgway will definitely happen, is not happening. This is an appalling budget and it should be condemned.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I move to the vote, I welcome to the parliament today year 11s from St Aloysius College. They were in the gallery. I acknowledge and welcome them and hope they enjoy their visit. They are guests of the member for Adelaide, the Minister for Child Protection.

Motions

STATE BUDGET

Debate resumed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The question before the house is that the amendment moved by the Minister for Transport be agreed to.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes 24
Noes 20
Majority 4

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cregan, D.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.

Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.

AYES

Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.J.	Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

NOES

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

Amendment thus carried.

The house divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes	25
Noes	19
Majority	6

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion as amended thus carried.

THE JUNCTION, MOUNT GAMBIER

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:52): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the valuable service that The Junction, Mount Gambier, provides to people who are suffering from mental illness in the Limestone Coast region;
- (b) acknowledges the volunteers who run programs that are provided at The Junction; and

- (c) calls on the state government to provide funding to The Junction to enable them to expand the services currently provided by them to include a wider cross-section of the community.

Mental health and wellbeing is an issue affecting every single South Australian. The South Australian Mental Health Strategic Plan states that 45 per cent of South Australians will experience a diagnosable mental illness at some time in their life and that the remaining 55 per cent are likely to, in some way, have to care for or be impacted by those who do.

We all know people in our lives affected by mental illness, whether it be a family member or a fellow employee, whether it be short-term or an ongoing condition. To those in treatment and recovery mode, support services are absolutely critical to getting back on your feet. Today, I want to highlight the good work of a volunteer-run organisation that is filling a significant gap in the Limestone Coast region's services. This organisation is The Junction, which has centres in Mount Gambier and Millicent.

The idea for The Junction began back in 2008 through a group of mental health organisations and individuals who recognised a need in the community for those people past the acute stage of their mental illness but who still needed assistance and support. The Junction was designed to fulfil this need, becoming an activity and learning centre and providing ongoing services and programs to these people. The word 'ongoing' is the key word here, as many services end after diagnosis or a defined period of time or treatment.

For some people, the ongoing effects of mental illness can affect their lives for years or even decades. The Junction provides that steady crutch, that ongoing support to get you back on your feet. Their activities are designed to give people the chance to work on social inclusion, coping skills and healthy relationships—all those little things that are key to getting people back to themselves. This includes cooking, healthy living, exercise, perinatal and positive psychology sessions.

They also run what they call the 'mental health first-aid kit' for local companies, educating people about the various conditions, teaching them how to recognise the warning signs and the right time to ask for help. During the last few years, more than 2,000 people have gone through this course. Everyone here would have heard the saying 'ripple effect', where one event, situation or person can have a flow-on effect to others around them. Each of these people takes these valuable skills back into the wider community, getting the message out to friends, family and their workplaces.

During the last 10 years, The Junction has had an overwhelmingly positive ripple effect on the Limestone Coast community. This year, The Junction is about to come to a major milestone: 10 years of operation, but maybe what they should be celebrating is 10 years of survival. The centre survives on a shoestring budget, consisting of grants, donations from local organisations and proceeds from charity events. The main driver behind The Junction's continued existence is Nel Jans, whom I have known for more than 10 years.

Nel is a strong-willed, very dedicated lady, who is incredibly passionate about mental health. In her homeland of the Netherlands, Nel was a mental health nurse, social worker and homeopath, so she brings a wealth of knowledge and skills to her role. When the centre began 10 years ago, Nel's position was funded by Country Health SA. At the time, there were six other Junction centres across regional South Australia. In 2012, the funding for the coordinated position was withdrawn and three of those centres were forced to close, but Nel made the decision to continue on as a volunteer because she did not want the centre to close or leave her clients without the support they needed.

Throughout the years, the highs and lows of The Junction have continued. In 2015, they lost the services of a qualified support worker and now depend on their base of 25 volunteers. Many of these volunteers have lived experience, which is also important when supporting others. You need someone to walk with you on your journey, to understand what living with a mental condition is actually like. Again, I will argue that a centre that is filling such an important gap in our region's mental health services should not have to depend on volunteer services alone.

As other local organisations have folded in recent years, such as the Anxiety Disorders Association South East, The Junction has tried to fill the gaps left. It also performs as an umbrella organisation for other mental health initiatives, including a new program called Lifeboat and the Limestone Coast Meditation Community group. Like many volunteer-run organisations, they need a succession plan, but they are hampered by the fact that there is no money to attract the right person

to the role. We are very lucky to have somebody dedicated like Nel Jans in Mount Gambier, but it is unfair and unreasonable to expect that this situation will continue indefinitely.

Nel admits that the funding situation is so stressful that it is beginning to impact on her own mental health. Who looks after those mental health workers when they need help? I mentioned the word 'ongoing' before and I will mention it again now. The Junction deserves ongoing state government assistance. Assistance of \$150,000 a year would allow The Junction to pay a coordinator, expand its services and opening hours and alleviate some of the pressure. Currently, The Junction is only able to open two days a week. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

SERVICE SA MODBURY

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

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:01): I bring up the 17th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr TEAGUE: I bring up the 18th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today year 11 students from St Aloysius College, who are being hosted by the Minister for Child Protection. Furthermore, I welcome students to parliament today from the South Australian College of English, who are also guests of the minister. I also welcome to parliament Ruby Saulwick, a year 10 student from Glenunga high school who, I am told, has recently returned from the United Nations Youth's Young Diplomats Tour in Europe. She is a guest of the Premier.

Question Time

KEOGH CASE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier read the report by the former solicitor-general and current Chief Justice, Chris Kourakis, regarding the murder of Anna-Jane Cheney?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:04): The report which has been referred to and which was tabled in the parliament yesterday, which was the advice as outlined by the Leader of the Opposition, was a document pursuant to the Full Court decision, which was subsequently released under the delegated responsibility of the chief executive.

As members know from previous advice to the parliament, the Chief Executive of the Attorney-General's Department had the conduct of this matter since the election of the new

government—for obvious reasons, but I am happy to recount them if necessary—and the whole question of the freedom of information application of Channel 7 had culminated in a decision on a question of law before the Full Court populated by three Victorian Supreme Court judges on 12 April. That was a decision that was made, and subsequently the chief executive determined to release the report.

The SPEAKER: Attorney, there is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is all very interesting, sir, but the question was whether the Premier read the report.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Debate.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I have given the Attorney probably about half a minute to provide some preamble. I do believe the question as I heard it was about whether the Premier had read the Keogh report. I will listen carefully to the answer. I have the point of order, thank you.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As a result of the Full Court determination, the chief executive advised me early last week, I think it was, that she had determined that it was appropriate, as a model citizen that the Crown should be, that a copy of the report should be delivered to Channel 7, which was the applicant under the freedom of information application, and that was done on Wednesday of last week. I was provided a copy that night. I spent a good part of ANZAC Day reading it. To the best of my knowledge, the only other copy that was provided on that day was to the current Chief Justice.

KEOGH CASE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Premier. Why haven't you read such a crucial report, considering you paid \$2.57 million of taxpayers' money to Henry Keogh?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:06): And this is a matter which has been the subject of other questions, except this: the document in question has been tabled in this parliament because it is a document that is now the subject of a Full Court order of the Supreme Court that no longer has legal professional privilege, waived as a result of the conduct of Mr Foley, and which the previous government had fought for years to keep secret. The Full Court determination changed—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —the parameters and, accordingly, that document has been made public. However, it ought to be remembered by members that the document itself is an historical document. It is a document which, whilst the—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —opposition fought hard to keep secret—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left and right!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier and the Leader of the Opposition are called to order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —upon coming into office, as the new government and the delegation of responsibility in relation to that matter to the chief executive, ultimately there was a determination of referral by SACAT to the Full Court of the Supreme Court—which may not immediately come to the mind of the Leader of the Opposition, but perhaps he needs to reflect on this—and that is that the case stated of questions of law were referred to the Supreme Court.

Not unreasonably, some time was taken by the court to make a determination that, in all of the circumstances, and in particular that the author of the said report is now the Chief Justice, arrangements were then made for the appointment of three Victorian Supreme Court judges. I was not instructing on that matter nor privy to those arrangements. They were a matter under the delegation for that purpose.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Questions of law have been determined.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Questions of law have been answered. That is a freedom of information application issue, and it needed to be resolved and it has been made public. The fact, though, as to its relevance in relation to the whole sad, tawdry Keogh saga, is one which is almost irrelevant, and the reason for that is this: there is a second Full Court decision on 19 December 2014 of—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —the Supreme Court, which heard all of the evidence, quashed the sentence—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —recommended that the matter be referred for consideration of further trial and, in fact, the DPP, whilst it issued those proceedings, withdrew them.

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I don't know all of the particulars surrounding that. We weren't in government. That whole mess was during the time—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —of the former government, so I can't answer for them as to what had been handed over.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question, leader.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: What I do know is that subsequent to that 2014 decision of the Full Court—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —applications were made. The former attorney-general sought legal advice and, to paraphrase the extensive answers I have answered on this matter, opinions

were sought and further information was obtained. It was negotiated by two senior Queen's Counsel on behalf of the government, a settlement was reached and the matter was resolved. I just remind members that the two Full Court decisions should not be confused. The one relating to the now historical document published today was a—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —decision in relation to whether a legal opinion—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —provided to the former government—

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

The SPEAKER: Minister for Education!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —should be made public, given the conduct of Mr Foley. They answered those questions, and they determined in answer to those questions that the legal professional privilege was waived, and the document has been produced.

KEOGH CASE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Why won't the Premier inform the house why he has not read the report from the now Chief Justice, Chris Kourakis?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:10): I think it has been made abundantly clear—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that the report has been made public by virtue of tabling it in the parliament, and I don't know whether the Leader of the Opposition—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is also warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —was listening to the last answer. I think what's important to understand, and I will just repeat this, is that the purpose and more importantly the relevance of this document for the purposes of determining any payment that was made to Mr Keogh is frankly irrelevant. It's an historical document, which eight years predated the Full Court determination to quash the sentence—

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

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and indeed 10 years predated the legal advice given to the previous government, and I think on that basis—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —11½ years predated the further legal advice given to this government in relation to those matters.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Leader of the Opposition was a member of the cabinet in that time. He probably has more information about this matter than I do.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier and the leader, please cease interjecting.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I make this point: I bring to the attention of the cabinet, and indeed the Premier, matters that are relevant to the issues in question. I personally had not read this document before ANZAC Day last week for obvious reasons: because it was advice to the previous government. I would have had to write to the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Premier!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to seek the permission of the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —for the disclosure of that document. He might want to check his own notes, but I don't recall ever a time the Leader of the Opposition—

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

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —ringing my office to say, 'Look, please advise the Attorney that I give permission for her to review a document which was provided to the legal advice of my government.'

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: He didn't do that ever.

BUS SERVICES ON DEMAND

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:13): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house on the state government's tender for an operator to offer demand-responsive bus services?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:13): I would like to acknowledge the member for Waite as an avid public transport user.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: He may have caught the train in this morning. He is certainly an avid advocate for public transport, especially train services in his electorate. I was excited last year that we were able to make sure that we provide those extra Belair train services.

It's fair to say that the public transport network as it exists today in South Australia does not provide the best level of service to South Australians. We have basically the lowest level of public transport usage in the nation at about 8 per cent of traffic movements.

We also have the worst level of integrated services at only 3 per cent of services in the nation. We have also seen, over the past three years to the middle of last year, a decline of about half a million users per annum of our public transport network—the equivalent of 10 Adelaide Ovals worth of passengers. What we have currently is a public transport network that is stuck in the last century. What we have seen is an inability to drive any sort of innovation in public transport and a former government that was obviously too scared or too lazy to get on and improve this network.

What we have announced this morning is new money into public transport: up to \$1 million on the table to provide a trial for a new type of service that is making good gains in other parts of the world. We are talking about recorded demand-responsive transport—it's much easier to explain as Uber for buses. Essentially, it's the idea that, instead of having a fixed-route service bayed to a fixed timetable, people can use an app to book live when they want to be picked up and then be dropped off where they need to go, in a way that helps to collect real-time data about the amount and frequency of service that's needed for the number of people who want to use that service.

It's something that, when I was over in Sydney last year, I was able to get along and have a look at, and it was getting huge success in the number of people willing to engage with the technology. It again showed me that this is something that could be brought here to South Australia. We are undertaking a trial because we want to understand how this can fit as part of our broader public transport network. Right now, as we are undertaking a tender into our bus services contract, this is the right time for us to undertake this trial.

We think, here in Adelaide especially, that this is an opportunity for people who are a bit further away from their closest train stop or bus stop or tram stop, or who don't have a high frequency of service in their area because there is low patronage. Here is an opportunity for us to provide a flexible service that will be able to get closer to people's doors and take them closer to where they need to go. I think very clearly here about people living with a disability or people who need modified access. The ability to get closer to their front door means that we can help get those people out of their houses and get them where they need to go.

We put this money on the table, and the trial will be awarded before the middle of this year. What I look forward to is being able to show South Australians that we can actually move forward and have new technology in our public transport network, that they have a government that isn't scared to trial new ideas, because we want to deliver a better, more customer-focused service. This is something that speaks very much to the policy document that we took to the election about improving the customer focus of our public transport network.

I look forward to this trial getting underway so that again we can show South Australians that there are new ways to deliver public transport. We can deliver a better service and we can shape our city in a way that makes it more mobile and more liveable for its citizens.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:17): My question is to the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney-General received any advice or opinion that contradicts the conclusions and findings of the Kourakis report that concluded that Henry Keogh was indeed guilty of murder, and any advice that recommended an ex gratia payment be made to Mr Keogh?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:17): We have canvassed this at some length, but I am happy to repeat the following: on coming into office, there was an application submitted by Mr Keogh, via his legal practitioners, to the previous government, seeking a payment in respect of compensation, if you will, for having spent nearly 20 years in gaol, which was subsequently a conviction that was quashed. The former attorney-general had sought and obtained legal advice from two senior counsel—Queen's Counsel—and had been provided a very extensive opinion in relation to that.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As it was a live matter, it was brought to my attention. Further advice was obtained from the relevant counsel, and they were instructed to negotiate, on behalf of the government, consideration of the application for funds. That matter culminated in the resolution, ultimately, via a recommendation to the Treasurer for SAicorp's payment. I think the rest is evident. In fact, a copy of that settlement—full and final settlement of any claims, both for legal claims and costs—was tabled in this parliament, I think within days of that resolution.

As has been previously outlined, that position was subsequent to obtaining advice, some 10 years or probably closer to 11 years subsequent to the historical document to which the minister is referring and which, as is now clear, had been overturned, if you can put it in that sense, in a

general way by the Full Court determination led by Justices Gray, Sulan and, I think, Blue—I will have to go back; I have a copy of it in my office—who had quashed the conviction in the Supreme Court on 19 December 2014.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:20): My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General have any contact before the 2018 state election with Dr Bob Moles and any member of the Keogh defence team or any representatives of Henry Keogh?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:20): I have met Mr Bob Moles. He was the author of a book in relation to pathology and certainly was running some kind of campaign in relation to Mr Manock, who was then the state's appointed pathologist. Dr Manock, whom I didn't ever meet personally, was someone who, of course, over a some 30-year career with various governments as the senior pathologist, came under some scrutiny in relation to his evidence, not just in the case that is the subject of this question but in relation to a number of other cases. Ultimately, they were matters that were presented to the Medical Board of South Australia. So, yes, I have met Mr Moles; I can't remember when, but certainly during the time. I think he published a book, from memory.

In relation to his other legal team, I think I have already advised the parliament that Mr Kevin Borick QC was an ardent advocate for law reform during the time I have been in the parliament to look at the question of changing the law and allowing appeals where there is fresh and compelling evidence. The previous government ultimately presented a bill to the parliament which did just that.

In fact, subsequent to that, applications have been made. I am not sure at this stage whether Mr Borick made the final application to the court culminating in the 19 December decision, but certainly he was the representative in relation to a number of other cases. Bartholomew comes to mind, but there were a number of other cases of historical convictions that were the subject of applications to both the High Court and also under the fresh and compelling evidence amendment.

In short, yes, I knew Mr Borick. He lives in my electorate, not far down the road from Don Farrell actually, on Waterfall Gully Road—interesting street. His wife was a legal practitioner during the time I was in practice, so, yes, I know him. Marie Shaw QC was the counsel who presented submissions in the final case. I think Mr Borick was largely involved with representations and, I think, one of a number of five petitions that went to the previous government for mercy to seek the Governor's excusing of the conviction

Marie Shaw QC was counsel, as I recall, in the case before the Full Court culminating in the decision led by Tom Gray on 14 December 2014. Yes, I certainly know them all, or have met them.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:23): My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General take any steps to seek to access former solicitor-general Chris Kourakis' legal opinion prepared in 2006 in regard to the third petition for mercy by Mr Keogh before she made the decision to make a \$2.57 million payment to an accused murderer?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:24): No, and the reason for this is that it was a legal advice to the former government. As the new Attorney-General—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —as I understand the advice I received from the Solicitor-General in one of the very first meetings I had with him, the documentation that related to the previous attorney-general, as a predecessor, was not available. There are circumstances in which you can apply to seek that it be made available, but I can say that there was in fact material before me from the new counsel, who had been appointed by the previous government to deal with the matter, and that was obviously primary in respect of the matter, particularly as it was postdated the decision of the Full Court.

Whilst the solicitor-general in 2006 had given his assessment through this opinion to the previous government, that, in my view, was a matter that was no longer particularly relevant. It was very important to the question of the freedom of information application as a document, so it didn't really matter what was in it. It was a legal opinion that was given to the previous government that was pertinent to the legal question referred to the Supreme Court on whether legal professional privilege was waived by the conduct of Mr Foley. Singularly to that document, that was relevant for that purpose, but in relation to the—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is now warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —matter as to the opinion itself, it was of historical interest but not significant to the determination.

FLINDERS LINK

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:26): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister provide an update to the house on the progress of the Flinders Link project?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:26): I thank the member for Davenport for his question. This is a project that he and I have been talking about for a long time because providing that link across Darlington—across South Road—into the Flinders campus is a great way to help encourage more patronage on the Tonsley line for the people in his constituency. As he points out, this is the first time the trains have come to the current Davenport.

This is a very important extension out to Flinders University, given what is going to happen out there and given this government's agenda to grow international student numbers here in South Australia. This is a 650-metre upgrade of track. Yes, it is costing \$125 million. It is going to provide a vital connection to the Flinders Medical Centre, Flinders Private, Flinders University and everybody else who doesn't want to cross South Road.

It is a train line that is going to be elevated into the air. It's going to have to go over the top of the Darlington Interchange. As part of it, it is also going to have a full shared access path, so that people can actually use it to cross South Road without having to go down to the surface. It also has a lift in it on the northern side of South Road, so that, again, people can cross the road using the overpass without having to cross some pretty heavy traffic.

We have seen a change in scope to this project. I think we were pretty clear about that when we talked about it on Monday, but I would like to offer the house, and certainly members opposite who were asking questions about the details of why this project has changed in scope, a full account. Essentially, this project changed because what we had before was a very basic design—a basic graphic—to work from, which has now been worked up into a full engineering scope. The decision was taken around upgrading the viaduct structure to a T-based superstructure because of the fact that this structure is going to have take a train that is turning and it's actually a very heavy bit of kit, so we need to make sure that the engineering is strong enough to take that weight and that load.

We also saw upgrades to retaining walls. We saw an upgrade to the lift to make sure that it is fully compliant and accessible and an upgrade to the shared use path. Whilst we were there, it was also identified that there were a number of sleepers on the existing Tonsley line grade that also need to be upgraded, so we are taking the opportunity, while we are undertaking this project, to swap out some of those sleepers.

When it's presented to me, it really does leave a minister and a government with a stark choice of whether or not we spend money to do the project properly in the first place and whether or not we listen to the engineering advice about what is safe. We have seen instances in the past, and the member for Unley has well enunciated what happens when you build a tram overpass on South Road and you get some of the engineering wrong: you see chunks of concrete fall off and potentially fall onto cars. We want to make sure when we undertake this project that we get it right the first time, that it is safe, that it can handle the load that it is going to take and that bits don't fall off it. That is exactly why we have undertaken the project in the way that we have.

This is going to have massive benefits in unlocking the Flinders University campus and connecting it to Adelaide. I really look forward to this being a key part of a broader strategy to see more international students at Flinders University living around campus, living on campus and giving those people a connection to Adelaide. I think this is a great project. It is going to deliver urban congestion busting in the southern suburbs, and I look forward to this project getting on and being completed in the near future.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:30): My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General accept the conclusion of Chief Justice Chris Kourakis SC that Keogh lied to several people about the full value of insurance that Keogh had taken out on Anna-Jane Cheney's life before she was murdered?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: standing order 97, and especially given the report of the Supreme Court on an array of comments from Mr Foley, I think quoting selectively from documents of this nature is very concerning, especially when he doesn't have the leave of the house.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. Given what is being traversed today, I am going to allow that question but I do have regard to what the minister is saying. I will allow the Attorney an opportunity to answer.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Could he repeat the question.

The SPEAKER: Could you please repeat the question, thank you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General accept the conclusion of Chief Justice Chris Kourakis that Keogh lied to several people about the full value of insurance that Keogh had taken out on Anna-Jane Cheney's life before she was murdered?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:31): I have no view on that and nor do I seek to do so. As I have said before, the question of Mr Keogh and his guilt or innocence is not a matter that I propose to proffer any contribution on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The matter—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is called to order

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that has been traversed in the Full Court that relates to his claim indeed relates to the quashing of the sentence. The matter that relates to the Full Court determination, which led to the tabling of that historical document, is a matter that relates to freedom of information law, and it's an important law. It's an important decision of the Supreme Court. Everyone in this room should appreciate the significance of that law in relation to the protection of privilege.

It details, in particular, legal professional privilege, but just in this chamber we of course need to be aware of the parliamentary privilege that we protect for the purposes of citizens. It is an important piece of law, and so the issue in relation to the material as to opinion is historical and is of interest to some but is of no import for my personal determination about whether it's right or wrong.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:33): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General aware of the former solicitor-general's advice that any

possibility that Ms Cheney's death was caused by natural causes is convincingly denied by the incriminating circumstances of Anna-Jane's death?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the member continues to characterise the legal advice in a way without seeking leave and without quoting the relevant passage in full. Either reason makes the question out of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I'm trying to hear the point of order. The point of order is that information is taken and it is being argued in a way. Is that what the point of order is—characterised—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Characterisation of a piece of legal advice without being quoted is being presented contrary to standing order 97 and without leave.

The SPEAKER: In putting any such question, a member may not offer argument or opinion—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It's on the edge. I'm going to allow that question. I do have the point of order, but I do accept that it's on the edge.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:34): As I have advised the house, I have read the document. I have noted the advice that was given to me of the intention of the chief executive to provide a copy of it to Channel 7 pursuant to freedom of information. Obviously, I have had to receive advice in respect of material in the document which may or may not be able to meet the standards as set in the FOI Act—for example, in relation to personal information about the victim, Ms Cheney, and whether that should be in some way excised. Those are the sorts of things that are in the report.

But the question of the import of the opinion by the then solicitor-general, as I say, has been succeeded by events which quashed the relevant sentence and on which I and, indeed, the previous government had advice.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:35): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General aware of the former solicitor-general's advice that there is no reason to doubt the guilt of Henry Keogh, notwithstanding the way in which Ms Cheney's autopsy was conducted and the differing opinions of a pathologist about the results of that autopsy?

The SPEAKER: Yes, that question does contain argument, so the member can rephrase it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General aware the former solicitor-general's advice stated that there is no reason to doubt the guilt of Henry Keogh?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:36): As I have indicated, I have read the report and made comment on it.

COUNTERTERRORISM

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. How is the Marshall government working to counter terrorism and extremism in South Australia?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:36): I thank the member for the very important question and know that the member for MacKillop, I hope like everyone in this place, is very keen to keep our entire community as safe as possible. In the wake of the terrible tragedies in Christchurch and Sri Lanka in recent weeks, it has highlighted the potential of terrorist ideology and extremism in our communities and the danger that is associated with that. We join with other nations around the world in condemning the actions that we have seen from extremists.

The Marshall government has been focused on counterterrorism policies since before the March 2018 election. We took a firm commitment to the people of South Australia over 12 months ago not only to focus on keeping South Australia safe in the immediate term but also to commit to safeguarding against the evolving threat of terrorism. Part of that commitment involved preventing radicalisation in our prisons.

We are investing in the safety and security of our prisons through our Better Prisons infrastructure projects, and the Department for Correctional Services is working hard on our election commitment to prevent radicalisation in prisons. We are delivering a better prison service. It is a commitment we made, it is something we are delivering and it is what the South Australian people voted for—better services from our government.

The Marshall government is continuing to progress the development of the government's counterterrorism action plan. SAPOL has undertaken a vulnerability assessment of public places and events. We provide a greater certainty for police in the use of lethal force, thanks to the Attorney-General's bill that was passed in June last year—the Terrorism (Police Powers) (Use of Force) Amendment Bill—and additional training for security guards, with SAPOL providing security briefing and awareness packages to the security industry through Project Griffin, an internationally recognised partnership between SAPOL, the private security industry and other relevant stakeholders, such as event managers at different venues.

This committee is focused on multi-agency collaboration and information sharing to ensure we have a consistent and coordinated response to any threats in our community. We are working closely with our federal counterparts to ensure that a best practice approach in line with national standards is achieved.

There are many different types of violent extremism, and the motivations of those engaged in violent extremist acts vary, including but not limited to political or religious ideology and/or economic, social and environmental causes. The Marshall government is committed to working with agencies and departments to ensure that they are able to prevent, detect and disrupt radicalisation to violence in all its forms.

The government was very pleased to see the Morrison Liberal government's commitment to additional funding to keep our communities safe in this year's federal budget, with the investment of \$52.8 million in the Safer Communities Fund, \$513 million over five years to the Australian Federal Police to enhance its counterterrorism activities and community policing services and \$58.6 million for the Australian Security Intelligence Organisation to enhance its operations.

Outpourings of support for the victims and the people of all ages, cultural backgrounds and political groups have touched all of us and have strengthened our resolve against the alleged offenders' abhorrent motives for such crimes that we have seen recently. The government, in cooperation with the experts, will continue to remain focused on countering any and all threats whenever and wherever they may arise.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:40): My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General agree with the former solicitor-general that there is no evidence that Ms Cheney suffered an anaphylactic reaction but was murdered by Henry Keogh?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:40): I have read the report and I have no comment to make in relation to that. It speaks for itself.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens and then the member for Florey.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am happy for the member for Florey to go first, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey.

BEEKEEPING INDUSTRY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture. Will the minister consider setting up an advisory committee consisting of beekeepers and farmers who rely

on their services to give him, and through him the government, proper and full advice on pollination? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: Currently, beekeepers who provide pollination services represent the production of about \$5 million of honey annually. The crops that require pollination services such as almonds, lucerne and others provide several billions of dollars extra to the South Australian economy. As I understand it, currently only the Apiarists' Association, which does not cover all beekeepers, advises the minister.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:42): I thank the member for Florey for a very good question. We know how important bees are to food production. I just need to clarify a couple of things there. Bees provide different levels of service for different jurisdictions.

Obviously, many of us enjoy the golden nectar of a bee, honey, and we have honey bees that produce honey. But we also now have a growing demand for the pollination services. As we have said, in horticulture by and large some of the open-field crops are now relying more heavily on pollination services. We know that with the increased planting of almond farms and nut crops they are now looking for more pollination services.

It has become critical that the apiarist organisations and PIRSA work much more closely together. We know that some apiarists are looking for further direction and support. That is why my department is working with the Department for Environment, looking at ways we can support a bee industry and a growing bee industry.

I think it is also important to understand that when apiarists provide a service for pollination services, they are not making honey. They are using honey. So we are looking at ways that we can investigate the use of honey bees. They are bees that are very aggressive. They are bees that tend to dominate hives. They come in and bully other bees, the working bees and drones, to an extent that they become stressed, stop production, stop making honey, but they also stop the pollination services. At the moment, I know that the apiary services here in South Australia are working very closely with the primary industries department, and they will continue to do so.

BEEKEEPING INDUSTRY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:44): A supplementary question: was that a yes or a no?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:44): As I have said, the apiary industry is working very closely with PIRSA Primary Industries which have been a great conduit to the industry for many years.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Are you answering the question?

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is warned.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: To the member for Florey, there is a capacity for PIRSA to look at a potential advisory group on how we can further support the apiary industry.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:44): My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General agree with former solicitor-general Chris Kourakis in his conclusions that the defence theory promoted by Dr Moles that Anna-Jane Cheney died of an allergic reaction to Naprosyn found at the home at the time of death was without any basis and that forensic tests found no traces of the drug in Anna-Jane's body?

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

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order, I believe. It is about introducing facts. If the member for West Torrens had asked whether the Attorney had agreed with the conclusion, that might be okay, but he then continued to elaborate on that extensively, which does arguably breach standing order 97: that a member may not offer any facts except by leave of the house. I have allowed the member some scope here. I ask him either to amend the question or I will switch to the other side and come back to him. This would, of course, go away if leave was allowed.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Indeed, sir. My question is to the Attorney-General. Does the Attorney-General agree with the former solicitor-general's advice that a proposition promoted by Henry Keogh that he must be acquitted if Anna-Jane Cheney did not drown, as described by Manock, was silly?

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: In continuing to characterise what the advice is without quoting, the member is in breach of the standing order continually.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order, and I ask members to consider whether they might consider allowing leave if it was in fact asked for in the future. I will switch to my right and come back to the member. The member for Narungga.

ELECTRICITY INTERCONNECTOR

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the importance of the South Australian-New South Wales interconnector in developing new renewable energy zones?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46): Thank you to the member for Narungga, whose electorate is certainly connected to this question. I appreciate his interest in it. Renewable energy zones are very important in South Australia. In fact, the Marshall Liberal team went to the last state election with the commitment to develop renewable energy zones in South Australia, and we are delivering on that. Of course, renewable energy zones, which are a way of generating more renewable energy and reducing emissions, need to be connected to customers.

The only way you can continue to develop renewable energy zones in our state is if you have the very important infrastructure necessary to transport to customers the energy that you generate, typically in regional and remote areas, typically in metropolitan or more heavily built-up areas in regional centres. So the interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales is absolutely vital for us to be able to continue to develop renewable energy zones in South Australia. Of course, the South Australia-New South Wales interconnector would be absolutely vital for anybody else who wanted to develop renewable energy zones in South Australia.

We have interestingly heard this morning the federal Leader of the Opposition say that he wants to develop a renewable energy zone in Spencer Gulf. Clearly, he must be a strong supporter of the New South Wales-South Australia interconnector because, without that, he couldn't actually do it. This was how the former state Labor government was until the former state Liberal opposition, now state Liberal government, took this policy to the last election, at which point the state Labor Party flipped on their position. We don't know whether the federal Labor Party is going to flip on their position, but what is very interesting about today's announcement—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —by the federal Leader of the Opposition, saying that he wants to develop a renewable energy zone in Spencer Gulf, is that we actually already have one. We are already well on the way to developing it. We have 11 renewable energy projects on the books—

Mr Patterson interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —in Upper Spencer Gulf alone.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Fair enough, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles and the member for Waite are called to order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Perhaps the federal Leader of the Opposition isn't all over South Australia's policies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: He doesn't really seem to care much about South Australia. But, Mr Speaker—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is called to order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —interestingly, the Australian Energy Market Operator's integrated system plan was published in July last year, and there is actually a renewable enterprise zone planned for the Mid North of South Australia, another one for Yorke Peninsula, covering the electorate of Narungga, another one for Eastern Eyre Peninsula, another one for northern South Australia, another one for Roxby Downs and another one for Leigh Creek.

Those six planned renewable energy zones actually all surround what is commonly known as the Spencer Gulf and Outback region. So, while I welcome the federal Leader of the Opposition jumping on board with our policies, I look forward to the South Australian opposition doing exactly the same. While I welcome that, I have to say that there is nothing new in the announcement that Mr Shorten made today.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is warned. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

KEOGH CASE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): Thanks, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. What justification is there now for the payment to Mr Keogh, considering the findings and conclusions of the Kourakis report?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:51): Exactly the same justification for the decision that was made and identified last year.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned. The member for West Torrens.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:51): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Attorney-General. Did the Attorney-General contact the Cheney family before the Attorney-General decided to table the Kourakis report in the parliament making public the now Chief Justice's view that their daughter was murdered?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:51): Yes. A letter was sent by me on Monday morning, it must have been. Once the decision was made after advice was given on whether any portion of the document needed to be redacted, I made it clear and conveyed a letter to solicitors for the Cheney family, who had contacted us after we had made contact with the Cheney family in relation to the settlement arrangements, that it was appropriate that they be advised as a matter of courtesy that the decision had been made, that a copy of the document that had otherwise been kept secret by the previous government would be tabled in the parliament, and, from memory, that it would be made clear that it would be made in full.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:52): Were the family aware that you were tabling the document before you tabled it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:52): I can't answer that other than—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, can I be clear. On the last occasion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Let's be clear about this. On the last occasion in relation to the settlement, direct contact was made via the DPP's Witness Assistance Service to advise the family. Objection was taken by the representative of the Cheney family that direct contact had been made and that it should have been made via his office. I thought that in those circumstances it was reasonable that on this occasion—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In fact, a letter was sent directly to his office to advise as to what was going to happen, particularly in light of the sensitivity of the matter. As a result of the direct request and confirmation that this particular lawyer was still representing the Cheney family and expected that he should be contacted in relation to matters, we accorded to those wishes.

MYPONGA RESERVOIR

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on the successful opening of the Myponga Reservoir to the public in April and the positive impact this and future reservoir openings will have on their local communities and economies?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:54): What a great opportunity to update this house on another one of the Marshall Liberal government's election policies being well and truly on the way to being fulfilled, that is, the opening of a number of reservoirs for recreational opportunities across our state.

In mid-April we began that process with the official opening of the reserve lands which surround Myponga Reservoir on the beautiful Fleurieu Peninsula. It was great to be joined by the Deputy Premier, the member for Finniss and the member for Heysen at that official opening and also Georgina Downer, the candidate for the federal seat of Mayo, who came along and enjoyed that event.

The opening of these reservoirs is part of an opportunity to really stimulate regional communities where these reservoirs are found in regional South Australia. We are seeing that happening in Myponga. As well as 2½ thousand people visiting Myponga Reservoir on the day that it opened, we have had, on average, 200 people each day visiting the reservoir since it opened. We have a population in the township of Myponga of only about 400 people, so we are seeing a 50 per cent increase day on day of people visiting the shops in that community and the local businesses.

It was really interesting to hear from the Smiling Samoyed Brewery, which sits just on the shores of the reservoir. They have seen their best month on record with the opening of that reservoir, the best business they have achieved since they opened several years ago. That's exactly what we wanted to achieve with this policy—opening up the gates, removing the fences, giving people the opportunity to explore somewhere they haven't been able to explore before, getting out into the great outdoors, enjoying the natural environment, connecting with nature and learning about nature. It is about young and old and everyone in between being able to visit a place they weren't able to before.

When people travel out into these communities they will spend money, and that is exactly what we are seeing. We are seeing it in the local businesses around the Myponga township, and we will see it across the state. We will see it in the Southern Flinders Ranges when we work to open up those reservoirs. We will see it in the Para area with the Little Para Reservoir and the South Para Reservoir. We have already stocked the South Para Reservoir with 180,000 fingerlings because that's going to be a destination reservoir for fishing in the future.

We are really excited about the prospects of this policy, and we know that this will bring communities to life and it will create economic activity in regional South Australia. There are metropolitan reservoirs that we are planning to open for recreational opportunities in the future as well. That includes the Hope Valley Reservoir in the north-east of our capital city and it includes the Happy Valley Reservoir in the south-west of the city. Again, there are more opportunities to get people into nature. It's really interesting to see how many people are keen to go somewhere that they haven't been able to get to before, and to partner with various organisations—Trees For Life, Nature Play SA—to bring people into the environment to enjoy those experiences.

It was a very exciting date for Myponga in April, but a less exciting day for the South Australian Labor Party fundamentally opposed to this policy. They have continually put barriers in the way but it was great to get an endorsement from Saskia Gerhardy, the Labor candidate for Mayo, who told us on her Facebook that she congratulated the organisers on this great work. The Marshall Liberal government thanks her for the endorsement because we were the organisers.

LABOUR HIRE PRACTICES

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (14:58): My question is to the Attorney-General. Given the Attorney-General's answer yesterday to a question regarding commonwealth labour hire laws, does she stand by her previous statement that labour hire laws were draconian and would open up the industry to union bullying and unnecessary over-regulation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:58): Notwithstanding that the matter is in relation to the quotes that relate to the bill before the parliament, which I won't traverse for obvious reasons, and I appreciate it's a new member in the parliament on this matter—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —I'm happy to say this: I just ask him to check that the matters—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question. I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that have been raised by the member. I do stand by them. They do relate to the state legislation, and I certainly stand by them.

LABOUR HIRE PRACTICES

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (14:59): My question is to the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General aware that Commissioner Dini Soulio says that he will start enforcing South Australia's labour hire laws from 1 June 2019, and will the Attorney-General now commit to not blocking the commissioner from enforcing these laws?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:59): Let's be very clear about this. I have read the evidence of Mr Soulio. Mr Soulio has made it very clear in his evidence to the committee and this parliament that he hasn't been directed by me, or even asked by me, not to progress the matter, so to repeat that assertion is quite wrong.

His evidence is very clear: he is an independent commissioner, and he explained to the committee why he decided that he would not progress that and, in particular, relates to matters such as, in the event of there being any repeal of that legislation, the expense and unnecessary training it might have put to persons who may have felt that they were liable to obligations under that legislation. He explained all that to the committee.

He confirmed that he had no request or direction from me or, as best I understand it, anyone else in government. He is an independent person in that regard. Yes, he did give evidence that, in the event that there is no repeal of the legislation, he would continue to look at the progress of that matter. But the legislation is yet to be debated in the other place for the purposes of dealing with the matter, so I would invite the member to be aware of the importance of not reflecting on matters that are before the house in relation to legislation. In relation to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —the statements, as previously indicated, I fully stand by them. In relation to Mr Soulio's action as an independent commissioner, I have noted them and fully respect them.

KEOGH CASE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:01): Will the Attorney-General now table in the parliament all legal opinions relating to the Keogh case?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:01): Perhaps the member hasn't availed himself of the opportunity to read the decision of the Full Court of the Supreme Court.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: I did. He should be charged with murder, but you paid him \$2.5 million.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens! The member for West Torrens can leave for 15 minutes under 137A.

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member has interjected to the extent of asserting that the Full Court—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right, or you will be following.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, be quiet!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —of the Supreme Court in some way made some determination in relation to a murder case. That's completely erroneous and is a very distasteful reflection on the Full Court. If the member had read the Full Court decision, which is a public document and he is able to read the same, he would know that the question of law before them was whether the legal opinion given by the then solicitor-general to the government was a document that was within the confines

of legal professional privilege, whether it should be produced pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act consistent with what the Ombudsman had already determined and, furthermore, how the conduct of Mr Foley in particular, as the acting attorney-general, in the issuing of a press release about this matter might affect it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Quite clearly, in respect of that document, in respect of that application by Channel 7 for the freedom of information application production of it, the answer was clearly that, yes, the legal professional privilege was interfered with and that indeed the Ombudsman's position would then stand. There were two choices for the chief executive, who has been delegated this matter for the last three years; one was to relist the matter before SACAT, advise them formally of the decision of the Full Court and then allow that position to be answered in direct consequence of the Ombudsman's decision standing.

The second alternative was that she acknowledge, as a model litigant on behalf of the Crown, that the Full Court decision had been made, not as an appeal but as a question of law stated to them. They made a decision. In the absence of there being any decision to appeal against that, she made the decision that it was appropriate to release the document to Channel 7. That was done last Wednesday as the applicant.

It only relates to that document. It only relates to that legal opinion. It only relates to facts surrounding the conduct of Mr Foley in relation to that document. I don't know how many others he might have mucked up but, anyway, that's the only one we know of. That was the only one subject to the FOI application 'questions of law determined by the Full Court' and so the answer is no.

Grievance Debate

FEDERAL ELECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:05): I rise to speak about the appalling record of the Liberal Party in relation to workers, a record that exemplifies their utter disregard for working people, their complete lack of understanding about what people engaged in low paid, insecure work, and indeed any work, go through to make ends meet, their long-term committed relationship with the top end of town and their inability and deep reluctance to do what it takes to achieve fairness and equality.

It is a record, and approach, that is so very well supported by every one of those opposite, many of whom seem bizarrely obsessed with disparaging unions and any collective voice that speaks up for dignity and equality for people at work. I am sure that it is an obsession born out of the fact that they know that it is the labour movement that often stands up for people being able to live a decent life in the face of the interests of their beloved big end of town. It is a record and approach at the very core of their federal party and a record and approach of which Nicolle Flint, the member for Boothby, is an exemplar.

At this federal election, Australians have a choice: a choice between Labor, whose record on working with and for working people to ensure they are treated with dignity and respect, is strong, sound, at the centre of their history, their present and everything they will deliver for Australians into the future, and the LNP, who have highlighted over and over that they just do not get what working people getting a fair go looks like, let alone what needs to be done to make sure that they do.

Today, I examine a few of their highlights, or lowlights as the case most clearly is. In 1972, Australian women, through their unions, fought for and won equal pay, enshrining the principle that women and men undertaking the same work be paid the same, a huge step forward for equality. But since then pay inequality has continued, as industries predominantly engaged in by women continue to attract lesser pay than those industries traditionally engaged in by men.

Ninety seven per cent of early childhood educators are women, and for too long the outstanding role these workers play at the heart of our community, supporting and developing our youngest Australians, has been undervalued, misunderstood and underpaid. As part of their ongoing campaign, they are seeking support from federal candidates and asking them to sign a pledge to support their work being valued as it should be.

These workers met with the member for Boothby and asked her to sign that pledge, which simply reads, 'I stand with early educators' professional pay now.' Unsurprisingly, she refused. I say 'unsurprisingly' because this is the person who, whilst Labor were listening to these workers, signing the pledge, committing to close the gender pay gap and increase their pay by 20 per cent, was instead signing petitions to get her ultra-conservative mate Peter Dutton a new job. This is the same member for Boothby who voted not once, twice or even three times to cut penalty rates, but eight times—eight—and 20 times against the banking royal commission.

If you care about working people, about people doing it tough, and if you care about those who deeply rely on penalty rates to pay the rent and about those who deserve compensation for working on Sundays away from family and friends, you support them earning a decent wage. The party of those opposite could have intervened and supported the restoration of penalty rates. They could have thought about those who cook and serve them food and drinks, who work for global corporations selling all sorts of things at Westfield Marion and elsewhere.

The member for Boothby could have considered those people and the impact this cut will have on their lives, but she did not. Nor did she think about the dangerous precedent this slashing of penalty rates sets for those who rely on them, working around the clock in DV services, in hospitals and in emergency services—she did not.

The member for Boothby, those opposite and their mates in Canberra did not think about those working women who deal with the terrible impact of domestic violence, who desperately need paid leave to ensure they can keep their job and have both the finances and time they need to move house, for court appointments and to seek support from services. In the meantime, Australian Labor has clearly committed to 10 paid days' leave for people experiencing domestic violence.

Australian women did not expect better from a party with so few women amongst its ranks and with no plan to change this, but they are disappointed because, whilst they did not expect better, they know they deserve so much better than this.

Parliamentary Procedure

QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:10): I rise in relation to a breach of sessional order No. 3. I raised a number of questions that I put on notice to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Minister for Energy, namely, questions 691, 692, 694, 695, 696, 706, 708, 709 and 710, all of which were asked on 21 March. Sessional order No. 3, as you are aware, requires an answer within 30 days and that has not been provided, so I ask you to rule on the breach of the sessional order.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Kaurna. I will conduct my own investigations. If you could provide me with a copy of that list of alleged outstanding answers, I will endeavour to look into the matter.

Grievance Debate

KENILWORTH FOOTBALL CLUB

Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:11): I rise today to heartily congratulate the Kenilworth Football Club on the development of their clubrooms, which were officially opened on the Saturday just passed. Kenilworth Football Club has a rich history dating back to 1907.

Mr Malinauskas: Go the Kookas!

Mrs POWER: Go the Kookas, indeed. The club is named after characters in Sir Walter Scott's novel *Kenilworth*. It is the second oldest club—only Adelaide University is older—playing in the SAAFL today. The early Kenilworth Football Club played out of the southern Parklands of Adelaide and enjoyed a great deal of success, winning the 1911 premiership in the Uniting Church Association before joining the SAAFL for the 1924 season.

Over the decades, the football club moved up and down grades and achieved various levels of success. One thing that is clear is that, since its early beginnings, it now stands as a club with an incredible sense of team spirit and a strong sense of community built on values of respect, being

family friendly and inclusive and giving back to the community. This is obvious to anyone who spends some time at the club and with the players.

Today, I would like to especially congratulate the president, Ric Bowyer, John Schulz, secretary Megan Neindorf and other committee members and volunteers on their work in securing funding for the development of new clubrooms and seeing the project through to development. A very special acknowledgment should be given to John Schulz, who was a driving force behind this and spent countless hours completing grant applications.

When I first met with Ric and John at the club, they may have been uncertain where the funding would come from, but they were unwavering in their determination and commitment that their vision would become a reality. Fortunately, the member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, was quick to get behind the club and lead the way by securing federal funding. This provided a springboard that enabled the club to then seek funding from the state government, local government and the AFL. I am proud that the state government has contributed over \$400,000 towards the project.

As mentioned, the results of their vision and hard work saw the clubrooms officially opened on Saturday 27 April. It was fantastic to be there and celebrate this incredible milestone for the club. The new clubrooms include a bar, additional office and storage space, and a community meeting space and function room that lead out onto a deck overlooking their home grounds. The high-quality playing field on Laura Avenue in St Marys is surrounded by beautiful gum trees. The setting is so picturesque that you would have no idea you were in the suburbs only 20 or 30 minutes from the city.

The lunch on Saturday was made possible by all the hardworking volunteers and players who served guests, who even included police commissioner Grant Stevens. The 2019 season ahead will no doubt be an exciting season for the club. They have a strong women's league at the club, including under 16s, under 18s and a seniors team. Last year, the women's team made it all the way to the grand final. This season may be the season they win the premiership flag. The men's teams are certainly in with a chance after grades A, B and C all won their matches by a significant margin on Saturday.

The new clubrooms are also home to the Gaelic football team, and today I acknowledge their committee members, players and supporters. Since 2001, they have called the grounds in St Marys their home ground, giving cause for the creation in 2006 of the St Marys Park Sports Association, which was formed between the Kenilworth Football Club and the Gaelic Football and Hurling Association of South Australia to ensure that Gaelic football continued at the oval. Currently, close to 200 games of Gaelic football are played at the grounds during the summer over four nights per week.

There are currently eight clubs plus a league of social clubs for Gaelic 7s. As the state member for Elder, it is fantastic to have clubs like the Kenilworth Football Club, affectionately known as the Kookas, and Gaelic football and hurling association clubs in our community.

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

A quorum having been formed:

Mrs POWER: Grassroots sporting clubs are about more than just sport; they help form the fabric of our community, building key skills in young people, even potentially building key skills in future leaders such as those across the floor. Grassroots sport is also about bringing people together, whether as a player, volunteer, committee member, spectator or fan. Today, I say a very big congratulations and well done to those two clubs in particular and, of course, more broadly, to all our local sporting clubs.

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS' DAY

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (15:17): I rise to mark and recognise today, 1 May, as a day of great importance for working people across our state and throughout the globe. Mr Speaker, happy May Day, and special thanks to staff here in parliament. To those who help us as elected leaders discharge our duty, your work is invaluable and your service to the community of South Australia is greatly appreciated.

This International Workers' Day, we recognise the gains of working men and women, their sacrifice, their toil and their collective solidarity in achieving the type of working conditions that we and many others take for granted today, from the eight-hour day, sick leave, overtime pay and superannuation to more contemporary achievements like paid maternity leave and family and domestic violence leave, fought for and won by working people, and let's not forget one of the greatest achievements of the broad labour movement: Medicare.

These things were not gifted to working people: they were fought for by working people, their trade unions and the labour movement. Today, in recognising the achievements of working people I also reflect on the challenges ahead, the work to be done for this pursuit of decency, dignity and fairness for working people, and the stark differences that currently present. We must ensure that working people are front and centre as partners and simply not passengers in a rapidly changing working and economic landscape.

They should be able to count on fair and decent work or a job that is safe and secure, and not be forced into sham contracts or the purgatory of unending casual work. They should be able to count on fair pay rises, especially at a time when the share of profit is skewed so sharply towards big business. They should be able to count on their employer simply abiding by the law and not promulgating business practices and models that steal the wages from working men and women.

Working people deserve better. They deserve a fair go. The stark reality is that we can have a CEO in this country earning 436 times the wage of a worker cleaning the desks and cleaning the toilets in the same building. We are in the midst of a wages crisis. What is the Coalition government doing about this country's wages crisis? What is the government doing about the fact that 80 per cent of workers have not had a real wage rise in the last 12 months, or the fact that the minimum wage, once considered to be a living wage in this country, is now so desperately inadequate that it barely accounts for any quality of living at all?

What kind of political leadership do we have when Dan Tehan, a senior member of the federal Coalition government cabinet, thinks it is communism to lower the costs of child care for working families? If the stakes were not so high, it would be laughable. So consumed by their own sense of justice for high-income earners and big business, the Morrison Coalition government will now disregard the care and education of our young in this desperate pursuit.

What about cuts to penalty rates? What about the promised rivers of jobs and better pay—if working people would just suck it up, cop cuts to their pay and fair compensation for weekends and public holidays? Just four days ago, the head of the Council of Small Business of Australia said, and I quote: 'There's no extra jobs on a Sunday. There's been no extra hours. It's been just a waste of time.'

The radical agenda of cuts, pursued with great zeal by many members of the federal Coalition government, not least of whom is the member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint, who in between carrying the flame and spear for the failed prime ministerial bid by Peter Dutton, voted to slash penalty rates on eight separate occasions. She called these penalty rates 'outrageous wage increases'. It was the greatest of con jobs, tried on by an individual who has never stood up for working families—not once.

As we acknowledge this day of achievement by working people, we recognise the great crossroads at which we find ourselves. The struggle does not stop while progress is still to be made. On 18 May, change the rules for working people: vote for Nadia Clancy in Boothby and kick out the Morrison government, a government that has so desperately abandoned working families.

FLINDERS UNIVERSITY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:22): Flinders University has had a proud 50-year history and has long been regarded as a dynamic and democratic university, guided by principles of social justice and collegial governance. The very mission of a university is to uphold the public interest and free and open inquiry and commentary. The public interest is served by staff and students having an absolute, full right to intellectual freedom to contribute to university governance and to speak truth to power for the public interest. Evidence is beginning to show that intellectual freedom has been curtailed, and changes see staff and students no longer active participants in university governance.

The sad saga of the demise of Women's Studies in this quasiquicentenary year of dual suffrage in South Australia seems to indicate something has indeed changed at Flinders. A restructure process took place late last year and continues this year, with more to come. I have been told many excellent scholars and teachers were pushed into voluntary redundancies where they felt they had little or no real choice. The alternative was to lose money through involuntary redundancy or to be pushed into teaching-only roles.

Effectively, the restructure was both a physical and psychological restructure. It displaced people into new positions—not usually the ones they wanted—or out of the university altogether. The psychological restructure seems to have been more about embedding top-down leadership that places power in senior management, deliberately eroding collegiality and collective governance. In December 2018, the Flinders branch committee of the National Tertiary Education Union moved and passed the following motion, which was supported by over 600 staff, students and alumni. This is the quote:

Flinders University is a public university entrusted to deliver excellence in research and teaching for the public good. Staff, students, alumni, and concerned community members move a motion of NO CONFIDENCE in the Vice-Chancellor and Chancellor to deliver ethical governance, empowering leadership, or due diligence on the academic restructure for the public good. The damage to campus culture and morale could become irreparable unless immediate steps are taken to return to a collegial model of governance. The ill-conceived academic restructure risks the quality of research, teaching, and community engagement and exposes Flinders to massive reputational damage. Management's gross incompetence to date gives us no confidence in its capacity to effect change that is sustainable, consultative, evidence-based, or in the long term interests of the university or the broader community.

What happened in Women's Studies after that? I am told two well-regarded level D academics (associate professors) had to compete for the one position left at that level while a third staff member's position at level C simply disappeared.

The final version of the restructure document offered a small improvement to the Women's Studies situation, with one level D and one level B (both balanced positions) and as such this meant the discipline would continue with research status. In academic jargon, a 'balanced position' means research plus teaching, which used to be the standard job description for any academic position. Now these positions will be rare and many staff will be either research-only or teaching-only. This is considered by many to be a terribly backward step.

Inaugurated as an independent discipline in 1987, Women's Studies at Flinders has always punched above its weight in terms of scholarship, national competitive research funding and innovative teaching. For most of its 30-year history, this has been delivered through 2.5 full-time equivalent academic staff. Women's Studies has attracted significant numbers of overseas postgraduates to both coursework and RHD enrolment, bringing concomitant funding to the university. It has modelled and initiated many interdisciplinary and collaborative research and teaching projects, both locally and nationally.

Women's Studies at Flinders occupies a special position among Australian universities as the inheritor of the first student-led interdisciplinary Women's Studies course (in 1973) and the first university to appoint dedicated Women's Studies staff. Professor Lyndall Ryan was appointed as a reader in 1986 and Dr Susan Sheridan was appointed as a lecturer in 1987. Among their many credits, Professor Ryan initiated the formation of the National Women's and Gender Studies Association and Emeritus Professor Sheridan was founding co-editor of the A-ranking journal *Australian Feminist Studies*.

While it would be a great pity if this notable history at Flinders were to be lost in the proposed restructuring, even more distressing is the prospect of the present program's disappearance. I have seen numerous cases where women's studies and gender studies at university or TAFE have changed lives. With the proposed positions—one level D teaching and research, and one level B teaching-only—the required resignation of two of the three current research-active members of staff has meant the loss to the university of their outstanding contributions.

It is hard to see how such changes under the guise of restructure could enhance Flinders' national and international standing. It scarcely needs pointing out that interdisciplinary research as well as teaching on gender equality are urgently needed in today's world. Has the social and cultural capital of the university—the health, wellbeing and wisdom of its staff and students—been sacrificed

for the dictates of corporatisation? Time will tell in the climate where job security has been eroded and it becomes difficult for most staff to speak out or speak back. Fear replaces voice and the critical and questioning spirit of the university is diminished.

REGIONAL NEWSPAPERS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:27): If we want regional newspapers to survive, we need our regional members of parliament to support their regional papers. It was only a few months ago that I was here speaking about the importance of regional media, and today I am here to draw attention to another issue potentially facing South Australia's regional newspapers.

Currently, it is a requirement that councils and the state government advertise in newspapers in the local area matters of public relevance—for example, where there is public consultation required, bushfire notices, public assemblies, road closures or development applications. This is to notify the public, describe the matter under consideration and invite anybody with interest to make a submission to have their say.

There is the potential that this could change. If it changes, it is likely to change where it would be advertised on a website only, determined by the minister, or to give agencies the option to now bypass publishing in local newspapers. Some people would consider that any amendment to those acts would be a good thing. Whilst I support the modernising of notices, job applications and requirements by local councils and state governments, there is a real danger that this change could potentially affect our regional papers.

On the Limestone Coast, The Border Watch Newsgroup produces seven papers that cover six regional councils, including Mount Gambier, the District Council of Grant, Wattle Range, Robe, Kingston, Naracoorte and Lucindale. The news group currently employs around 45 staff across its Mount Gambier and Millicent sites. On any given day, there can be up to five or six public notices published under these mastheads from various councils and state government. An audience of around 62,000 people reads these papers each week, both in print and online.

Any changes to the current situation could result in advertising being withdrawn or severely restricted because the state government is satisfied that it has advertised online. It would have a devastating and irreversible effect on country papers. For The Border Watch and its papers in the Mount Gambier region, it would lead to the loss of at least 2.5 full-time equivalent jobs. In short, this government will be taking jobs away from regional areas, and that is something that I want to draw to the attention of particularly regional members.

If the state government and councils are able to skip advertising in newspapers and only post on websites or social media platforms, I would argue that this would be a major loss of transparency and connection with ratepayers and community members. Facebook is a platform highly prone to misinformation and a lot of fake news. If we look at the combined Facebook audience of the two Limestone Coast major councils, we are talking about a total of 3,180 people. There are 35,000 people in my two councils combined.

This would be a major shortfall in the reach and ability of the state government to connect with regional communities. I cannot understand why the state government is heading down this road. It is going to lead to job losses and a disconnection with regional communities, a disconnection of the communication with those communities. I have also spoken to Darren Robinson, who is President of Country Press SA. He represents 14 independent newspapers that will all be severely impacted by any change, leading to lost coverage on days or complete closures of their papers. He said:

I strongly [oppose] the decision to remove the requirement to advertise in newspapers as this does not align with the views of our member newspapers.

I could go on. I want to warn regional members that any changes to this advertising requirement will have a serious and severe impact on regional papers.

NEWLAND ELECTORATE

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:32): I rise today to speak about the enormous tourism potential that exists within my electorate, particularly in the fantastic local businesses in the Adelaide Hills areas of Newland. In South Australia, we are so lucky to have so close to the CBD regions like the

Adelaide Hills, the Barossa Valley and McLaren Vale, all of which generate some of the highest quality produce in the world and make such a significant contribution to South Australian tourism.

As a proud South Australian, I have a great appreciation of the Barossa Valley, McLaren Vale and areas of the Adelaide Hills, such as Hahndorf. However, as the member for Newland, I have much more affection for and pride in the areas of the Adelaide Hills within my electorate, such as Inglewood, Kersbrook and Paracombe. These areas are perhaps lesser known than the others, but they are home to not only some of the best produce that South Australia has to offer but also some of the most genuine and hardworking people in the state.

Last week, I had the pleasure of holding a tourism round table with the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, the Hon. David Ridgway from the other place, and a number of local businesspeople from the Adelaide Hills areas of Newland. I was also very pleased that the member for Morialta was able to attend, particularly as I know that he is a fierce advocate for areas neighbouring Newland, such as Cudlee Creek, Gumeracha and Birdwood.

The purpose of the round table was to discuss how we can take advantage of the significant tourism potential of the area, which has not garnered as much attention as other areas across the state. In addition to having the opportunity to raise with the minister directly any questions or issues that local businesses had, it provided a forum for businesses to begin working together to improve outcomes for the whole area. It is also important to note that we were also quite pleased to have representatives from the South Australian Tourism Commission, as well as the Adelaide Hills Council and Adelaide Hills Tourism.

The ability of these businesses and organisations to work together is an important factor in the region being as successful as possible, and each business represented at the round table was incredibly enthusiastic about the possibilities that will result from working together because they know that increasing the number of visitors to the area as a whole means that there will be more customers for their business and, in turn, more jobs for locals.

These include businesses like the Inglewood Inn, Paracombe Wines, Paracombe Premium Perry, Kersbrook Hill Wines and Cider, the Topiary Cafe at Newman's Nursery and the Templewood Horse Riding Centre. Just across the border into Morialta, we also have the Applewood Distillery, the Gorge Wildlife Park, the National Motor Museum, the Cudlee Creek Cafe and the Cudlee Creek Tavern. This diverse range of wonderful businesses are all incredibly passionate about what they do and incredibly keen to work together to advance interest in the area.

It is also worth noting that something this government is doing that will certainly go a long way to increasing visitor traffic through the area is opening up the South Para Reservoir for recreational activities. I was quite excited to be at the reservoir with the Minister for Environment and Water, as well as the member for King, when we released 180,000 fingerlings there. We released golden perch, silver perch and Murray cod to provide enormous fishing opportunities down the track as well as a very exciting opportunity to support businesses and provide incentive for people to pass through the area.

As far as the round table is concerned, I would also like particularly to acknowledge the work of Peter and Milly Howell for advocating a much more coordinated approach to attracting visitors to the area. They have been doing this for quite some time now, and so it was quite fitting that this first round table was held at the stunning Inglewood Inn, which has outstanding views of the local area and so much incredible history.

I am very pleased that all those who attended approached the discussions with incredible enthusiasm; in fact, they have formed a working group that will meet at regular intervals over coming months and really help to take advantage of this initial opportunity and continue to advance interest in the area and put this region of the Adelaide Hills on the map. I would certainly be eager, if any members in this place were keen, to take them on a tour of this area. As the local member, I am certainly very proud of the area and look forward to seeing their plans come to fruition.

*Bills***STATUTES AMENDMENT (SCREENING) BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:39): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce a bill for an act to amend the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016, the Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Act 2017 and the Disability Inclusion Act 2018. The Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016 and the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 as previously passed by this parliament are important pieces of legislation to protect, support and include people with disability and children.

This bill introduces a number of amendments that are necessary to implement policy directions, including national agreements that have arisen since the introduction of both acts. The Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016, hereinafter referred to as the prohibited persons act, will commence on 1 July 2019. This act aims to minimise the risk to children, posed by people who work or volunteer with them, by providing a framework for the prohibition of persons who pose an unacceptable risk to children by working or volunteering with them.

Through the prohibited persons act, South Australia is releasing a new child-related worker screening scheme, which implements recommendations of both the South Australian Child Protection Systems Royal Commission, otherwise known as the Nyland royal commission, and the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse, that is, the commonwealth royal commission. The Disability Inclusion Act 2018, hereinafter referred to as the DI Act, aims to promote human rights and improve inclusion in the community for South Australians with disability.

The act sets the state government's future direction and role in supporting people with disability, focused on rights and inclusion, in line with the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities and the National Disability Strategy. In addition to the rights and inclusion focus, part 6 of this act provides the ability to establish a disability worker screening scheme through regulations.

In preparation for the commencement of the new scheme, the Statutes Amendment (Screening) Bill 2019 amends the prohibited persons act, the Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Act 2017, and the DI Act to implement the election commitment to abolish fees payable for persons who work with children or vulnerable people in the new screening laws, to meet nationally agreed obligations regarding working with children screening, to establish a scheme for NDIS worker screening, and to standardise and simplify screening.

Let me first address the government's commitment to supporting volunteers by implementing free screening checks. From 1 November 2018, volunteers no longer need to pay a fee for screening checks conducted by the screening unit of the Department of Human Services. This initiative has been welcomed by volunteering organisations and volunteers.

To strengthen this initiative under the new screening legislative regime, the amendment bill amends the prohibited persons act and the DI Act to differentiate between free screening for volunteers and paid screening for paid work with children or persons with a disability. This will mean that a person and organisation can only use a free volunteer screening for a volunteering role and not for paid employment. This will ensure the measure directly benefits the volunteering sector. It will also stop any potential misuse, that is, if someone signs up to be a volunteer just to get a free screening check.

This reform will ensure that the free volunteering checks directly benefit volunteers and the volunteer sector. The Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Michelle Lensink in the other place, amended the original bill in light of discussions she had with members of parliament and industry

representative bodies. As a result of these discussions, the bill now applies a volunteer to use their free volunteer screening for paid work with children or persons with a disability for up to seven days.

Regarding the national standards and national reference system for working with children checks, the bill adopts the national standards for working with children checks and will lead to consistency of WWCC processes and assessments across Australia. This is an important national commitment recommended in the commonwealth royal commission into institutional abuse. It also adopts nationally agreed consistent principles and processes for working with people with disability under the National Disability Insurance Scheme. All states and territories have worked together to achieve national consistency for both WWCC and NDIS worker checks.

The bill also enables the South Australian screening authority to share, exchange and access information provided through the national reference system, as also recommended by the royal commission into institutional abuse. The commonwealth, states and territories are also working together to implement the NRS, which will improve sharing of information—for example, if someone is not assessed as suitable for a WWCC in one jurisdiction but applies in another.

In respect of transitional provisions for the prohibited persons act, it is important that these are in place to support the commencement of the prohibited persons act on 1 July 2019. Many thousands of South Australians and many businesses and organisations will be affected by these important reforms. Many people who previously did not require a screening will now require one. Importantly, there will be new obligations on both individuals and organisations as there will be penalties for employing someone in worker or volunteer roles without an appropriate screening check, or for individuals who work with children without the clearance.

It is important that the community is fully informed about these changes and that there is also a transition to the new regime that gives people in organisations time to ensure that the right checks are in place. The bill supports the transition to the new WWCC under the prohibited persons act by recognising an assessment of relevant history: a national police check conducted by individual organisations as a WWCC and assessments of national police checks conducted for emergency services for a period of 12 months. This means that people with a current, valid national police check will have 12 months or until the check expires to get a new screening assessment. This prevents thousands of South Australians from being unwittingly in breach of the law from 1 July 2019 and allows for an orderly transition.

Regarding the NDIS worker screening scheme, the DI Act currently mirrors provisions of the prohibited persons act. It creates three categories of prohibited persons: those issued with a prohibition notice by the central assessment unit, those prohibited from working with children by another jurisdiction and those found guilty of a prescribed offence. Operational details are to be provided in the accompanying regulations. The commonwealth states and territories have also been working together to ensure nationally consistent and portable NDIS disability screening check for those who work or volunteer with people with disability.

The bill implements this new approach. In June 2018, South Australia signed the Intergovernmental Agreement on Nationally Consistent Worker Screening for the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS IGA). The amendment bill inserts into the DI Act a new part 5A—Screening of NDIS workers. Part 5A provides for the screening of persons providing supports or services under the NDIS. The NDIS worker check is Australia's first national worker screening scheme. Commonwealth, state and territory governments have worked collaboratively to agree on the key design policy and operational framework.

The provision of NDIS supports and services is regulated by the commonwealth National Disability Insurance Scheme Act 2013 and associated rules. The commonwealth determines the types of NDIS work that require a worker to hold a clearance. NDIS employers are responsible for identifying which roles within their organisations require a worker to hold a clearance. Compliance with these requirements is a commonwealth responsibility via the NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission.

Under the IGA, all states and territories must establish an appropriate legislative scheme. The bill therefore aims to prevent persons who pose a risk of harm from working with vulnerable people and ensure employers do not engage persons who pose a risk of harm to vulnerable people.

It ensures that all people who provide NDIS supports and services through a registered NDIS provider and have more than incidental contact with a participant or a key personnel with a registered NDIS provider are required to have an NDIS worker check. It establishes that the central assessment unit, as established under the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act, will be responsible for conducting NDIS worker checks in South Australia.

Only NDIS workers can apply for an NDIS worker check. Applications must be endorsed by an NDIS employer. In addition, to avoid any legal barriers that may exist in screening persons from another jurisdiction, a person must currently reside or work or intend to reside or work in South Australia to be eligible to apply for an NDIS worker check in South Australia. Once obtained, a check will be portable between states and roles. The NDIS worker check includes a national criminal history check and workplace misconduct information from the NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission. Child protection information will also continue to be checked for all applicants.

The NDIS IGA recognises that there are certain offences that indicate a prima facie risk to people with disability, referred to as 'disqualification offences'. Applicants who have been found guilty of such offences committed as an adult are automatically disqualified from working with people with a disability. These offences include murder, serious assault and sexual assault of a child or a vulnerable person.

A second category of offences, presumptively disqualifying offences, will also result in persons who have been found guilty or who have pending charges for such offences being automatically disqualified from working with people with disability unless there are exceptional circumstances that show they are not a risk to people with disability. These offences include manslaughter, neglect or ill treatment of a person under care, and fraud and deception offences. Persons granted a clearance are permitted to provide NDIS supports.

The South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal will have the jurisdiction to review certain decisions related to NDIS worker checks. An NDIS worker check clearance will be valid for five years and portable across jurisdictions. Where a person applies for and is issued with a clearance while their current clearance is still active, the five-year validity period of the new clearance commences from the date that the previous clearance expires. This ensures that there is no penalty if a worker renews their clearance before their last clearance expires.

The central assessment unit will be empowered to suspend a person's clearance whilst a reassessment is undertaken. A suspension may be imposed if there is evidence—for example, obtained through monitoring—that a person is likely to present a risk of harm. When fully implemented, the NDIS worker check will feature national ongoing monitoring of criminal records and workplace records, not just state monitoring. All states and territories will upload the outcome of the screening decisions to a national database administered by the commonwealth. The national database will ensure workers who are excluded by one state or territory do not apply elsewhere. It will also allow employers to verify the clearance status of their workers and will support national continuous monitoring of workers for any new criminal or workplace records.

Transitional provisions will be agreed with the commonwealth, and it is proposed that current disability clearances will be recognised as an NDIS check in lieu of an NDIS worker check clearance for the transitional period. The administrative amendments of the bill aim to standardise the mechanisms of screening processes, risk assessment and decision-making. This includes:

- identifying specific categories of offences for which an applicant will be presumed to be excluded, unless they can prove exceptional circumstances;
- consequential amendments to the prohibited persons act and the DI Act to reflect the changes made by these provisions and standardise provisions between the screening types;
- enabling the screening authority to establish a scheme for worker screening through regulations for screenings other than WWCCs and NDIS worker checks; and
- facilitating information sharing between South Australia, the commonwealth and other jurisdictions when a person has been prohibited.

The powers include the sharing of disciplinary misconduct child protection information or any other information that is relevant to the screening process or risk assessment. It also inserts provisions that facilitate the sharing and receipt of information with the commonwealth and other jurisdictions when a person has been prohibited.

Members, I commend the bill to you for your consideration after its lengthy assessment in another place, and I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted 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 Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016

4—Amendment of section 6—Meaning of *child-related work* and *work with children*

This clause inserts new subsection (1a) into section 6 of the principal Act, clarifying that the circumstances specified do not amount to child-related work.

5—Amendment of section 9—Meaning of *excluded person*

This clause deletes paragraphs (a) and (b) from section 9(1) of the principal Act, instead addressing those matters in clause 5 by excluding them from the definition of child-related work. It also inserts new subsection (1a) disapplying subsection (1) of section 9 in relation to a person who undertakes paid work with children on less than 7 days in any 12 month period.

6—Amendment of section 12—Interaction with other Acts and laws

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 12 of the principal Act to reflect the changes made by new section 26A of the Act.

7—Amendment of section 21—Functions

This clause amends section 21 of the principal Act to add screening and other functions under the *Disability Inclusion Act 2018* to the functions of the central assessment unit.

8—Insertion of section 26A

This clause inserts new section 26A into the principal Act. The new section sets out provisions that will apply to the conduct of a working with children check in respect of a person who has been found guilty of a presumptive disqualification offence.

The effect of the provision is that certain persons will be presumed to pose an unacceptable risk to children, and will be prohibited from working with children unless they satisfy the central assessment unit that the offending should be disregarded, or that exceptional circumstances exist in relation to the person such that the person does not appear, or no longer appears, to pose an unacceptable risk to children.

The clause also defines 'presumptive disqualification offence'.

9—Insertion of section 33A

This clause inserts new section 33A into the principal Act, requiring persons who did not pay a fee for the conduct of their working with children check on the basis that they are a volunteer to pay a fee should they commence working with children other than as a volunteer. It is an offence to fail to comply with the requirement.

10—Amendment of section 34—Records management system

This clause amends section 34 of the principal Act to clarify that the central assessment unit need only include information on the records management system if they are in possession of the information.

11—Amendment of section 38—Court to provide notice of certain findings of guilt to central assessment unit

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 38 of the principal Act to reflect the changes made by new section 26A of the Act.

12—Substitution of section 39

This clause inserts a new section 39 of the principal Act to reflect the changes made by new section 26A of the Act.

13—Insertion of section 39A

This clause inserts new section 39A into the principal Act to require reporting bodies, as defined by the new section, to notify the central assessment unit if they suspect a person with whom the body is dealing to pose an unacceptable risk to children.

The new section also allows such bodies to provide information to the central assessment unit any information on any matter relevant to the operation of this Act.

14—Insertion of Part 5 Division 5

This clause inserts new Division 5 into Part 5 of the principal Act, with new sections 42A to 42G providing for the provision of relevant information to and from the central assessment unit respectively.

15—Amendment of section 53—Regulations

This clause amends section 53(2) of the principal Act to insert an express power to make regulations relating to the provision of information or documents.

Part 3—Amendment of Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Act 2017

16—Insertion of sections 8A and 8B

This clause inserts new sections 8A and 8B into the principal Act as follows:

8A—Recognition of certain assessments of relevant history as working with children checks

This section recognises certain assessments of relevant history conducted in accordance with regulation 6(1)(a) of the *Children's Protection Regulations 2010* within the 3 years preceding the commencement of this section as working with children checks in respect of the person conducted under the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, subject to the conditions set out in the new section.

8B—Transitional provisions—certain emergency service workers

This section conditionally disapplies certain sections of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016* in respect of emergency workers during the transitional period (as defined by the principal Act).

17—Amendment of section 43—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause deletes section 43(1) of the principal Act.

Part 4—Amendment of Disability Inclusion Act 2018

18—Amendment of long title

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the long title of the principal Act.

19—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause amends section 3 of the principal Act to insert definitions of *central assessment unit* and *Registrar*.

20—Insertion of Part 5A

This clause inserts new Part 5A into the principal Act as follows, with the new Part (predicated on *National Disability Insurance Scheme (Worker Checks) Act 2018* of NSW) forming part of a nationally consistent scheme for screening of certain workers for the purposes of the NDIS scheme:

Part 5A—Screening of NDIS workers

Division 1—Preliminary

18A—Interpretation

This section defines key terms used in the proposed Part.

18B—Meaning of disqualified and presumptively disqualified persons

This section defines persons who are disqualified persons, and presumptively disqualified persons, for the purposes of the proposed Part.

18C—Criminal intelligence

This section is a standard provision relating to the classification and protection of information that is criminal intelligence.

18D—Protected information

This section provides that the Registrar may, in accordance with any requirements set out in the guidelines, classify specified information as protected information (a term defined in new section 18A but generally protecting the identify of people with disability, and also including specified child protection information). Information so classified is treated and protection in the same way as criminal intelligence.

18E—Powers of delegation

This section is a standard power of delegation in respect of functions and powers of the central assessment unit and the Registrar of that unit under the proposed Part.

18F—Pending applications to be disregarded

This section clarifies the position in this State that a person must actually have a clearance before undertaking NDIS work, that is to say that merely having applied for a clearance is not enough.

Division 2—Obtaining an NDIS worker check clearance**18G—Application for NDIS worker check clearance**

This section sets out how a person can apply for an NDIS worker clearance.

18H—Certain persons not permitted to apply for NDIS worker check clearance

This section sets out persons who are not permitted to apply, or are banned from applying, for a clearance under the proposed Part, and makes related procedural provisions.

18I—Determination of application—grant of NDIS worker check clearance

This section provides that an application for a clearance under the proposed Part must be granted except as is set out in the section.

18J—Determination of application—issue of NDIS worker check exclusion

This section provides when the central assessment unit must issue an NDIS worker check exclusion in relation to an applicant for an NDIS worker check clearance.

18K—Certain persons presumed to pose risk of harm to people with disability

This section sets out provisions that apply in relation to determination of an application for a clearance in respect of a person who has been found guilty of a presumptive disqualification offence, in particular that the person will be presumed to pose a risk of harm to people with disability and be excluded unless the person satisfies the central assessment unit of the matters referred to in subsection (1)(c)(i) and (ii).

18L—Notice of grant of NDIS worker check clearance or issue of NDIS worker check exclusion

This section sets out how the central assessment unit is to give notice of the grant of a clearance, or issue of an exclusion, and allows the unit to notify notifiable persons in relation to the applicant.

Division 3—Risk assessment**18M—Nature of risk assessment**

This section sets out the nature of a risk assessment of a person under the proposed Part, namely that the central assessment unit is to assess and determine whether the person poses a risk of harm to persons with disability.

18N—Requirement for risk assessment

This section sets out when a risk assessment of a person is required under the proposed Part.

18O—Matters to be considered in risk assessment

This section sets out the matters that the central assessment unit is to consider when undertaking a risk assessment under the proposed Part.

Division 4—Duration and termination of NDIS worker check clearances and exclusions**18P—Duration of NDIS worker check clearance**

This section sets out that an NDIS worker clearance remains in force for 5 years, unless it is cancelled sooner under the Part. The section also allows for the extension of the duration of a clearance for up to 6 months after it would otherwise have expired.

18Q—Duration of NDIS worker check exclusion

This section sets out that an NDIS worker exclusion issued to a disqualified person remains in force indefinitely. Any other NDIS worker exclusion remains in force for 5 years, unless it is cancelled sooner under the Part.

18R—Suspension of NDIS worker check clearance

This section enables the central assessment unit to suspend an NDIS worker clearance if the unit is of the opinion that there is a reasonable likelihood that a risk assessment of the holder will determine that the holder poses a risk of harm to persons with disability.

18S—Cancellation of NDIS worker check clearance

This section sets out when the central assessment unit must, and may, cancel the clearance of a person, and makes procedural provision in respect of such cancellations.

18T—Cancellation of NDIS worker check clearance at request of holder

This section provides that a person may, by written notice to the central assessment unit, surrender their clearance, and that the unit must then cancel the clearance. The section also sets out circumstances in which the unit must refuse to cancel a clearance under the section.

Division 5—Information gathering and sharing

Subdivision 1—Information gathering

18U—Court to provide notice of certain findings of guilt to central assessment unit

This section requires a court that finds a person guilty of a disqualification offence or presumptive disqualification offence to provide specified information to the central assessment unit.

18V—Commissioner of Police to provide information to central assessment unit

This section requires the Commissioner of Police to provide specified information to the central assessment unit where a person is charged with a disqualification offence or presumptive disqualification offence. The Commissioner of Police may also disclose to the central assessment unit any information on any matter relevant to the operation of the principal Act.

18W—Power to require information from applicant or clearance holder

This section empowers the central assessment unit to require information from an applicant for, or holder of, a clearance, and allows the unit to terminate an application or cancel a clearance for non-compliance with the requirement in accordance with the section.

18X—Power to require information from other persons

This section empowers the central assessment unit to require any person to provide information relevant to whether a person poses a risk of harm to persons with disability for the specified purposes. The section also sets out how compliance with the requirement can be enforced, including an offence where a person fails to comply with an enforcement notice.

Subdivision 2—Information sharing and use

18Y—Central assessment unit may disclose etc information with other jurisdictions

This section allows the central assessment unit to receive and make use of information relevant to the functions of the central assessment unit under this Part from any person or body in this or any other jurisdiction.

The section also allows the central assessment unit to disclose information (not being information classified by the Commissioner of Police as criminal intelligence) in the possession of the unit to a prescribed person or body in another State or Territory for an NDIS purpose.

18Z—Access to police information

This section authorises the limited disclosure by the Commissioner of Police of certain information relevant to determining whether a person who engages or proposes to engage in NDIS work poses a risk of harm to persons with disability.

18ZA—Provision of information to central assessment unit

This section provides that any person or body can provide to the central assessment unit any information that the person or body reasonably believes is relevant to the functions of the central assessment unit under this Part, and will incur no liability for doing so.

18ZB—Provision of information to NDIS employers and participants

This section provides that the central assessment unit may provide certain information to NDIS employers and participants.

18ZC—Power to retain information etc indefinitely

This section provides that the central assessment unit may retain certain information and documents indefinitely.

Subdivision 3—Miscellaneous

18ZD—Notification by reporting bodies of conduct requiring risk assessment

This section requires reporting bodies, as defined, to notify the central assessment unit of the name and other identifying particulars of any person against whom the reporting body has made a finding that the person has engaged in conduct that constitutes circumstances prescribed by the regulations as requiring a risk assessment of the person.

18ZE—Information sharing for national register or database

This section allows the central assessment unit to disclose information obtained in the operation or administration of the proposed Part to an authorised person for the purpose of providing relevant information for entry in a national register or database established under the NDIS Act.

18ZF—Information sharing for research, monitoring and auditing purposes

This section allows the central assessment unit to disclose information obtained in the operation or administration of the proposed Part to an authorised person for the purpose of providing relevant information for use for the purposes of research into the operation of a relevant law, or auditing of compliance with such laws.

18ZG—Disclosure of information about offences

This section allows an authorised person to disclose to a law enforcement agency of the State or any other jurisdiction information obtained as a result of the exercise of a function under this Part that indicates that a relevant offence may have been committed, or that constitutes evidence of a relevant offence.

18ZH—Disclosure of information to prevent significant harm

This section allows an authorised person under the proposed Part to disclose to an appropriate person or body information obtained in the operation or administration of the proposed Part if there are reasonable grounds to suspect that there is a risk of significant harm to a person with disability, or to a child or other vulnerable person, or to a class of such persons, and the disclosure is reasonably necessary to prevent that harm.

Division 6—Review of decisions by South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

18ZI—Review of decisions by South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal

This section confers jurisdiction on the SACAT to review certain decisions under the proposed Part.

Division 7—Miscellaneous

18ZJ—Fee payable where volunteer undertakes paid employment

This section requires the holder of a clearance obtained without cost as a volunteer to pay a prescribed fee if they commence paid work utilising the clearance. However, the requirement does not apply to a person who performs less than 7 days paid work in any 12 month period.

18ZK—Effect of Part on other rights and procedures

This section clarifies the operation of the proposed Part in respect of the rights of employees and their employment.

18ZL—Limitation of liability

This section confers immunity on the Crown, the central assessment unit and other persons acting in good faith under the proposed Part.

18ZM—False or misleading statements

This section creates an offence for a person to knowingly make a false or misleading statement in information provided under the proposed Part.

18ZN—Evidentiary provision

This section allows certain matters in legal proceedings to be proved by means of certificate.

18ZO—Failure to give notice of decisions

This section provides that a failure to give notice of a decision as required by this Part does not, of itself, affect the validity or effect of the decision.

18ZP—Central assessment unit may seek external advice

This section provides the central assessment unit with the ability to seek expert or professional advice in relation to a decision or determination.

21—Amendment of section 19—Interpretation

This clause amends section 19 of the principal Act to insert or remove the definition of key terms.

22—Insertion of sections 22A to 22E

This clause inserts sections 22A to 22E into the principal Act as follows:

22A—Steps employers must take before employing person in prescribed position

22B—Employer to ensure screening check conducted at least every 5 years

22C—Employer to advise central assessment unit of certain information

These three sections are the equivalent of sections 17, 18 and 19 of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, and are included to ensure consistency with that Act. Collectively, the sections impose requirements on employers to ensure employees are the subject of current screening checks and are not prohibited persons.

22D—Records management system

This section requires the central assessment unit to establish a records management system for the purposes of the proposed Part, although the system may be combined with the records management system under the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*.

22E—Inspection of records management system

This section provides for the inspection of the records management system required under proposed section 22D

23—Amendment of section 23—Regulations to set out scheme for screening checks

This clause amends section 23(2) of the principal Act to reflect the amendments made by this measure.

24—Amendment of section 33—Regulations

This clause amends section 33 of the principal Act to increase the maximum fine that may be set under the regulations to \$50,000, to allow transitional regulations to be made following the amendment of the principal Act by this measure and to provide an express power to make regulations in relation to the provision of information or documents to the central assessment unit.

25—Insertion of Schedule 2

This Schedule makes transitional provision in respect of applications for assessments of relevant history under the *Disability Services Act 1993* on foot but not determined on commencement of this measure. The Schedule also recognises certain assessments of relevant history granted under that Act within the preceding 3 years as NDIS worker clearances.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Cook.

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

Second Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(15:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The South Australian Public Health (Early Childhood Services and Immunisation) Amendment Bill 2019 is the first of two no job no play bills that will be introduced to state parliament. The first phase of the government's no job no play policy aims to improve the ability to prevent and control outbreaks of vaccine-preventable diseases in early childhood services. The bill requires parents and guardians to provide immunisation records to their child's early childhood service and gives the Chief Public Health Officer the power to request those records.

In the event of an outbreak of a vaccine-preventable disease at an early childhood centre, the bill will allow the Chief Public Health Officer the power to exclude a child from the centre. This will provide our public health officers with more support to prevent and contain a dangerous outbreak. Most other states have the ability to exclude unimmunised children from an early childhood service when an outbreak is occurring.

While these measures will help reduce cases of vaccine-preventable disease and improve our ability to respond, we are continuing to consult on further measures to improve overall vaccination rates. Immunisation is one of the most effective strategies to protect children and adults against serious diseases. Immunisation is also one of the most cost-effective health interventions and is supported by the World Health Organization and all levels of government in Australia. Immunisation saves lives and protects lives.

Although immunisation coverage in South Australia is very good, in most areas it falls short of the national aspirational immunisation coverage target set at 95 per cent. Statewide immunisation coverage in South Australia in the assessed age groups is between 86.83 per cent and 95.83 per cent, depending on the group. Increasing immunisation rates for children under five to as close to 100 per cent as possible is critical to ensure herd immunity and protect children and adults from highly-infectious diseases.

Some children are unable to be immunised for medical reasons, such as immunosuppression or severe allergy. These potentially vulnerable children are provided with a circle of protection against most vaccine-preventable diseases if other children are fully vaccinated. The commonwealth enacted no job no pay legislation in 2015 to improve vaccination coverage. The no job no pay act directly impacts parents who receive the Family Tax Benefit Part A supplement and the Child Care Subsidy. Under the no job no pay act parents are still able to send incompletely immunised children to early childhood services, but they are unable to receive the usual government benefits.

New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland have enacted no job no play legislation. Both New South Wales and Victoria require parents or caregivers to provide evidence that the child is fully vaccinated for age prior to enrolment in early childhood services. Queensland legislation permits early childhood education and care services' discretion regarding whether or not they will allow attendance of undervaccinated children.

Western Australia has recently commenced regulations to require caregivers to provide their child's Australian immunisation register statement upon enrolment in child care, kindergarten and school. This is the first step of Western Australia's proposed three-part process. The second part, which will require children to be fully vaccinated for age to be eligible for enrolment in child care and kindergarten, is currently undergoing consultation. The third part of the proposal will involve policy initiatives aimed at improving childhood vaccination coverage.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to improving South Australia's overall immunisation coverage and reducing pockets of underimmunisation. The government is going to consult on the best model for South Australia. Our starting point is to legislate to exclude children from early childhood services if they are not vaccinated. We are not considering the Queensland model.

The other two models, from New South Wales and Victoria, differ. Victoria provides a greater range of exemptions—for example, if the child is descended from an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander, or the child is in the care of a parent of a parent who is the holder of a Health Care Card, pensioner concession card, gold card or white card, or the child was a multiple birth. An issue that will need to be considered is if the role of preschool childhood education in maximising beneficial health and development outcomes for children during their school years is supported by strong evidence.

The Royal Australasian College of Physicians highlights the importance of affordable and accessible early childhood education, raising concerns that lack of access to early childhood education is highly detrimental, especially from three to four years of age and especially if compounded by financial vulnerability.

The South Australian Child Development Council has provided in-principle support for the measures, which focus on improving immunisation coverage rates, recognising the complexity of the issues around no jab no play legislation and the potential impact on human rights, such as the child's right to health and education. The council cautioned against the blunt nature of such a policy instrument that might violate some of the core principles of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

Given the complexity of the issues, this government has determined to adopt a two-step approach. This bill is the first step. The government bill seeks to take the opportunity to facilitate a swift public health response to vaccine-preventable disease outbreaks ahead of full implementation of a no jab no play policy, pending further evaluation and consultation. Under the second phase of no jab no play, it is proposed that children must be appropriately immunised on an immunisation catch-up program or be exempt for medical reasons in order to enrol or attend early childhood care services. The government will now go to community consultation on a further South Australian bill on that aspect.

The government will shortly release a discussion paper that will draw on input received and assessments of the impact of interstate legislation. We want to ensure that we get our laws right. We are committed to protecting children and believe that South Australia should have the best childhood immunisation rates in the nation. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted 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 South Australian Public Health Act 2011

4—Insertion of Part 12A

This clause inserts new Part 12A into the *South Australian Public Health Act 2011* as follows:

Part 12A—Immunisation and Early Childhood Services

96A—Interpretation

This clause defines key terms used in the measure. For the purposes of the measure, an *early childhood service* is defined as a service for the education or care (or both) of a child under the age of 6 years but does not include the following services:

- (a) the provision of primary education provided at or in connection with a primary school;
- (b) a service comprising a person engaged by a parent or guardian of a child to babysit the child in the child's home;
- (c) a babysitting, playgroup or childminding service that is organised informally by the parents of the children concerned;
- (d) a service provided for a child by a family member of the child or friend of the family of the child personally under an informal arrangement where no offer to provide that service was advertised;
- (e) a service principally conducted to provide tuition to 1 child or a number of children who ordinarily reside together;
- (f) a service principally conducted to provide instruction in a particular activity (such as sport, dance and music);
- (g) a service where a parent or guardian of each child remains on site and is available to care for their child if required;
- (h) a service comprising out of school care;

- (i) care provided to a child by a person in accordance with a parenting order under the *Family Law Act 1975* or *Family Court Act 1997* of the Commonwealth;
- (j) care provided to a child under the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017;
- (k) any other service, or service of a kind, prescribed by the regulations.

Immunisation record is defined as any of the following:

- (a) an extract, or extracts, from the Australian Immunisation Register under the *Australian Immunisation Register Act 2015* of the Commonwealth;
- (b) a document of a kind approved by the Chief Public Health Officer;
- (c) a certificate in writing issued by the Chief Public Health Officer.

96B—Requirement to provide immunisation records to service provider

This clause provides that the parent or guardian of a child that is enrolled or attends at premises for the purposes of the provision of an early childhood service must provide immunisation records relating to the child to the provider of the service in accordance with the requirements of the Chief Public Health Officer.

The clause further provides that a provider of an early childhood service must take reasonable steps to ensure that the parent or guardian of a child complies with the requirements to provide the records and must also keep a copy of all records provided to the provider under the clause.

96C—Provision of information to Chief Public Health Officer on outbreak of vaccine preventable disease

This clause provides that the Chief Public Health Officer may, if satisfied that there is an outbreak, or a risk of an outbreak, of a vaccine preventable disease at premises at which early childhood services are provided, require the person with responsibility for providing the service at the premises to provide to the Chief Public Health Officer—

- (a) the name and date of birth of each child that is enrolled, or routinely attends, at the premises for the provision of an early childhood service; and
- (b) immunisation records relating to each child referred to in paragraph (a) provided pursuant to clause 96B(1); and
- (c) the contact details for a parent or guardian of each child referred to in paragraph (a); and
- (d) any other prescribed information.

If the Chief Public Health Officer requires the provision of information under the clause then the information must be provided within 24 hours and a maximum penalty of \$30 000 applies for a failure to comply.

96D—Exclusion of children from premises on outbreak of vaccine preventable disease

This clause provides that the Chief Public Health Officer may, by notice in writing, direct that a specified child is excluded from attending at specified premises at which early childhood services are provided if satisfied that—

- (a) the child has been diagnosed with a vaccine preventable disease; or
- (b) there is an outbreak of a specified vaccine preventable disease at the premises and the child would, if the child attended at the premises, be at a material risk of contracting the vaccine preventable disease.

The clause provides for service of a direction of the Chief Public Health Officer on the person responsible for the provision of an education or care service at the specified premises and also on the parents of a child specified in the direction.

The clause provides that a person must not provide an early childhood service to a child at premises from which the child is excluded pursuant to a direction under the clause and a maximum penalty of \$30,000 applies.

96E—Exemptions

This clause provides that the Chief Public Health Officer may, by notice in writing, grant an exemption from this Part or specified provisions of this Part—

- (a) in relation to a specified child or children of a specified class; or
- (b) to specified persons or persons of a specified class; or
- (c) in relation to specified early childhood services or early childhood services of a specified class.

An exemption under this clause may—

- (a) be subject to such conditions as the Chief Public Health Officer thinks fit; and
- (b) apply for a specified period, until further notice or indefinitely; and
- (c) vary according to the circumstances to which it is expressed to apply.

A person who contravenes or fails to comply with a condition of an exemption imposed under this section is guilty of an offence and a maximum penalty of \$2,500 applies.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (16:03): I rise to speak on what is an important issue and what would be an important bill if it actually had anything in it. The bill that has been provided by the government hardly contains anything new, hardly contains anything that the government does not already have the power to do and is not going to go very much further at all in protecting our kids and protecting our broader society from vaccine-preventable diseases, and that is such an important issue for this state.

We know that other states have progressed proper no jab no play policies in their early childhood childcare centres. We know that has happened both in Labor states and Liberal states. We know that has happened in those states with the support of both the Labor Party and the Liberal Party. But here in South Australia we see this Liberal Party, this government, bring to the floor this bill which does not include that, which does not prevent people who are unvaccinated without a good medical reason from attending child care and potentially putting at risk other kids. That is shameful and that is an issue on which South Australia, through this government, has dropped the ball. It is something on which this parliament should actually be taking some action.

In speaking on the South Australian Public Health (Early Childhood Services and Immunisation) Amendment Bill, I indicate that I am the lead speaker. The minister has shown over the past year that he loves good spin. He has proved that time and time again. He says that this legislation is the first part of a no jab no play reform, but to label it as such is entirely false. It is entirely misleading because that is not what is going to happen here. There are no additional powers to make it no jab no play as we have seen in other states.

We did have a government that had the policy of bringing in no jab no play legislation to South Australia, and that was the last government. We brought in a piece of legislation, after extensive consultation that we did over 18 months ago, and it was brought to the other place. Unfortunately, it was not able to pass before the election, but that is no reason why we should not be using it and bringing it in here in South Australia so that South Australians can be protected.

It is important to note that an extensive level of consultation occurred prior to the introduction of that bill back in 2017, including a full public consultation process. The groundwork has already been done on asking for feedback on this bill. When the government keeps insisting that they cannot introduce no jab no play without going to consultation, it is completely false and also complete spin because that has all ready happened—that consultation has already occurred.

Unfortunately, that legislation could not be passed. What I did upon becoming the shadow minister for health was say that this was an important piece of legislation and that parliament needed to deal with it as soon as possible. It was unfortunate that it could not pass before the election, so I brought it here as a private member's bill. Unfortunately, it has been lapsing on the private members' legislation list week after week after week. There has not been any desire to debate it. There has not been any desire from the government to progress it. Meanwhile, they have been working on this weaker form of legislation that is not actually going to bring in any meaningful change whatsoever for South Australia.

We are now lagging behind other states. I think Victoria was the first state to bring this in. It was the first to bring in proper no jab no play legislation to prevent unvaccinated children from attending childcare centres. That was then followed by the Berejiklian government in New South Wales, which brought in legislation, and it is about to be followed by the Western Australia Labor government, which in July this year are going to bring in no jab no play legislation.

So we have three states that have taken strong action on this, and we are now unfortunately being left behind in this regard. There is no reason why we should be left behind. We have done the work, we have the legislation drawn up, we can debate it today and we can get it through as amended

today. I will be seeking to introduce amendments to do that to make sure that we have it in place here in South Australia.

We know what is happening here. Unfortunately, there are people celebrating the fact that the government has not done this work properly, the fact that the government has brought in this weaker bill—that is, the anti-vaxer movement, which is strong. Unfortunately, there is a strong minority of people who are very adamant about their distaste and their belief in pseudoscience science. They are part of an anti-vax alliance, and they are the vast minority of people. They amplify themselves by the internet, they amplify themselves by writing letters and angry notes to members of parliament, but they are the minority. The vast majority of people support action. The vast majority of people support what is the established science, the established medicine, which is that vaccines save lives.

We on this side will be standing on the side of those scientists and doctors who support vaccines. We absolutely believe it is important that all children who can be medically vaccinated are vaccinated. In fact, it is an element of the laws we brought to the parliament that there would be medical exemptions in place, similar to the medical exemptions that were brought in under the federal Liberal government for no jab no pay.

No jab no pay is an important policy that has been in place at the federal level for some time, denying benefits such as childcare benefits or family tax benefits to families who do not have their children vaccinated, unless they have a very specific number of exemptions under that legislation. Of course, that tends to impact lower income families. If you are a higher income family, then you could probably ignore that. If you are a higher income family, you probably do not worry about whether you miss out on your childcare benefits. But if you are a lower income family, that obviously means a lot.

That is why having the no jab no play legislation is so important, because it is not just targeting lower income families but all families. In fact, it was so important that one of the first people to push for this was former prime minister Malcolm Turnbull. I know those opposite do not like to talk about him anymore, given what happened last year, but Malcolm Turnbull went to the states and said, 'We think no jab no play is absolutely important and needs to be brought in in every state in the country.' He took that to COAG and was adamant about the fact that this needed to be in place to protect kids across Australia. We agreed with that and that is why we sought to take action. Unfortunately, those opposite have not agreed with that. They have not agreed that action is necessary and are now lagging with this bill that is unfortunately nowhere near what we need.

Vaccines are important. Preventing the spread of vaccine-preventable disease is important. We have seen this in America recently where, unfortunately, there have been outbreaks of measles, a disease that should be taken out through vaccines. If people had their vaccines and if we did not have people believing pseudoscience along anti-vaxer lines, then we could eliminate diseases like measles. But if we continue to give credence to those arguments and allow those myths to become a reality in people's minds, then we will see the emergence of some of these diseases in South Australia that should have been eliminated a long time ago.

This is a policy that draws people's attention to the truth, the science, the medicine and aims to stop people listening to the anti-vaxer movement. We will not stand for those myths that the anti-vaxers are spreading and we want to actively combat those myths by making sure that it is very clear where our law stands on vaccinations.

I have to say that this is a law that is supported by the public. How do we know that? Before the last election, the *Sunday Mail* did a massive survey of its readers and asked the question: should unvaccinated children be banned from preschools and child care? To that, 90 per cent said yes, that the risk of spreading disease is too high. Unfortunately, 10 per cent said no, parents have the right to refuse to vaccinate. But here we have the government siding with those 10 per cent of people, rather than the 90 per cent of South Australians who think this is an important policy that needs to be brought in place.

The vast majority of parents such as mine, who send their children to childcare centres, want to make sure that every other child in that centre is vaccinated so that they can have herd immunity. A huge amount of the importance of this subject is that some people are unable to be vaccinated

because of their medical condition. It might be a child who has an immuno issue in terms of cancer, for example, who cannot get vaccinated. We want to make sure those kids are protected as well.

If there are kids who are unvaccinated, who could contract those potentially deadly diseases that can be prevented, then those other kids who cannot get vaccinated because of medical reasons could be at risk. That is one of the main reasons we are trying to address. We have seen it progressively and we are continually beating the drum on the importance of vaccination from this side of the house. We pushed for meningococcal B and dragged the government to that.

Members interjecting:

Mr PICTON: Absolutely. You were not going to do it at all. It was our policy to do that before the last election. You were dragged kicking and screaming to that policy, and likewise to free flu shots for under five year olds. We were continually pushing for that. It was just as we are seeing at the moment, where the government has had the most ham-fisted approach to flu vaccines that this state has ever seen. It has been completely despicable.

We cannot even get our front-line doctors and nurses, who are trying to protect South Australians, vaccinated against the flu under this hopeless government. Time and again, we will continue to push for vaccines, continue to push the importance of them and continue to dismiss the myths from those who seek to oppose them. The minister has already confirmed in the other house that, without this bill, as things currently stand in South Australia, at least 98 per cent of childcare centres are proactively collecting immunisation records.

The other element of this bill is whether a public health order can be issued to prevent children who are unvaccinated from attending a childcare centre in evidence of an outbreak. They already have the power to do that. The South Australian Public Health Act gives the power to make such orders already. They already have the information. The information is already collected. If there was an outbreak, they already have the power to stop unvaccinated kids from attending. What we are seeking to do is stop those outbreaks occurring in the first place, and this bill does nothing to make that happen.

This bill does absolutely nothing on that front. It brings in powers that essentially are already there in other pieces of legislation and packages them together so that they can get a grab on the TV news looking like they are doing something, but they are actually doing nothing. We will keep pushing for proper no jab no play laws in South Australia. It is pretty unclear exactly what the government's position on that is. On the one hand, they are out there criticising that policy, but on the other hand they are saying, 'We are going to consult on whether to bring in that policy in South Australia.' So it is very unclear whether they believe that or not.

I hope that they come to the point of saying, 'We do need this policy in South Australia.' We will keep advocating for that but, ultimately, we need the government and its numbers to make that a reality in South Australia. I hope that happens sooner rather than later. I hope that they see the importance of doing that today in some amendments before the house. I fear that may not be the case. I hope that we do not see outbreaks in South Australia that are potentially preventable because we do not have strong provisions in place and because we are not doing everything we possibly can as a parliament to make sure that kids get their vaccinations and that kids who cannot because of medical reasons are protected from vaccine-preventable conditions.

With those words, I welcome the idea from the government that they are hoping to do something, but there is not much in this bill of any importance. We will seek to make this a much stronger bill. We hope that the government sees the light on this issue pretty quickly and makes sure that this happens as soon as possible because our kids need it.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (16:18): Today, I rise to support the South Australian Public Health (Early Childhood Services and Immunisation) Amendment Bill 2019. This bill is the first of two no jab no play bills to be introduced into the state parliament. Undoubtedly, immunisation is one of the greatest medical advancements in human history. There are now numerous infectious diseases that had been, if not certain death sentences, the cause of lifelong serious disability that are now left to the annals of history.

Some examples include smallpox, which has been eradicated from the world. Within Australia, tuberculosis has been eliminated to the point where we do not routinely vaccinate Australians anymore, although it does still exist on our doorstep. Polio is an infection that has been almost eradicated from the world. I think it is worth acknowledging the work of organisations like Rotary International and the End Polio Now campaign. I know that my own local Rotary club, the Rotary Club of Tea Tree Gully, has done a lot of work in supporting that program.

There are also other groups of diseases that still pose a risk but have had significantly reduced incidence due to immunisation, such as whooping cough, hepatitis B and measles, mumps and rubella. Of course, this was not helped by the scientific fraud committed by Wakefield et al. in claiming a link between the MMR vaccine and autism. Of course, that work has since been retracted.

However, there are also now some relatively new vaccines that have been deployed in the last ten years or so. The vaccine against the human papillomavirus is one we should be particularly proud of in Australia as it is where it was developed and helps protect against cervical cancer. There is also the rotavirus vaccine, and now we are also seeing in parts of Africa large-scale pilot programs of a malaria vaccine, which will hopefully be promising in its ability to reduce that very severe and enormous burden of disease in many parts of the world.

I am very pleased that the vaccination coverage within South Australia is for the most part quite good, with more than 95 per cent coverage in some areas. However, there are deficiencies in other areas with some rates of coverage falling to as little as 86 per cent. I would like, though, to take this opportunity to commend my own local community where a number of the suburbs actually have amongst the highest rates of immunisation in the nation, and I am certainly very pleased to see that.

An increase in immunisation rates for children under five to as close as possible to 100 per cent is essential for protecting children from the diseases to which they are vulnerable and also providing lifelong protection. The high rates of immunisation in this age group is also important for providing herd immunity to protect those who are not protected. These can include people who are immunocompromised. They may have at some time in their life been immunised, but their immune systems are no longer able to respond to the infection, or there may be infants who are too young to have yet been vaccinated.

It is important to stress the critical point that immunisation is not just important for those who are protected, that individual who is being immunised, but that it is an important community effort to protect those around us. We have seen in recent times where, within pockets of the community, immunisation rates have dropped to below 95 per cent, and we have seen some outbreaks of measles. This is, of course, a highly contagious infection and a very serious disease, frequently requiring hospitalisation and frequently causing permanent disability and, in some cases, death.

Measles had largely been eliminated from Australia, but what is clear is that the virus is still out there. It still exists in the world, particularly given that there are outbreaks happening in other countries, and so this poses a continued risk to us in Australia and stresses the importance of ensuring that we have high rates of immunisation here.

This bill before us today aims to improve the ability to prevent and control outbreaks of vaccine-preventable diseases in early childhood services. Children, of course, are an important group in terms of the transmission spread of infectious diseases throughout the community. I know that, in a past life, when a vaccine became available for children with respect to the organism I used to work on, one of the first effects they saw was that it actually reduced the incidence of disease in their grandparents, so early childhood is an important target for the vast majority of immunisation programs.

This bill will require parents and guardians to provide immunisation records to their child's early childhood service—for example, child care, family day care and long day care. The bill also gives the Chief Public Health Officer the power to request those records from the service if satisfied that there is an outbreak or risk of an outbreak of a vaccine-preventable disease, and enables the Chief Public Health Officer to exclude a child from premises during an outbreak of a vaccine-preventable disease if the child has been diagnosed with a vaccine-preventable disease or is at material risk of contracting the vaccine-preventable disease.

These measures are largely consistent with most other jurisdictions in Australia where unimmunised children can be excluded from an early childhood service when an outbreak is occurring. It is worth noting, though, that this bill does not include a provision for routine exclusion of children who are not up to date with vaccinations or who are on a recognised immunisation catch-up program.

This bill complements the important work done at the commonwealth level that made the parents of incomplete immunised children ineligible to receive some government benefits. The commonwealth no job no pay act directly impacts parents who receive the Family Tax Benefit Part A supplement and the Child Care Subsidy. Under the commonwealth no job no pay act, parents are still able to send incomplete immunised children to early childhood services but they are unable to receive the usual government benefits.

As I mentioned earlier, this bill is the first of two bills in this area. Importantly, the second bill will be informed by consultation. This process of consultation will commence shortly following the release of a discussion paper that will investigate the experience of similar legislation in other jurisdictions within Australia to identify other options that could help strengthen our work to achieve the aim of immunisation rates in children as close as possible to 100 per cent. An important issue for investigation is the role of preschool childhood education in maximising beneficial health and developmental outcomes for children during their school years, which is supported by strong evidence.

The Royal Australasian College of Physicians has raised concerns that lack of access to early childhood education is highly detrimental, especially from three to four years of age, and especially in concert with financial vulnerability. In this area, it is important that we consider such decisions carefully to ensure that children are overall better off as a result of any changes and that such decisions are actually supported by evidence.

Of course, it is unsurprising that those opposite would carp and complain about this, as it is really quite commonplace over there. If we had said we would do A, those opposite would say we should do B. If we said we were going to do B, they would say we should do A. That is pretty much what happens on a daily basis. Almost every day we hear those opposite out there complaining about our health system despite the fact that they were largely responsible for the problems that we are facing.

This carping and complaining in this area has happened before, in the area of the meningococcal B vaccine program, when those opposite were pushing that we needed to move the bill through and immediately put in place their plans, but we said, 'No, we are going to listen to the experts. What is the best way of deploying our health resources to ensure the greatest outcome for our community?' We went away and talked to the experts in a working group.

Whereas the opposition were proposing that only children under the age of two should be vaccinated, we came up with a program supported by the experts that would target children up to the age of four, as well as late teens and early 20s—important cohorts responsible for transmitting that infection throughout the community. We did the work, we spoke to the experts and we came up with a better plan. What those opposite would have done was to go for the photo opportunity, the media press release, ram it out there so that they could jump up and down and tell everyone what a wonderful job they were doing, but in the end people would be worse off. That is not how this government has been operating or will operate.

Once again, we are trying to get the best outcome for our community. Given the immediate sense of urgency pushed by the member for Kaurua earlier and how it was so unfortunate that they could not pass their bill through the last parliament—and of course they had 16 years in government—it is worth pointing out that, whilst they found the time before parliament prorogued to ram through the legislation to remove the fairness clause, presumably because they thought they would get some kind of electoral benefit at some stage, apparently the immunisation of children was not quite as important an issue as they saw their electoral prospects. Of course, that is out there for everyone to see.

In closing, I would like to commend the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in the other place for his work in this important area and also more broadly commend him for his efforts in fixing up the

mess in health left to us by the former Labor government. I commend him for ensuring that our community is protected as best as possible from serious infectious diseases. This, of course, should be a priority for any government and it certainly is for this one. On this side, we will continue to work with the experts to ensure that we implement the best possible plan, supported by evidence, to ensure that the people of this state have the best possible health. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:28): I rise to support the South Australian Public Health (Early Childhood Services and Immunisation) Amendment Bill 2019, which is the first of two no jab no play bills that will be introduced into state parliament. The first phase of the government's no jab no play policy aims to improve the ability to prevent and control outbreaks of vaccine-preventable diseases in early childhood services.

The bill requires parents and guardians to provide immunisation records to the child's early childhood service, such as child care, family day care and long day care. It gives the Chief Public Health Officer the power to request those records from the service if satisfied that there is an outbreak, or risk of an outbreak, of a vaccine-preventable disease. It also enables the Chief Public Health Officer to exclude a child from the premises during an outbreak of a vaccine-preventable disease if the child has been diagnosed with a vaccine-preventable disease or is at material risk of contracting the vaccine-preventable disease.

It is important to note that most other states have the ability to exclude unimmunised children from an early childhood service when an outbreak is occurring. These new measures will help us reduce cases of vaccine-preventable diseases and facilitate a swift public health response to vaccine-preventable disease outbreaks. It is important to note that there is no provision for the routine exclusion of children who are not up to date with vaccinations or who are on a recognised immunisation catch-up program.

Immunisation is one of the most effective strategies to protect children and adults against serious diseases. Immunisation is also one of the most cost-effective health interventions and supported by the World Health Organization and all levels of government in Australia. Although immunisation coverage in South Australia is very good today, in most areas it falls short of the national aspirational immunisation coverage target set at 95 per cent. Statewide immunisation coverage in South Australia in the assessed age groups is between 86.83 per cent and 95.83 per cent, depending on the group. I hear that in the north-eastern suburbs it is actually quite high, and I commend the work done in our area and particularly supported by the local councils.

Increasing immunisation rates for children under five to as close to 100 per cent as possible is critical to ensure herd immunity and to protect children and adults from highly infectious diseases. The South Australian government is continuing to consult on further measures to improve overall vaccination rates, particularly on the proposed exclusion of unvaccinated children from attending an early childhood service. What we absolutely need to think about in this regard is the impact that might have on children and their early education.

We as a government will certainly be taking our time to make sure that we listen to experts in education and in health to make sure that we achieve the best outcomes for our South Australian community. Community consultation will be undertaken as well to inform the second no jab no play bill. A discussion paper will be released shortly that will investigate the experience of similar legislation in other Australian jurisdictions and explore potential options to further strengthen the protection of children against vaccine-preventable diseases.

An issue that will need to be considered is whether the role of preschool childhood education in maximising beneficial health and development outcomes for children during their school years is supported by strong evidence. The Royal Australasian College of Physicians raised concerns that the lack of access to early childhood education can be highly detrimental, especially from three to four years of age and especially if compounded by financial vulnerability. The South Australian Child Development Council has provided in-principle support for measures that focus on improving immunisation coverage rates, on recognising the complexity of the issues around no jab no play legislation and on the potential impact on human rights, such as the child's right to health and education.

Also being considered is the commonwealth no job no pay legislation. The Social Services Legislation Amendment (No Job, No Pay) Act 2015 provides that the parents of incompletely immunised children are not able to receive some government benefits. The no job no pay act directly impacts parents who receive the Family Tax Benefit Part A supplement and the Child Care Subsidy. Under the no job no pay act parents are still able to send incompletely immunised children to early childhood services, but they are unable to receive the usual government benefits.

Let's also consider Labor's bills, as on this side of the house we look to work and collaborate with our colleagues in this house on all important issues that affect the health of South Australians. On 27 September 2017, the South Australia Public Health (Immunisation and Early Childhood Services) Amendment Bill 2017 was introduced in the Legislative Council. However, the bill lapsed prior to consideration when parliament prorogued for the 2018 election. Amongst other proposed changes, the bill proposed that early childhood services could not allow the commencement and continuation of an enrolment of a child who was not age appropriately immunised, with the exception of those who met limited exclusion criteria.

On 4 July 2018, the member for Karna introduced the South Australia Public Health Amendment Bill 2018 as a private member's bill. On 2 April 2019, amendments were moved in the Legislative Council to the government's bill to prohibit an early childhood service from enrolling or providing service to a child who was incompletely vaccinated or for whom immunisation records had not been provided.

A child who was currently attending at a service and did not have vaccination maintained, or for whom the parents or guardians had not provided the immunisation records, would have to stop attending the service and hence interrupt their early education. The amendments were not supported by the Legislative Council. It is important for us as community representatives to reflect also at this time on the human rights perspectives, while deliberating the bill and the second no job no play bill.

The World Health Organization has stated that immunisation is a proven tool for controlling and eliminating life-threatening, infectious diseases and is estimated to avert between two million and three million deaths each year. It is one of the most cost-effective health investments. It has also stated that vaccines are very safe and that you are far more likely to be seriously injured by a vaccine-preventable disease than by a vaccine.

For example, in the case of polio, the disease can cause paralysis, measles can cause encephalitis and blindness and some vaccine-preventable diseases can even result in death. While any serious injury or death caused by vaccines is one too many, the benefits of vaccination greatly outweigh the risk and many, many more injuries and deaths would occur without vaccines. The World Health Organization states that vaccines are very safe, but not 100 per cent effective or risk free, and many parents remain concerned about a potential risk of any severe adverse consequence for their own children.

Having two children myself, I can certainly relate to parents' concern for eliminating any risk to their children's health, but I also wish every child to have every chance of a full education. That is why on behalf of King constituents I support the bill to enable the Chief Public Health Officer to exclude a child from the premises during an outbreak of a vaccine-preventable disease and if the child has been diagnosed with a vaccine-preventable disease or is at material risk of contracting the vaccine-preventable disease. I also support the important community consultation process that will be undertaken to inform the second no job no pay bill.

I will read carefully the discussion paper to be released shortly that will investigate the experience of similar legislation in other Australian jurisdictions and explore potential options to further strengthen the protection of children against vaccine-preventable diseases. This is an important bill, which we should work together on across this house for the benefit of the health of the South Australian community so that more children in South Australia can reach their full potential.

I note the support already today for the bill across our government, and I commend members for their caring approach to early childhood outcomes and the best health outcomes for South Australians.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:39): I understand from the whip that the opposition would like to go into committee. I know that the shadow minister has some amendments filed that he wants to discuss, which is certainly his prerogative, and we are willing to do that. The government is not inclined towards the amendments as I understand them but is happy to hear what the opposition wants to put forward and have them discussed in committee.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PICTON: In relation to this bill, my understanding from what the minister said is that this bill is step 1, or bill 1, and there is going to be a bill 2, which may or may not include an actual no job no play provision as part of it. Apparently, the second bill, which may or may not include no job no play, is going to follow some consultation. My question to the minister is: has the government commenced consultation on bill 2 and, if not, when is that going to start?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The shadow minister is quite correct in that we plan to do this in two phases. It is no mystery. It is no secret. The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been very clear about that. The second reading speech that I just provided does exactly the same. The reality is that, while the South Australian opposition suggests that we do everything that is considered to be done in one go, other states have made other choices. In fact, one state—Western Australia, I think it is—is proposing a three-stage approach. We are participating in a two-stage approach.

We are very comfortable that the two-stage approach is the right way to go. Subject to the will of the parliament, we propose to have this bill pass parliament as it is and then move on to the public consultation. The things that the opposition would like to have considered immediately will be consulted upon. I heard the shadow minister say in his contribution that he believes that has already happened to his satisfaction. My interest is the satisfaction of the actual minister, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing.

To the question raised by the shadow minister in regard to when the consultation will actually start, the consultation papers are being drafted as we speak. I do not have an exact date, but I know that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing is not one to dawdle. He will try to get on with it as expediently as he possibly can.

Mr PICTON: Well, that fills me with a lot of confidence. My second question is: what form will this consultation to start at some stage take, and when does the government plan to conclude the consultation?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The form of the consultation will be pretty standard. Public consultation papers will be put out for the public, whether they be parents, caregivers, medical professionals or educators, to consider and provide feedback on. It is pretty straightforward. However, I will remind the shadow minister of something I said in the middle of the third page of my second reading explanation: 'Our starting point is to legislate to exclude children from early childhood services if they are not vaccinated.' That was specifically with regard to the proposals that we put forward to be consulted on. That is what we will be putting out there. That will be our starting point for consultation but, of course, the end point will as always be guided by that consultation and the feedback that we get from it.

Mr PICTON: I will ask the second part of the last question again: when does the government plan to conclude the consultation, and also when does the government anticipate that parliament will be presented with the second bill that the government intends to introduce?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I cannot tell the shadow minister when we will finish because, as he knows, I cannot tell him when we will start. I have already given him an assurance that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing will approach this in an expedient but sensible and careful fashion—

Mr Picton: Why doesn't he start now?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —because that is exactly the way the Minister for Health and Wellbeing would want to go about it—sensibly. The shadow minister interjects and asks why does it not start now. He already knows the answer to that question. It does not start now because the public consultation papers are being prepared. It is very likely that if I had said to the shadow minister, 'We're ready to go; we're starting tomorrow,' he would accuse me of having pre-empted the will of the house.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr PICTON: I just have a couple more questions, which I will ask on this clause, then we can shoot right through to clause 4, if you like, where we have the amendments. This will not take too long, I promise. Can the minister outline what percentage of childcare centres already take steps to collect immunisation records?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Around 98 per cent.

Mr PICTON: Can the minister clarify whether the Chief Public Health Officer already has powers within the Public Health Act that could enable him to request other records of immunisation from childcare centres?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Other records? Other than what?

Mr PICTON: Does the Chief Public Health Officer have the ability to request and require the production of immunisation records from childcare centres under the Public Health Act?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Chief Public Health Officer can currently ask for immunisation records for a child with a notifiable condition.

Mr PICTON: Can the Chief Public Health Officer under the Public Health Act, at the moment, stop an unvaccinated child from attending a childcare centre in the event of an outbreak of a notifiable condition?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The shadow minister asked whether the Chief Public Health Officer has the right to exclude an unvaccinated child. The information that I have is not specific to an unvaccinated child, but it does answer the question nonetheless because the unvaccinated child will be within the group of all children. The Chief Public Health Officer can currently exclude a child or children from an early childhood service if he or she has reasonable grounds to believe that a person has, or has been exposed to, a controlled notifiable condition and that a public health order is reasonably required in the interests of public health and that urgent action is required in the circumstances of the particular case, and counselling can be provided after action is taken.

While I understand the question was asking whether the Chief Public Health Officer can exclude an unvaccinated child, the Chief Public Health Officer, as I understand it, could, if he or she chooses, exclude an unvaccinated or a vaccinated child.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr PICTON: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Picton-1]—

Page 4, after line 15 [clause 4, inserted section 96A]—After the present contents of inserted section 96A (now to be designated as subsection (1)) insert:

- (2) For the purposes of this Part, a child *meets the immunisation requirements* if—
 - (a) an extract, or extracts, from the Australian Immunisation Register under the *Australian Immunisation Register Act 2015* of the Commonwealth indicates that the immunisation status of the child is up to date; or

- (b) a document of a kind approved by the Chief Public Health Officer indicates that the child meets the immunisation requirements within the meaning of the *A New Tax System (Family Assistance) Act 1999* of the Commonwealth; or
- (c) a certificate in writing issued by the Chief Public Health Officer indicates that the child meets the immunisation requirements.

This amendment sets up the definition of 'immunisation requirements'. Those requirements obviously follow through to the second amendment that I will move in relation to implementing a proper no job no play requirement. However, I will speak briefly to the immunisation requirements.

What was in our original bill that was introduced to the parliament in 2017, which I have introduced into this parliament as a private member's bill and is replicated here, is that those immunisation requirements should be the same as those the Turnbull Liberal government introduced in terms of the no job no pay legislation so that there are similar requirements under the register as there are for that. Obviously, I think the larger thrust of the debate will be with the second amendment, but the first amendment deals with the requirements that are needed for the second amendment to happen.

Amendment negatived.

Mr PICTON: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Picton-1]—

Page 4, after line 41—After inserted section 96B insert:

96BA—Prohibition on providing early childhood services to child not meeting immunisation requirements

- (1) A person who provides an early childhood service must not enrol a child for the provision of the service and must suspend the existing enrolment of a child if—
 - (a) immunisation records relating to the child have not been provided to the person in accordance with section 96B(1); or
 - (b) the child does not, according to immunisation records provided in accordance with section 96B(1), meet the immunisation requirements.

Maximum penalty: \$30,000.

- (2) A person must not provide an early childhood service to a child if—
 - (a) immunisation records relating to the child have not been provided to the person in accordance with section 96B(1); or
 - (b) the child does not, according to immunisation records provided in accordance with section 96B(1), meet the immunisation requirements.

Maximum penalty: \$30,000.

This is the major amendment that is being moved in my name. This really changes this pathetic excuse for a bill from the government into a bill that actually does something—an actual no job no play piece of legislation. It will prevent unvaccinated children from being able to attend preschool, which is, if you believe what the minister just said a moment ago, is the government's intention for a second piece of legislation to come down the track. However, I did hear some of the contribution from the member for King that suggested that that was a bad idea, so I am very confused as to exactly what the position of the government is and whether or not they want to do that.

Nevertheless, we know what the legislation is required to look like because the work was done back in 2017. It has been sitting there for 18 months for this parliament to debate. We believe we should do it now. We should put this in the legislation now. We should make sure that kids are protected now.

As I outlined in my second reading speech, this not only affects kids whose parents and families want their kids to be vaccinated and protected through herd immunity but also, importantly, those kids who cannot be vaccinated because of their medical conditions and who rely on the herd immunity of other kids to make sure that they are vaccinated against these preventable diseases. As was very articulately outlined in the speech by the member for Newland, they are diseases that have been cured through vaccines.

We can make sure that our children in South Australia are protected. We can move this amendment now. The government has not even written a consultation paper. They do not know when the consultation is going to happen. They do not know when they are going to bring back a second bill and they do not know what is going to be part of it. We did the consultation in 2017. We did the drafting back in 2017. It has been sitting here for 18 months.

Let's pass it now, just like the Liberal government did in New South Wales, just like the federal Liberal government did with no jab no pay laws, and just like the Liberal Party in Victoria has supported with no jab no play laws there. So I move the amendment standing in my name to bring in proper no jab no play laws in South Australia.

The CHAIR: The member for Waite wishes to speak.

Mr DULUK: If I may, I wish to ask some questions of the member for Kaurua regarding his amendment.

The CHAIR: You have the call.

Mr DULUK: The member for Kaurua, in relation to your amendment as tabled, I want to know which health and education groups or similar advocacy groups support Labor's amendments.

Mr PICTON: Thank you very much to the member for Waite. This is an area that was discussed in detail in 2017 when we did a vast public consultation. The government has access to all that information. You only need to ring the Minister for Health to get access to that information. All of those consultations occurred back then. The government has all that information.

Back then, the Liberal Party was supporting this. In fact, *The Advertiser* was running a story before the election in December 2017 saying that the Liberal Party would be the better bet to get proper no jab no play laws passed in South Australia. But here we have the government delaying the introduction of these laws to South Australia when we have had the consultation. The whole community was consulted in exactly the same way that the minister outlined he is proposing to do now, so let's get this legislation done and stop delaying it.

Mr DULUK: I have a further question. What health or education groups have come out in support of Labor's proposed amendments. I am not talking about 2017; I am talking about the ones tabled in the house right now. Who have they consulted with for these amendments?

Mr PICTON: The member for Waite will be delighted to know that these are exactly word for word what was proposed by the government in 2017. We did that consultation in 2017. We know exactly where everybody stands. There clearly is broad support in the community for this. There are obviously some people who do not support it, but I do not think that is a reason for us to delay action on this, which supposedly, according to the Minister for Energy, is something the government is minded to do. So let's get this done. Let's stop delaying it and bring in these laws that the South Australian community supports. It is in place in Victoria and New South Wales, and this is exactly word for word what was drafted and consulted on in 2017.

Mr DULUK: Can the member for Kaurua please outline which groups were consulted in 2017?

Mr PICTON: The member for Waite knows full well because he is in the government and has access to all that information. All that information is publicly available. All those groups were consulted with.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

Mr PICTON: A wide variety of groups were consulted with, a huge number of people responded, and in fact—

Mr DULUK: You could at least say the AMA, surely.

Mr PICTON: The government has all that information. You only need to ask the officers here who will give you the bundle of files. Let's be clear: there were a huge number of anti-vaxers who opposed this, who did not like what the then Weatherill government was proposing in these exact

words. I do not think that that is the reason, member for Waite, that we should be stopping this. I do not think that is a reason we should stop doing what is in place in Victoria, what is in place in New South Wales and what is about to be in place in Western Australia.

Exactly the same thing is going to happen now when you do this second round of consultations on your supposed inclination to bring in a similar bill. You are going to get all the anti-vaxers coming out opposing it. You are going to get a huge number of people who are anti-vaxers from around the world. As I said in my second reading speech, I believe it is a very small minority of people in South Australia who believe this, but they are particularly noisy, and I do not believe that that number of people should be able to stop the vast majority of South Australians who believe in this and want to see action occur.

Mr PEDERICK: I am interested to know at least one body that the member for Kurna consulted with back in 2017. He is quite condescending about our plans for consultation, but at this stage he has not told us about one body—just one is all I want to know—he consulted with in 2017. He is telling us that there was broad consultation, yet I have not heard of one actual group he consulted with, and I would like to for the benefit of the house.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Not the one the member for Waite told you about.

Mr PICTON: A huge number of people were consulted with. You only have to go to the Department for Health to get access to the list of people who were consulted, if you have these particular questions on the 2017 consultation. I have replicated word for word what was drafted back then following the consultation that occurred and following what was a decision by the government.

As I understood back then, there was supposedly an indication from the opposition at that time before the election to say that they were supportive of this, so much so that *The Advertiser* then responded, back in 2017, to say that the Liberal Party might be the surer bet to get these laws passed. That has turned out to be completely bogus because here we have the Liberal Party not just holding up introducing these laws but now filibustering my attempt to bring in these laws through an amendment.

They clearly fear whatever anti-vaxer groups are ringing their electorate offices saying that they do not want these laws to happen. I think that is very concerning. I think this needs to happen now. I think these laws should be passed, just as supported by the Victorian Liberal Party, just as supported by the New South Wales Liberal Party, just as supported by Liberal prime minister Malcolm Turnbull and just as supported by the Liberal Party in Western Australia. Why is South Australia any different? Why are we behind the eight ball when we are seeing a movement to these nationally to protect children in other states but not here?

Mr PEDERICK: I am still intrigued that the former health minister cannot name one organisation he consulted with back in 2017. Please, just give us one group as the former health minister.

Mr PICTON: Well, I was never the health minister.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Notwithstanding the fact that the shadow minister has been asked on five occasions to name one organisation that supports his amendment and he is unable to do that, the reality is that, in his own words not too long ago and based on the advice that I am given right now, amendment No. 2 requires the passage of amendment No. 1, which has already been defeated. Amendment No. 1 is not going to pass this house. I am advised that amendment No. 2 is not of any use without amendment No. 1.

I would also like to make it very clear that the comments made by the shadow minister, that we are avoiding action, are deliberately misleading. I have made it very clear that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, his ministerial office and, no doubt, his department will take action on this matter expediently. The shadow cannot tell the house even one member, having been asked five times. In fact, one of them was even suggested to him to be the AMA, but he did not even latch on to that and say, 'Yes, the AMA,' so perhaps the AMA is not one.

The government does not support this amendment, and the shadow minister knows that. Even to seek for this amendment to be passed right now is really a waste of the house's time, given

that amendment No. 1 did not pass and, I am advised, that amendment No. 2 requires amendment No. 1.

The CHAIR: Member for Waite, you have had three questions already.

Mr DULUK: It was two. One last one, sir.

Mr PICTON: No. I do not get three questions.

The CHAIR: I have given you flexibility at times in the past, member for Kaurna.

Mr PICTON: Never.

The CHAIR: Yes.

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Chair, for your indulgence. As one final question to the member for Kaurna, has the Child Development Council raised any concerns with the shadow in relation to his amendments?

Mr PICTON: I will take that on notice and get the member for Waite an answer.

Mr COWDREY: Has the opposition member had any concerns raised with him by the Royal Australasian College of Physicians in regard to the amendment proposed?

Mr PICTON: I think that the Royal Australasian College of Physicians has been on the record, in fact, as saying that it is opposed to what the government is saying is its inclination to support in terms of restricting children from attending.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

Mr PICTON: I am sorry member for Waite; I will answer myself. What the royal college has said is that it does not support this in any form. It has said that to the government, it has said that to us. I disagree with that. There are a number of people who disagree with that. Clearly, the government has said that it is their inclination to bring in the restriction of unvaccinated children from attending childcare centres, so that would be in breach of what the Royal Australasian College of Physicians has said in its submission as well.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 17

Noes 23

Majority 6

AYES

Bedford, F.E.

Brock, G.G.

Hildyard, K.A.

Malinauskas, P.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.

Close, S.E.

Hughes, E.J.

Michaels, A.

Picton, C.J. (teller)

Wortley, D.

Boyer, B.I.

Gee, J.P.

Koutsantonis, A.

Mullighan, S.C.

Stinson, J.M.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.

Cregan, D.

Gardner, J.A.W.

Luethen, P.

Murray, S.

Pisoni, D.G.

Tarzia, V.A.

Whetstone, T.J.

Chapman, V.A.

Duluk, S.

Harvey, R.M. (teller)

Marshall, S.S.

Patterson, S.J.R.

Sanderson, R.

Teague, J.B.

Wingard, C.L.

Cowdrey, M.J.

Ellis, F.J.

Knoll, S.K.

McBride, N.

Pederick, A.S.

Speirs, D.J.

van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr PICTON: There are a couple of other subsequent amendments. I accept the will of the house not to support those amendments, but I will continue to move them and be defeated without division. In that vein, I accordingly move:

Amendment No 3 [Picton-1]—

Page 6, after line 21 [clause 4, inserted section 96D]—After inserted section 96D(5) insert:

(5a) For the avoidance of doubt, a child may be excluded from premises under this section irrespective of whether the child meets the immunisation requirements or not.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I thank the shadow minister for his efficient way of going about this. As previously indicated, the government does not support the amendment.

Amendment negatived.

Mr PICTON: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Picton-1]—

Page 7, line 10 [clause 4, inserted section 96E(4), penalty clause]—Delete '\$2,500' and insert '\$30,000'

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The government does not support the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:13): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 April 2019.)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (17:13): I rise in response to the Supply Bill in my capacity as shadow minister for trade, tourism and investment. I take this opportunity to hold the government to account on this important economic portfolio—a portfolio that is responsible for delivering billions of dollars of economic activity to our state.

The primary agencies responsible for the oversight and delivery of these economic benefits are the South Australian Tourism Commission and the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment. The commission is a statutory body under the South Australian Tourism Commission Act 1993. They describe themselves as being focused on marketing our state to national and international audiences and on bringing new and exciting events, conferences and festivals to South Australia.

The role of the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment, which was formed on 1 July 2018, is to support businesses to connect with overseas markets, create strong international relationships and capitalise on export opportunities. The opposition supports the overarching objectives of both these public sector agencies. However, the opposition will not stand for the complete lack of leadership and lack of direction the Liberal government has provided.

Let's talk about tourism in its first year of government: an \$11 million cut out of the budget overnight in an industry that employs 36,000 South Australians. Forty per cent of tourism spend is in

the regions, which are an incredibly important part of our economy. This \$11 million cut has sent the industry backwards.

This means that we are behind in a very competitive industry. It is a short-sighted decision by this very new Treasurer, who is desperately looking around for efficiencies and savings. He says, 'No-one is going to notice this much. We'll just cut \$11 million from the budget,' but people have noticed. Not only have the people who invest in tourism and who work in tourism noticed but the facts will stand for themselves when we get the tourism results and we see where we stand.

Tourism Research Australia is the group that puts together all the consolidated information of facts and figures. International visitors are down 3.2 per cent, international visitor spend is down 3.5 per cent and international visit nights are down 9 per cent. This is what happens when you cut \$11 million from the budget. Our regional day trips are down as well. We know that areas such as the Barossa, McLaren Vale and the Limestone Coast, many of which are experiencing drought, are seeing this impact of the downturn. There is a \$70 million difference in regional day trips in the last 12 months compared with the previous 12 months.

Tourism is booming everywhere else. This afternoon we have had some new figures. The Tourism Satellite Account from Tourism Research Australia offers us some very detailed analysis about tourism in Australia. When they refer to the longer term, tourism has become a more important part of Australia's economy; it now has a 3.1 per cent share of the national GDP. Tourism is a resilient industry. Even though it had slowed down over the global financial crisis, tourism has continued to grow, and domestic tourism has driven growth.

We know that tourism is a supergrowth industry, and we have some pockets in South Australia that continue to grow. However, we now know that the current \$6.8 billion value of the economic contribution of the South Australian visitor economy is down \$100 million from earlier valuations. When you cut \$11 million from the budget, it has an impact. This comes at a boom time for all other states, particularly those whose state governments and territory governments are backing spend in tourism.

As we come up to the next state budget, people are very concerned that another cut is going to come. We need to make sure that South Australia gets its fair share of the national tourism market, and that means that there is a recognition by this government that tourism is important. Tourism is a huge employer. Tourism gives economic growth throughout the whole of South Australia. Rather than being ignored or rather than the belief that no-one will notice, tourism needs to be supported.

As we come up to the next state budget, you will hear me talk about 'tourism equals jobs'. What I want to do is create an awareness of the importance of tourism. I want to make sure that it is not ignored again. I want to make sure that, as the pie of tourism is growing in Australia at a great rate, we are not missing out. I want our fair share, but we have to go out and grab it.

I also want to talk about the other aspects of my shadow portfolio. I particularly want to talk about the trade area. When it comes to trade investment, this government has brought nothing but chaos and confusion. In its first year, the Marshall Liberal government abolished two successful investment attraction agencies, made two machinery of government changes and had a mass exodus of senior trade officials. In fact, it was described as 'a bureaucratic bloodbath' gutting the trade agency, with deep cuts and half a dozen officials shown the door. This is our agency that sells South Australia to the world. It is about attracting companies here and creating jobs. Yet what we have seen is this continual change.

First of all, the new government says, 'We are going to change the department.' Okay, that is your prerogative, and then, 'It is not going to be the Department of State Development; we are going to split it to be Infrastructure and Skills and we are going to have the Department of Trade, Tourism and Investment. We are going to get rid of Investment Attraction SA and we are going to dismiss health industries. That's how we are going to do it. We are going to set up the new department on 1 July.' Fantastic.

We get to estimates and I ask, 'Can I have an organisational chart?' They reply, 'We are not quite there yet.' I am still waiting for an organisational chart. We have now had a second machinery of government change, starting on 1 April. We now have a new title, Innovations and Skills, reflecting

the focus of the department, but we have just seen more additions to the Department of Trade, Tourism and Investment. At the same time, we have lost a CE—who knows when we are going to get another one—and I think up to six officials have gone. How can they be concentrating on our trade when this is happening?

While all these things are happening, the government decides to have a review, the Joyce review, which has come out just recently. It is a review that provided recommendations that it must invest in a different way. What this means is that 13 months after forming government there is still no clear direction in the way our state will conduct its trade and investment strategies.

I have talked about the organisational chart that still cannot be provided to me. The other area I have raised time and time again is having a forward calendar of trade missions. There was much criticism of the previous minister, that is, 'You are doing too much; you are going there,' but what we have now is nothing. There is no ability for businesses to plan ahead. With a calendar that is produced in advance, you know people in your businesses, in your areas, need to know if they are going to invest to go on these trade missions. In 2018, only 52 South Australians went on outbound trade missions overseas. This is in massive contrast with 2016 and 2017, when more than 400 delegates went out there to sell our state.

We know that the government has an interim program because of the Joyce review, a review that cost us \$108,000 for 17 days' work; that is \$6,381 per day. I am sure it was worth it, but it is a fair bit of kit. What does the review say? The first thing it says is that we should call a halt to this idea about trade offices. The big election commitment was to roll out trade offices in Japan, Malaysia, Dubai, probably one in the US and, I think, in KL in Malaysia, but the review said, 'Let's call a halt to increasing the number of new trade offices.' There was also a recommendation to be more strategic about trade missions.

I had a bit of a sense of *deja vu* when I read the Joyce report because it seemed to me that we were going back to very similar recommendations made in previous reviews that occurred many years ago that the Labor government adopted. Further, we see that the growth agenda that was announced is simply just a rehash of elements of the state strategic plan that this government dismantled, so when we are thinking about trade and investment policies we are just going back to the future. It is like history repeating itself without considering lessons from the past.

During the 2018 election campaign, the Premier promised an export-led recovery of the state economy, but under his watch the minister and the Premier have presided over South Australia's worst trade performance in 30 years. This is a trade slump that has led to a significant decline in the national share of exports—a measure that this government uses as a benchmark.

The Joyce review also talked about a program of trade missions. Once again, a little bit like the organisational chart, I asked time and time again: what is your plan? How do people know that you are going to go on a trade mission? How do people know that there is an inbound mission happening? I got the answer that they show an expression of interest. That is not a way to plan. That is not a way that you can say to South Australians that we are serious about trade. That is not a way that you can say to people, 'Let's work together and let me support you when we go away overseas,' so we know we are back to the future again.

The Joyce review has said that those trade missions should have a forward calendar so that people can be part of that. When it comes to tourism, trade and investment, I call on this government to get its act together. The opportunities for growing our exports and tourism are out there for our state to take advantage of, but in order to do this, the minister and this government need to provide direction and lead from the front.

These areas of our economy are too important. Tourism is a huge contributor to our economy and a huge employer. It must have the attention it deserves. We have been given mixed messages on trade. I cannot believe that we say we are going to do one thing, we change our minds, we get rid of half of the department and then we say, 'Hang on, we are just going to go back to what we did before.' Get it together. This is important for our future because we are at the lowest slump in exports that we have been in for decades. Every other place is going great guns in tourism and we are going backwards. It is simply not good enough.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (17:28): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill and, in particular, an issue of government spending cuts that has particularly affected members of the Enfield electorate. Prior to my arrival in this place, the Marshall Liberal government announced that it was closing three Service SA centres in the last budget. One of those three Service SA centres is the Prospect Service SA centre in Northpark Shopping Centre in the Enfield electorate. That service centre provides vital services to my constituents. In particular, it provides vital services to those who have no internet access in my electorate, which particularly targets the elderly and those who cannot afford to have internet access, and people who have limited English skills.

The Prospect Service SA centre was the third busiest centre in the state in the last few years. In the 2016-17 financial year, more than 104,000 South Australians went through and used that centre and it processed 269,000 transactions that year. The Prospect Service SA centre is not being closed because of declining use; this is clear on the facts. In the 2017-18 financial year, according to the government's own numbers 105,000 South Australians used the centre and it processed over 277,000 transactions.

I go into the Northpark Shopping Centre quite regularly and I often see long line-ups—in fact, they go out of the door on many occasions. Again, this is supported by facts, with a 20 per cent increase in waiting times in the last financial year. The Minister for Transport says that 82 per cent of transactions processed through Service SA can be done online. That may well be right, but I think the minister might discover that people are not choosing to stand in long lines at Northpark Shopping Centre because they think it is fun or because they have nothing better to do. Most of them are there because they actually have no other choice. These are the most vulnerable people in our community.

If the Marshall Liberal government cannot provide adequate services to the people who really need them in South Australia, I question what they are doing with their time. Getting involved in building fancy hotels is not helping the people who need government support. In particular, in my electorate there are elderly people who do not know how to use a computer or who are on the pension and simply cannot afford the internet, and there are people who cannot speak English well and need face-to-face contact. Indeed, many services provided by Service SA centres have to be done in person, such as renewing a driver's licence or getting a proof of age card.

The ABS tells us that 17.5 per cent of South Australian households do not have internet access at home and that 15 per cent of South Australians do not use the internet at all. Many of my constituents do not have the luxury of being able to afford the internet, and this cut is going to affect them severely. The Marshall Liberal government seems not to care about these people and has abandoned them. Many of my constituents have asked time and time again, 'Why exactly is the government closing Service SA? We can see it's so busy?' The only answer I can give them is that it is cost cutting; it is as simple as that.

Given all the frustration and all the worry that this has caused—not only to the people of the Enfield electorate but, as we have heard time and time again from the member for Florey, to her electorate and even to the member for Adelaide's electorate—I can tell you that the total budget savings for the closure of Prospect are \$1.2 million per year and only \$3.1 million per year for all three centres. If you compare that with the \$20 million plus that KordaMentha is being paid per year to run a hospital for the government, I hope that it puts the cuts in perspective. I hope that will be considered by the government in its next budget and when making its spending decisions.

I want to know if the government closes down the Prospect Service SA centre where my constituents are going to go to apply for a driver's licence, renew their car registration and get their disabled parking permit. If the government is going to close down one of the busiest Service SA centres in the state, what measures are going to be put in place in the next budget for the surrounding centres? What will the government do about the increased waiting times due to the influx of these people going to other nearby centres? I am new to this, but I would have thought that these are prudent questions to ask before a slash-and-burn budget announcement over six months ago and that they are perhaps the sorts of questions that might be considered by the government in framing its next budget.

I understand that more than 15,000 South Australians have signed petitions to keep the three Service SA centres open. I stand with those South Australians in calling for the government to reverse

its decision to close the Service SA centres, and I ask minister Knoll to urgently provide the community with some certainty about the issue, given that the announcement was over six months ago, and in particular before the next budget.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I will acknowledge the former member for Schubert and Custance, Ivan Venning. Welcome. I assume that you are in for dinner tonight, Ivan.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (17:35): It is a great innovation to have the digital recording of parliament because you can look up and see a confused look on the faces of people in the chamber and realise, 'Was I perhaps meant to be in the chamber?' You can assure yourself that that is the case and quickly get down here.

I rise to speak about the Supply Bill. This is a bill that is a peculiar aspect of our parliamentary system, where we basically give a big cheque to the government to spend a lot of money. We do that without any detail on what they want to spend that money on. We do it for a few months on the basis of granting some parliamentary approval before the actual budget is passed through both chambers of parliament to enable there not to be a reduction in or a cease of the supply of services in the state, which is very important. Obviously the opposition is supporting that supply. We do not want to do what the Fraser opposition did in 1975 and block supply, because we want schools and hospitals to remain open.

Mr Pederick: And you probably want to get paid—just that minor thing.

Mr PICTON: I think there is some detailed parliamentary questioning about whether parliament continues to operate even without supply being granted. Be that as it may, this is an important point at which we remark upon how the government is spending its money, how the government has decided that it should spend its money, how it should budget its money and how it should provide services in this state.

Wearing my hat as both the shadow minister for health and wellbeing and the member for Kaurna, I have particular concerns with what we have seen from this government over the past 14 months in terms of their decision-making on priorities for this state. Their priorities so far have been cuts, closures and privatisations. We have seen that in health, where, in an unprecedented move, corporate liquidators have been appointed to run some of our largest hospitals. They have been given the job not of improving clinical outcomes, not of making sure that patients are seen better, not so that we are listening more to our doctors and nurses; they have been given the job of cutting money out of our health system.

They have been tasked with cutting \$460 million out of the health system over three years. For the first year of that, we saw the health minister patting himself on the back this week, saying what a good job he has done. It was very easy. They set themselves the target of \$41 million. Apparently, most of that they got from updating their coding and updating the backlog of coding paperwork they had from when the move to the new hospital took place. That is pretty routine to do a catch-up of that. They have also done what other hospitals have been doing, particularly the Flinders Medical Centre, in trying to reduce the number of agency nurses. That has saved some money, and it is a good thing to do, and we were certainly embarking on that as a strategy previously.

But what we see is that the vast majority of the cuts that KordaMentha has been brought in to make are going to impact patients. They are going to impact beds, they are going to impact the number of operations performed in hospital and they are going to impact the number of doctors, nurses and other staff. That \$460 million includes 180 beds that are going to close at our hospitals.

It sets only 11 as a target in the first year but by the end of the third year there will be 180 beds closed every single night on average across the two major hospitals, the RAH and The QEH.

We also see that there are targets for reducing the number of operations. The equivalent of some 3,500 hip operations is their target to reduce the number of operations. These are not just some back-office savings. We had the health minister talking about savings on stationery that could be made—good and well, let's save some money on stationery—but to save \$460 million at a hospital? This is about patients, doctors and nurses; it is about health services for the people of South Australia.

People are not stopping in terms of going to a hospital. We are seeing demand continue. Day after day, we regularly see our emergency departments at Code White. Almost every single night now we have at least one hospital at Code White, and quite often almost every single hospital is at Code White. That is where the emergency department is so overcrowded that they are at emergency levels.

We have seen ramping become an absolutely rampant (pardon the pun) issue where almost every single day ramping is occurring at some of our major hospitals. We have also seen a huge increase over the past year in terms of the number of patients who stay in emergency departments longer than 24 hours. Every single day we see too many patients stuck waiting for a hospital bed and, quite regularly, that is 80 to 90 patients a day. That has meant that very often we have about 10 patients a day who have been stuck in emergency departments waiting for access to a bed, which is not acceptable.

When we were in government, we worked methodically to bring that number down and we had brought that number down. We have now seen that number go up dramatically under this government. We have seen that this government's priority has been closing beds. They have closed 25 beds at Hampstead, where there is an empty ward sitting there that was operating until late November. We have seen a reduction in 16 beds at Flinders Medical Centre for medical patients. These are the vast majority of patients who need a bed from the emergency department at what is the state's busiest emergency department. There are now 16 fewer beds at Flinders Medical Centre because of the cuts of this government.

We have 10 beds sitting at Glenside that are empty. Meanwhile, the number of mental health patients stuck in emergency departments continues to grow. We do not have those beds open, we do not have the beds open at Flinders, we do not have them open at Hampstead. The government seems to be saying that they might close Hampstead, although there are no definitive plans on how they are going to do that or when that is going to happen. They might be closing St Margaret's, but there are no plans there.

All over the system we are seeing cuts and we are seeing corporate liquidators being put in charge, but what takes the cake is what we are seeing with SA Pathology. We are seeing potentially the whole thing being sold off to the highest bidder. The government is saying that in 11 months' time they might well sell off all of SA Pathology and leave us without a public pathology provider in this state. That will inevitably lead to higher costs for patients; less access for people, particularly in regional areas; slower response times; more tests being sent interstate and overseas; more jobs being sent interstate and overseas.

Inevitably that is what private laboratories do: they will move those jobs out of this state, and it will mean that we will not be teaching or training the next generation of workers. We will also not have the ability to do research in South Australia. This is a very dangerous proposition of privatisation that this government seems to be embarking upon when it comes to SA Pathology. We will fight them every step of the way on that because it is absolutely unacceptable. It is going to put health care in our state backwards. It is going to leave patients much worse off in this state.

We are already seeing a range of cuts that the government is proposing out of a PwC report it has received in terms of pathology. We have already seen that that includes closing collection centres. We have seen that that includes reducing opening hours, cutting many staff across our pathology services, and also it is going to include closing what is one of the most important areas of pathology, which is the excellent work we do in genetics in South Australia.

It is not only treating kids who have particularly bad issues such as bloodborne cancers and diseases, it is not only helping neonatal kids who have been born with particular genetic issues, it is not only helping kids before they are even born, while they are still in the womb, but it is also leading the next research and leading the next discoveries. We are really seeing massive progress being made on a whole range of different cancers and other diseases through genetics work.

If we close that, if we say goodbye to that, then not only are we depriving patients in South Australia of those services and the ability to access those services but we are also denying them the ability to access the next wave of technology and the next wave of treatments that could be available to them. That is an absolutely retrograde step. It is highly opposed by the key clinical groups in South Australia, who see that this is something that should stay open and should be more supported rather than less.

We have also seen this government decide to cut a whole range of different services in the health area such as SHINE SA and HIV services. These important clinical services help to divert people away from emergency departments and stay healthy in the community. We have had two clinics close. We have seen the northern suburbs clinic at Davoren Park close and the southern suburbs clinic at Noarlunga close, right in the areas where we need those health services. In those areas of need, those SHINE SA clinics are now closed. People now have to make the journey into the city.

The government say that they do not think it is a good idea, but they are the ones who cut funding to SHINE SA, forcing them to do this. They forced them to do this through their budget cuts and through their priorities in this budget, which is disgraceful. We have also seen the government single out a number of organisations, one being the HIV services provided through Centacare. They ran a service called Cheltenham Place, which provided care for sufferers of HIV and provided support for people who have what is obviously a horrible condition. The government has cut all funding to that and it is now closed. That is another closure that has occurred under them.

We have also seen the government cut all the funding to the Health Consumers Alliance, the organisation that is there to provide advocacy for patients to make sure that our health system is improving and that it listens to patients, not just to health bureaucrats. The government does not want to see them anymore, so they have cut all funding to them. They either will be forced to close or will stagger along with fewer resources and less ability to advocate on behalf of patients and also to train the next generation of patient advocates to speak up on behalf of patients and consumers in our health services.

We have also seen the government say that they now intend to close and cut the Mental Health Commission in South Australia. It is an organisation that minister Wade himself called for in opposition. The minister himself said in estimates that he had no intention of closing it. The government have now said that they intend to close this service, which is particularly disturbing for all those groups who work in mental health, particularly mental health consumers. They see the importance of a commission that provides independent advice and independent oversight of not just mental health services but how this state responds to the challenges of mental health and how it can have a preventative mindset to prevent mental health issues from occurring or getting worse in this state.

These are all retrograde steps that are happening under this government. We still have a lot more pain to come. It looks like the government is trying to butter people up for more cuts coming in next year's budget. I hope that is not the case because we have seen the impacts of those cuts already. In my own electorate, we have seen not only the impact of the SHINE SA cut that has taken away that service from the people of the southern suburbs but also the huge impact of the cuts that have already happened in terms of public transport.

The south has been singled out for cuts to public transport in a way that other areas of the state have not. We have seen the outer southern and outer northern suburbs, where people have the greatest tyranny of distance, be singled out by cuts from this eastern suburbs minded government. We have not seen many cuts at all in the eastern suburbs. We also have not seen many cuts in the Hills where the government has a lot of seats, which is pretty coincidental, but we see the outer north and the outer south being hit hard with cuts.

The government's line is, 'We've got these ghost buses running around with no passengers on them.' I actually put in the FOI to ask the government what the passenger data is for those buses that have been cut in my electorate. It turns out that some of those buses had quite a number of people on them. For each one of those buses running, every single day there were 20 people on them, and some of those have been cut. That is not a ghost bus: it is a bus that has been very well used and very much needed by the community, and its cut has been detrimental to people in the south.

I have spoken to many people who have found it much harder to get around, much harder to get to work, much harder to get to school, much harder to get to see their family and friends and much harder to get to the shops because of these cruel cuts by this government that does not view public transport as a service that should be provided but as something that they should be able to cut as much money from as possible.

I am particularly worried because the cuts so far announced are such a small sliver of what is about to come. They have already backed in a huge number of cuts, including some \$36 million of cuts to public transport. We have only seen a few million of that cut so far. In these new tenders that are coming out that the Minister for Transport likes to spin as somehow being revolutionary for public transport, the people in my electorate know that that is just going to mean more cuts.

At the moment, there are six stops on Commercial Road in my electorate where a bus does not stop between 8.30 in the morning and 8.30 at night. For 12 hours, there is no bus serving that area in my electorate. Basically, it has got to the point where we do not have any bus services whatsoever in that area. It is a farce to say that it is still a bus stop when there are 12 hours in the middle of the day when there are no buses whatsoever going there. This government thinks that is acceptable. This government thinks that is how people in the outer suburbs should be treated, that they should fend for themselves.

The government also says that this is because we have the train line, so we do not want to have buses going near where train lines go. Sometimes these buses are running two or three kilometres away from where the train is going. This government thinks that it is okay for potentially a disabled person, a senior person or a kid to walk up to three kilometres to get to a train to get to where they are going. That is not acceptable. That is not the standard that South Australians expect from their public transport system in metropolitan Adelaide, and it is not something that we will stand by and watch. We will continue to fight these cuts to public transport, and I will continue to fight them in my electorate.

I am particularly concerned with this latest brainwave from the Minister for Transport that he is going to have Uber-style buses running around and that it will be so great because they will be able to pick you up from your door. This has disaster written all over it, and I think that we are going to see these cuts to services hitting the north and the south again. I am very fearful that we are going to see the Hills and the eastern suburbs protected because they protect their own patch. This is a government that does not care about people in the outer suburbs. They only care about their leafy inner-city mates, their voters in those areas or in the Hills, and that is detrimental to this state.

We will continue to fight their cuts. We will continue to fight both the cuts from the last budget and whatever Rob Lucas is cooking up now for his cuts in the next budget. The Liberals only know how to cut, they only know how to close things, they only know how to privatise things. South Australians have learnt this over the last 14 months since the election and we will continue to oppose those things.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

At 17:54 the house adjourned until Thursday 2 May 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***EX GRATIA PAYMENTS**

651 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). Has the Treasurer approved or made any ex gratia payments since 31 August 2018?

1. To whom were the payments made?
2. For what purpose were the payments made?
3. What is the amount of each payment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Yes.

1. The secrecy provisions of the Taxation Administration Act 1996 prevent me from releasing the names of the recipients of state tax related ex gratia payments.

2. In the period since 31 August 2018 to 28 February 2019 ex gratia payments have been made for the following purposes; land tax ex gratia payments (e.g. for a deceased estate); Job Accelerator Grants; Payroll Tax Small Business Rebates; Payroll Tax 2017-18 in lieu of proposed legislative changes to the statutory rate; payroll tax general ex gratia payments; stamp duty ex gratia payments (e.g. off-the-plan stamp duty concession); and remuneration of an Australian Energy Market Commissioner.

3. Total payments made since 31 August 2018 for each area of purpose are listed as follows:
 - A. Land Tax General ex gratia payments, \$247,720;
 - B. Job Accelerator Grants made by way of ex gratia payments, \$11,973,600;
 - C. Payroll Tax Small Business Rebates, \$433,187;
 - D. Payroll Tax 2017-18 rate reduction administered by way of ex gratia payments, \$1,210,108;
 - E. Payroll Tax General ex gratia payments, \$1,090,156;
 - F. Stamp Duty ex gratia payments, \$9,642,858; and
 - G. Remuneration of an Australian Energy Market Commissioner, \$33,989.96.

MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE

654 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018 what is the ministerial office budget for each minister?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Minister	\$000
The Hon. S Marshall	7,276
The Hon. VA Chapman	2,550
The Hon. RI Lucas	2,440
The Hon. JAW Gardner	2,117
The Hon. DW Ridgway	2,264
The Hon. JMA Lensink	2,154
The Hon. DG Pisoni	2,214
The Hon. SG Wade	2,701
The Hon. DC Van Holst Pellekaan	1,987
The Hon. R Sanderson	2,215
The Hon. TJ Whetstone	2,147
The Hon. CL Wingard	2,281
The Hon. DJ Speirs	2,165
The Hon. SK Knoll	2,483
Total Budget	36,994

MINISTERIAL EXPENDITURE

655 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). What is the number of ministerial advisers funded for each minister in the government?

1. What is the salary of each ministerial adviser position in the government as at 31 December 2018?

2. What is the total employment cost of each ministerial adviser position in the government as at 31 December 2018?

3. What non-salary components are provided as part of remuneration arrangements for ministers' chiefs of staff and ministerial advisers and what is the cost of each of these components as at 31 December 2018?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

1. The number of ministerial advisers (1) funded for each minister in the government, as at 31 December 2018, was:

Minister	Ministerial Advisers (FTE)
The Hon. S Marshall	23
The Hon. VA Chapman	5
The Hon. RI Lucas	5
The Hon. JAW Gardner	5
The Hon. DW Ridgway	4
The Hon. JMA Lensink	4
The Hon. DG Pisoni	4
The Hon. SG Wade	6
The Hon. DC Van Holst Pellekaan	3
The Hon. R Sanderson	4
The Hon. TJ Whetstone	4
The Hon. CL Wingard	4
The Hon. DJ Speirs	4
The Hon. SK Knoll	5
Total Ministerial Advisers	80

(1) Ministerial advisers includes any ministerial appointments such as Chief of Staff, Media Advisers, etc

2. & 4. The salary and total annual employment cost for each section 71 ministerial staff position as at 20 July 2018 was provided in the *Government Gazette* on 2 August 2018. The gazette outlines the additional entitlements of ministerial staff.

On 10 December 2018 ministerial staff received a remuneration adjustment of 1.5 per cent per annum operative from the first full pay period commencing on or after 1 July 2018.

In addition to their salary, ministerial staff receive superannuation which is 9.5 per cent of their annual salary. Section 71 ministerial staff are also entitled to the same recreation leave, personal leave, maternity leave, paternity leave, long service leave, retention leave and special leave as persons employed in the South Australian Public Service, but are not entitled to any recreation leave loading.

FUTURE JOBS FUND PROGRAM

656 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). How many loans were approved as part of the Future Jobs Program?

1. What were the details of each loan provided under the Future Jobs Fund, including interest rates and terms? (identification of the recipients is not required)

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The Future Jobs Fund (the Fund) included \$70 million in funding for low interest loans.

The former government approved twenty (20) loans totalling \$36 million to assist fund projects that were eligible to receive loans from the Fund.

Of the 20 loans that were eligible under the Fund, six are not proceeding (with a value of \$9 million) and six are currently in negotiation (with a value of \$13 million).

The details of the eight loans that have been executed to date (\$14 million) are as follows:

Loan Amount	Interest Only Period (months)	Principal and Interest Period (years)	Term (years)	Interest Rate	Disclosed on SA Tenders and Contracts
\$2,500,000	24	3	5	2.89% p.a.	Y
\$286,000		7	7	2.85% p.a.	Y
\$3,000,000	5	3.6	4	2.57% p.a.	Y
\$1,500,000	12	6	7	2.90% p.a.	Y

Loan Amount	Interest Only Period (months)	Principal and Interest Period (years)	Term (years)	Interest Rate	Disclosed on SA Tenders and Contracts
\$3,000,000	36	4	7	3.25% p.a.	Y
\$1,000,000	11	6	7	To be set at drawdown	Y
\$1,600,000		5	5	2.06% p.a.	Y
\$1,000,000	12	6	7	To be set at drawdown	In progress

FUTURE JOBS FUND PROGRAM

657 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). How much of the budgeted funds for the Future Jobs Fund remains unspent as at 31 December 2018?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

\$120 million in funding is being administered by the Department of Treasury and Finance for grants and loans under the Future Jobs Fund.

At 31 December 2018, a total of \$24 million had been paid to recipients under executed grant and loan contracts.

Further contracts are in the process of being finalised, and the value of unspent funds will reduce over time as recipients make claims under executed contracts once specific milestones are met.

SHANGHAI AND TOKYO TRADE OFFICES

717 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). How much did the Shanghai and Tokyo trade offices cost to establish?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The combined estimated cost to establish both the Shanghai and Tokyo offices is \$100,000.

This includes the refurbishment of the Austrade footprint in the Japan embassy to accommodate South Australian staff (\$30,000) and the refurbishment of the Austrade footprint in the Consulate-General in Shanghai to accommodate South Australian staff (\$70,000).

SHANGHAI AND TOKYO TRADE OFFICES

718 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). What are the ongoing operational costs for the Shanghai and Tokyo trade offices?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The estimated ongoing operational costs for the Tokyo office, fully staffed is about \$671,000 per annum.

The estimated ongoing operational costs for the Shanghai office, fully staffed is about \$778,000 per annum.

CHINA AND JAPAN COUNTRY DIRECTORS

719 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). How many applicants were there for the position of Country Director for China and Japan, respectively? What was the specific selection process for these positions, and who was on the selection panel?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

35 applications were received for the position of Country Director, China.

79 applicants were received for the position of Regional Director – Japan/Korea – South Australia.

The selection panels consisted of representatives from the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment, Department of the Premier and Cabinet and Austrade.

The selection process for both positions was open and competitive. The selection panel chair reviewed all applications on a merit basis against the position selection criteria to determine an initial short list of applicants. Following this, the selection panel considered the initial short list of candidates and in consultation, selected those that would be invited to an interview. An interview process was conducted and a second round of interviews held for the position of Country Director, China. A reference check was undertaken by the selection panel chair and the panel then made a final determination on the preferred candidate. Austrade completed its internal clearance assessments on the preferred applicants prior to their appointment.

CHINA AND JAPAN COUNTRY DIRECTORS

720 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). What is the length of contract and salary package for the Country Director for China and Japan, respectively?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Both the Country Director in China and Regional Director in Japan/Korea – South Australia are on fixed three-year term contracts.

Ms Xiaoya Wei's contract in Shanghai will expire on 5 November 2021 and Ms Sally Townsend's contract in Tokyo will expire on 18 March 2022.

The staff are recruited in the respective markets on behalf of the South Australian Government by the Australian Trade and Investment Commission (Austrade) under a Service Level Agreement between Austrade and the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment (DTTI) for administrative and support services at Austrade-managed posts overseas. Both Ms Wei's and Ms Townsend's salaries are commensurate with the responsibilities of their representative roles and their experience and are reflective of local employment markets. DTTI does not publish staff salaries.

TRADE, TOURISM AND INVESTMENT DEPARTMENT

725 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). Since 1 July 2018, how much foreign direct investment has DTTI successfully attracted to South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

As of April 2019, 25 company investments have been secured by the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment attracting \$572 million of foreign direct investment.

TRADE MISSIONS

726 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). How many delegates participated in outbound and inbound trade missions in 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 (thus far) respectively?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The following table shows delegate participation in outbound and inbound trade missions for 2016 through to 2019:

	2016	2017	2018	2019 (as of 16 April 2019)
Inbound	208	50	69	26
Outbound	468	436	52	8
Total	676	486	121	34

For those outbound business missions that are industry-led, the state government has provided support to build key connections in-market for delegates. One such example is FOODEX Japan 2019, where Food SA and AUSVEG SA led the program in Tokyo from 5 to 8 March 2019, and DTTI provided in-market connections as well as brand promotion. For this mission format, DTTI does not record mission delegate numbers. Industry groups conduct their own evaluation of the delegate outcomes.

For those outbound missions that are DTTI led, the recent business mission to Hannover Messe from 1 to 5 April 2019 being an example, the approach is to be highly-targeted, with a sector focus, contrasting with the previous largescale approach to missions. Delegate numbers are recorded for these missions and outcomes evaluated by DTTI.

DTTI's approach to business mission activities for 2018 and 2019 is not consistent with previous years (i.e. 2016 and 2017). Delegate numbers provided by DTTI under this new approach do not reflect the level of involvement by companies in the broader mission program, nor the success of the strategy.

This revised approach to business missions emphasises collaboration with industry, improved pre-qualification of participants and supporting businesses to make connections that lead to commercial outcomes.

TRADE MISSIONS

727 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). Which companies have previously attended any South Australian trade missions?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Companies participating in business missions led by the South Australian government expect, and are entitled to, privacy under the Terms and Conditions of the Government of South Australia's 'Mission Agreement' which states under section 18—Privacy that:

The Participant consents to the personal information in the Application Form being collected and used by the Government or its contracted service providers for the purpose of informing the Participant of other services, Events, opportunities, seminars, conferences, trade fairs and other export related activities that are organised or promoted by the Government. Notwithstanding the above consent, all personal information collected by the Government will only be used for the purpose for which it was provided and in accordance with the Privacy Act 1988. Access to the information the Government holds in relation to a Participant, is available upon request.

Therefore, under section 18—Privacy, the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment advises that in the absence of written permission from companies that participated in trade missions, it is unable to release the requested information.

TRADE MISSIONS

728 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). How many outbound and inbound trade missions are planned for 2019? How many of these outbound missions does the minister intend to lead?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment (DTTI) has delivered an interim program of two inbound and two outbound business missions in 2019 to date.

The South Australian government engaged the Hon. Steven Joyce to undertake a review of the government's international strategy and approach to international activities. The review was released on 6 March 2019.

The findings of this review will inform the government's international trade strategy and future approach to business missions.

Recommendation 9.28 of the Joyce review states that an annual calendar of business missions be released, after extensive consultation with industry. DTTI in conjunction with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and other agencies is commencing an extensive process of consultation with industry groups from food and agribusiness, international education, tourism, energy and minerals, defence and space industries, high-tech, health and medical industries and creative industries sectors, and across government, to develop sector strategies to deliver on the South Australian Growth Agenda.

As this work progresses, it is expected that global trade and investment opportunities that would be best progressed by either an inbound or outbound business mission, would be identified during this process, and a forward calendar of mission activities supporting priority sector growth, identified. Once the forward calendar is finalised, consideration will be given to ministerial participation.

EXPORT ACCELERATOR GRANTS

729 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). Can the minister table a list of the successful recipients of the first round of South Australia Export Accelerator grants, how much they were awarded, and for what purpose? Who applied for second round funding?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

In the first round of the South Australia Export Accelerator program, there were 19 grant recipients, who accepted grants totalling \$465,735.

The grant recipients are using the funding for the following purposes:

- Marketing materials
- Market research
- E-commerce development
- Export training and consulting
- Participation in tradeshow and trade missions
- Overseas travel and accommodation cost
- Support for inbound buyers

Grant recipients are:

- Never Never Distilling Co.
- 1847 Winery Pty Ltd
- Byrne Vineyards
- Chalk Hill Wines Pty Ltd The Trustee for Chalk Hill Wines Trust
- Eyre Peninsula Seafoods Pty Ltd

- Gawler Park Wines Pty Ltd T/A Thorn-Clarke Wines
- Healthy Heart Produce
- Mori Seafood Pty Ltd
- Ochre Nation Pty Ltd
- The Trustee for the GM Hardy Family Trust T/A Wines by Geoff Hardy
- WD Wines Pty Ltd
- 57 Films
- Oasis Systems Pty Ltd
- Op2ma Pty Ltd
- CNC Porting Pty Ltd T/A Bullet Race Engineering
- DNA Security Solutions
- Ennio Pty Ltd
- Sentek Pty Ltd
- Charlesworth Nuts Pty Ltd

In relation to Round 2 of the SA Export Accelerator, the grant offers have been signed and sent to successful applicants. The successful applicants have until 6 May to accept their grant offers. At this time these offers are confidential.

ECONOMIC AND BUSINESS GROWTH FUND

731 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). Which entity applied for funding from the Economic and Business Growth Fund? When was the original application made? Who will administer the South Australian Landing Pad?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment applied for funding from the Economic and Business Growth Fund for the South Australian Landing Pad.

The proposal was submitted to the Economic and Business Growth Fund Governance Group for consideration at its 25 February 2019 meeting.

Funding for the Landing Pad has been allocated to the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment.

MODBURY HOSPITAL

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (27 February 2019).

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

On current forecasts the work on the Modbury Hospital emergency department is expected to be completed in mid-2021, and the Lyell McEwin emergency department expansion by early 2022.