

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14 May 2019

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. V.A. Tarzia) took the chair at 11:00 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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SCREENING) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 2 May 2019.)

Clause 9.

The CHAIR: Welcome to today's committee. It looks as though we got part of the way through clause 9. Are there any further questions on clause 9?

Ms HILDYARD: My question is: what strategies will be employed to ensure that people know about the 28-day requirement?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Firstly, the proposed details will be on the website once the bill is passed, eventually; secondly, there will be a communications program; and, thirdly, there will be an information pack that goes out at the time of a volunteer check being done.

Ms HILDYARD: Following that answer, will the communication of information about the maximum penalty of \$5,000 be included specifically in the communication?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That has been finalised at this point, as to the content of it, but it would be very unusual for the particulars of a penalty to be outlined in relation to a matter. The presumption usually is that people know what the legal position is, but it may well be one that is worthwhile adding in so that we make it absolutely clear. Thank you for the suggestion.

Ms HILDYARD: Given the incredible volume of generous volunteers here in South Australia in an incredible volume of organisations, how much will the communication effort cost?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure whether that has been designed at this point. I will just add to the last answer that what is most important is that, in these circumstances, the expectation is that there will be an expiation fee of \$315. That may also need to be added.

The CHAIR: Last question, member for Reynell.

An honourable member: She has had three.

The CHAIR: I know she has had three. I am going to speak about that in a moment, but I will let her ask this one.

Ms HILDYARD: In relation to clause 9, but on a different matter, I know plenty of sporting, recreation and other clubs and organisations where people's volunteering will sometimes be rewarded with a range of things—perhaps a dinner at the club or a voucher for club apparel, etc. Where exactly will the line be drawn between a volunteer being thanked or rewarded for their efforts with some sort of gift, voucher or whatever it might be, and being paid for work undertaken?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They are not in employment. That would be part of an honorarium, which is specifically excluded under the volunteers law.

Ms WORTLEY: My question is in relation to new section 33A(4). Would an expiation be issued as soon as the 28-day period under subsection (3) was breached? Would the person receive information with regard to that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As with other noncompliance obligations, if the noncompliance is reported, it would need to be investigated and assessed, and the expiation would be issued after that time. That is the same with any noncompliance or offence process, that that would need to be undertaken first.

Ms WORTLEY: Can you guarantee that a person will receive a warning or a notice from the department that they are required to pay the department back? Could the department receive a flag that someone with a free screening has now undertaken a day of paid employment, but that person not be notified about the 28 days and immediately an expiation fee be issued?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No.

Ms WORTLEY: 'No' is your answer to that. Clarifying that, can a person who is covered by a free volunteer check undertake an hour of paid employment that requires a working with children check each month for seven months and then, should they undertake a further day of employment, have to notify the department within 28 days or be issued with an expiation fine of \$315?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct, as has been outlined numerous times in this committee.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I have a question in regard to the expiation. If they fail to comply, they are guilty of an offence with a maximum penalty of \$5,000 and an expiation of \$315. How does that compare with other areas of policy legislation? It seems to me that it is quite a significant fine. How does it compare with other areas?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Consistent with what is applicable with expiation fees, the fee is close to \$108. This is three times that, which is commensurate with the allocation of an expiation fee of this kind.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: My question is about recording and recognising the number of expiation notices on an annual basis. Where will we have access to that? How transparent will it be for us to see how many volunteers have now got work but have not paid for their screening and have been fined? How will we know how many people have been fined?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is in the police data.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

Ms COOK: Could the Deputy Premier please explain the rationale of the changes that clause 10 countenances?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This is an existing provision in relation to the records management system, which simply makes clear that the central assessment unit is in possession of the relevant information. In other words, you are not expected to go out and search it; it is to be made available as per the model that already exists. This is just a minor amendment.

Ms COOK: Can the Deputy Premier clarify who actually has access to that record system?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The unit is responsible for that, but I am advised that the 2016 legislation allows for public access to information that is already in situ.

Ms COOK: You said the public have access to it. By what method? How are the public able to access that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that, in relation to employer, employee and volunteer, they will have their own identifier number to access that information. Generally, in relation to the public who are seeking information regarding prohibited persons, there is a process for that. They do not get immediate direct access to it; they get information once they have established their cause.

The CHAIR: Member for Hurtle Vale, given that you sought clarification to the previous question—

Ms COOK: Yes, it was clarification.

The CHAIR: It was? I will allow this one.

Ms COOK: Thank you. My final question on this clause is: is the information we are discussing in relation to clause 10 all part of the live update system? Is it all part of that new interface where any information will immediately change what is stored at that level?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure that clause 10 will help you with that. In relation to the central assessment unit, which is having a minor change here, I think what the member is getting at is in relation to access to that. I am advised that in relation to that, as I say, it is not within the provision that is seeking to deal with that, but there is a process already in place to enable continuous updating to occur. The process of how it is going to be available is yet to be fully fleshed out, but this clause does not help you in that regard.

Clause passed.

Clause 11.

Ms COOK: Again, this is a very broad question. Can the Deputy Premier explain the rationale of the changes that are contained within clause 11 and how they are countenanced.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think these are all in the explanation of clauses but, for the benefit of the member, I indicate that section 38 of the prohibited persons act provides:

A court that finds a person guilty of a prescribed offence must ensure that the prescribed information relating to the finding of guilt is provided, in accordance with the regulations, to the central assessment unit.

Clause 11 makes a consequential amendment for that purpose.

Ms COOK: In respect of people who have committed offences or have been charged with offences, during the last period of questioning I recall the Deputy Premier clarifying for us that somebody who worked with a child—I believe the example was at a place like a McDonald's; they worked alongside a young person at a place like McDonald's—was not required to have a screening undertaken because they worked alongside, or with, or next to, rather than actually working with the child, which I understand to be delivering some kind of service to the child.

Is there any concern regarding people working next to children, that is, supervising the child, as opposed to working with the child? They do not have to be screened, versus these people who do have to be screened. So somebody could be working with a child in a workplace who has an offence, or has committed an offence, but they are not screened. Are there any concerns about the risk around that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I expect these are all matters that were raised at the time of the development of the screening laws, including by the previous government. One of the things to balance here is the opportunity for young people to have a job. The last thing we want is for industries that are providing employment to young people to be so overloaded with requirements in relation to the rest of their workforce that they say, 'We're not going to take on 16 and 17 year olds.' That would be a disaster. Clearly, they are matters that were under consideration under the previous laws developed by the previous government, and we are continuing it.

Clause passed.

Clause 12.

Ms COOK: Again, I am seeking clarification around the rationale of changes that clause 12 countenances.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I refer to my previous answers to questions from the member for Torrens and the member for Ramsay.

Mr PICTON: I would like to ask a question in relation to clause 12, which I understand puts the onus on the Commissioner of Police to inform the central screening unit of any prescribed charges that have been laid. What work has been done with the police in terms of making sure that their systems are going to be up to date, in order to make sure that that can happen in a timely way.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: A lot.

Mr PICTON: Perhaps the Attorney-General could elaborate slightly in terms of the work that has been undertaken and also in terms of what the expected time frames are. The proposal under the bill is that it be done as soon as reasonably practicable after the person is charged. What does that mean in terms of the time frames that would be happening under this clause?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not quite sure how much the previous government did in the two years that they were trying to deal with this matter and not completing it, so I cannot answer for that period of time. I can only answer for the last 14 months or so of our continuing to do the work that had already been passed in relation to this. That is already operational and, yes, the police have been a party that has been continuously consulted throughout the development of the regulations and the necessary amendments for that purpose.

Mr PICTON: I restate the second part of my question, which is that the bill talks about that this should be done as soon as reasonably practicable after the person is charged. What does the Attorney see to be reasonable in the circumstances of how quickly the central screening unit should be advised of charges laid under this section?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We are already doing it. I imagine it depends on the amount of information that they get within any time period, so it would vary. This has been operating for some time and entails the obligation of the police to provide them in real time, which is already operational.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My understanding of clause 12 is that it requires the Commissioner of Police to advise the unit of a presumptive disqualification offence. My recollection, from the brief time that we had canvassing this bill last sitting week, was that in new section 26A we included the presumptive disqualification offence at 26A(4), so this will be a new thing for the Commissioner of Police to be advising the unit of those presumptive disqualification offences.

I am not sure that the Deputy Premier's advice to the committee that they have been doing this for some time—advising the unit of those who have been found guilty of a presumptive disqualification offence—might actually stand up. The Deputy Premier has just advised the committee that South Australia Police have done a lot of work on this to make sure that they can adequately, accurately and quickly communicate to the unit those people who have been found guilty of a presumptive disqualification offence. My question is: can she detail to the committee the work that has been done by South Australia Police?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is all consistent with continuous monitoring now. Those items that are now in the presumptive category are actually already material that the police currently provide. I do not know how much clearer I can make that. Obviously, in relation to the process, it is already occurring. This formalises it in relation to the presumptive obligations but those offences that are currently to be captured under the new prescribed offences or in the presumptive disqualification is actually information that is already being provided by the police to the unit.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I must admit that I am somewhat confused by the Deputy Premier's answers. In answering the member for Kaurna's first question about what work had been done by South Australia Police and the commissioner in order to prepare for this new requirement that the legislation confers upon him, she said that a lot of work had been done. The evidence to the parliament now seems to have changed to all that is being done, in effect, is what has already been done in police communications to the unit.

That would then mean that there has not been a lot of work that has been done; in fact, it is conceivable that no additional work has been done by South Australia Police to prepare for both new 26A, which is to be inserted into the act by virtue of clause 8, and indeed the new requirement under the current clause we are discussing, that is, clause 12. So can I ask the Deputy Premier: what has occurred, for the purposes of this particular clause in this particular bill, for South Australia Police to be better prepared to communicate this information to the screening unit?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I refer you to my previous answer.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am not surprised that we have no further particulars from the Deputy Premier. Perhaps it would seem obvious to the casual observer to this exchange that the Deputy Premier shot off an answer half-cocked to the member for Kaurna's first question about a lot

of work having been done by the police commissioner; then her subsequent advice was that no further work has been done and all that has been happening is a continuation of past—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: A point of order, Chair: that was a most offensive and rude statement by the member in relation to South Australia Police. I urge the member to review the actual question of the member for Hurtle Vale in relation to this matter as to the work done for the police, on not just this clause but all the regulations and reforms in this area, and not to make such disgraceful allegations about the police.

The CHAIR: Attorney, you are suggesting that it was an offensive remark.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: And I ask him to withdraw it.

The CHAIR: Was it offensive to you as the member?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, indeed.

The CHAIR: The Attorney finds your comment offensive, member for Lee. Are you prepared to withdraw it?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have to beg your indulgence, Chair, because the offence that the Deputy Premier seeks to take from my remarks she tells us was in relation to my recollection of her response to a question that the member for Hurtle Vale asked. Unfortunately, what I had been raising was a response that she gave to the member for Kaurna, so perhaps the Deputy Premier needs to review the comments that she has made to this house, lest she be inadvertently causing an offence by genuinely impeding the business of the house by wilfully misleading us.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I seek an apology from the member forthwith.

The CHAIR: The Deputy Premier has indicated she finds the words offensive. We need to get on with this. I ask you, member for Lee, to withdraw your comments.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would be more than happy to withdraw but I am genuinely confused about what I have done.

Mr Pederick: No, just withdraw. That's what you were asked.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I was asking a question about what the member for Kaurna had asked and she took offence to something in relation to the member for Hurtle Vale, so what have I offended? Please just explain to me what I have offended and I will withdraw it. Just explain what I have done and I am happy to withdraw it. I am happy to do so, sir.

The CHAIR: There is no need for us to spend any more time or expand on this, member for Lee. The Attorney has found your comments offensive and I ask you to withdraw.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: For whichever comments I made to offend the Deputy Premier most recently, I withdraw fulsomely, unreservedly and apologise.

The CHAIR: Thank you. Are you getting to your question?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As I was saying, we had a response to a question to the member for Kaurna where the Deputy Premier said a lot of work had been done by the police to prepare the commissioner for his new responsibilities under this section of the bill where he will be responsible for telling the screening unit of those people who had been deemed guilty of a presumptive disqualification offence—a new offence that has been inserted in the course of the previous discussions on this bill for 26A under clause 8 of the bill.

My question, by which I inadvertently grievously offended the Deputy Premier, was that her response seemed to be at odds with her subsequent advice to the house that, in fact, what was occurring was just the continuation of the current practice of the commissioner advising the screening unit of offences that they were aware of. It is not clear from the Deputy Premier's advice whether she is mistaken between those two different responses in either of those responses or, indeed, if she is saying that the current process by which the Commissioner of Police is communicating offences to the screening unit will effectively be replicated for the communication of these new presumptive disqualification offences. If that is the case, can the Deputy Premier confirm that?

Secondly, could she also provide some advice, rather than cursory reference to her previous advice to the house, which did not get to the root of these questions, about how exactly the Commissioner of Police is communicating these offences to the screening unit? How much effort is going into this? What is the consumption of resources by South Australia Police in conferring this advice to the screening unit? How many pieces of advice, or how many offences, are they reporting to the screening unit, and how many do they anticipate reporting to the screening unit under the terms of this clause?

The CHAIR: I think, Attorney, there are about four questions.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In relation to the numbers and the consumption of resources, I do not have the answer to that. That will be a matter that the member can direct to SAPOL, but we have had no indication that it is going to be prohibitive for the purposes of them undertaking their responsibility. I confirm that a lot of consultation has occurred with SAPOL in relation to the development of these amendments, the regulations, the continuing obligations that they will have and what has been formalised in the new presumptive disqualification process, which happens to cover information about which, I am advised, they are already currently advising the unit. I hope that is crystal clear for the member.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What is the penalty for not informing the unit of a police officer laying a charge of a prescribed offence or a presumptive disqualification for SAPOL?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is not an offence for a police officer not to provide it under this law, in the penalties that are there. There are very often obligations of a mandatory nature for members in the public sector to undertake certain duties. It may well be some potential breach in relation to their code of practice as to their own operation, but there is nothing in this act.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand that you have been previously asked this, but I was just hoping that perhaps between the houses you could provide the committee or the house, on notice, the cost to SAPOL of this new requirement, created by the deletion of the former clause.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would be happy to get that if in fact they were going to be doing any extra work on it. What they are advising us and what I am advised here again today is that they are already providing this information to the unit as the types of offences that have been referred to. There is an obligation going into this legislation for them to cover the presumptive disqualification matters, but I am advised that, of those offences, they are already providing that information to the unit.

We have not been informed of any indication by SAPOL that under the obligations of this legislation—that is, to formalise, in this instance, a continuing practice—there are any extra costs or resources required (a 'consumption of resources', as referred to by the member for Lee) so I am assuming that, if there are any, they will be absorbing them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I always get concerned when we take out broad references in legislation. In the section that is being deleted, where the Commissioner of Police will provide information to a central assessment unit, paragraph (b) provides:

- (b) may disclose to the central assessment unit any information on any matter relevant to the operation of this Act.

That is being deleted from the bill and in its place a very prescriptive series of prescribed offences is being inserted. I am wondering whether the Attorney has received any advice about the narrowing of the scope or the freedom for the commissioner to provide information to a central assessment unit on a broader range of topics.

For example, perhaps someone who has not been charged but is under current police surveillance—perhaps a suspect in a criminal investigation, someone who perhaps has had complaints made against them but there is no formal charge pending as yet—would enable the commissioner, under the old section, to inform the central assessment unit that, 'Despite person A having no charges laid against them, they are under a long-term investigation, and I am informing you that this person should not be given a clearance to work with children.'

But, under the new clause—and I could be wrong, perhaps the Attorney has an answer to this—the narrowing of scope takes that freedom away from the commissioner or any police investigative unit to inform the central unit that would be issuing these clearances of information that may be pertinent or not as to whether this individual should be working with children. Off the top of my head, obviously active investigations are one of them, and closed investigations could be another.

Often police investigate, I would imagine, child sex offences or other matters involving children where no charges are laid because a lack of evidence does not justify a charge but police have very serious concerns or suspicions. An investigating officer may want to inform this unit of a person, even though that person was not charged.

I assume the reason we had paragraph (b) in the old clause was that it allowed police to inform this unit that there should be some caution taken toward whether or not this person should be allowed to work with children or given a clearance. I ask the Attorney if she could clear that up for the house because I imagine all members would be very concerned if we narrowed the scope of the ability of the police and the commissioner to inform the unit we trust to make sure our children are safe.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would urge the member to review, in clause 15, new 42B(1)(c), which covers that.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: The Attorney referred the member for West Torrens to a particular clause to give an answer to the question. Could you repeat that, please?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Clause 14, 42B(1)(c), which we are yet to deal with. The council has split those obligations but they are still there.

Ms HILDYARD: Attorney, can you please elaborate on discussions between SAPOL, the NDIS commission and the government about how this provision will work in terms of its alignment with the provisions relating to reporting to the NDIS commission?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will start by saying that in the two years since the commencement of the arrangement and the development of the NDIS matter, which has of course been over a period of time prior to the new government, I cannot account for what discussions took place in that period. But, in the last 14 months with the acuity of ensuring that these obligations are in place, given the urgency and desire from everybody to progress the NDIS obligations, discussions have been considerable and ongoing because the regulations are now proposed to incorporate that. There has been a very considerable team of people working on that and this screening bill of course is complementary to the concluding of that obligation.

Ms HILDYARD: That does not really answer my question. I appreciate that there have been discussions between SAPOL, the government and the NDIS commission, but my specific question is about the content and any agreements and conclusions as a result of those discussions about how the reporting requirements to this central screening unit will align with the reporting requirements to the NDIS commission.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Consistent with, I understand, national proposed practice in this regard, the information goes to the unit and the unit then gives the advice to the NDIS.

Ms HILDYARD: Are you saying, in that answer, that this clause somehow negates the requirement for a report to be simultaneously made to the NDIS commission?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, the information that is given from the unit—because I think that was the question asked—

Ms HILDYARD: No, it was not.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, let me clarify that. The information that goes to the unit—if somebody has not had a screening test who should have, then the unit advises NDIS. If there is other information you are asking about, could you indicate what it is?

Ms HILDYARD: Just to be really clear, you are saying that this clause results in the unit being required to make reports to the NDIS commission.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: To be clear, clause 12 does not deal with that issue, but as you have asked the general question we will get the answer anyway so that the member can be reassured on that. I hope this assists because, while this piece of legislation does not deal with that issue at all, I am able to inform you that my understanding, on the information I have regarding how the NDIS commission ultimately gets information about some risk, is that the police report to the unit, the unit conducts a risk assessment and the unit may decide to refer this matter nationally—and there is a national process for that.

Under the NDIS law—which is not what we are dealing with today, to be clear—there are a number of people under that legislation who have obligations, including employers and people who are service providers, etc., even people who are bound to have a screen. That is a different process.

What it culminates in—and I hope I am saying this correctly—are three things: the leftover check process for the purposes of child protection, which has one origin of law; the NDIS new regime that is coming through as to how that is going to have some application; and, thirdly, overlapping that, the volunteer process. So the origins of obligation and who is responsible for that for the reporting process is within the NDIS law.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you have had three questions and in my assessment—

Ms HILDYARD: There is one spontaneously arising from—

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, I am speaking. Your most recent question was more relevant, to my mind, to clause 13 than to clause 12 really. If you have another question—

Ms HILDYARD: Not if you understand the provisions of the NDIS act, it is not.

The CHAIR: That is my reading of it. Do you have a final question on clause 12?

Ms HILDYARD: Arising from the Attorney-General's answers, when the NDIS Quality and Safeguards Commission was set up there was a focus on ensuring that screening and reporting met a national standard for NDIS workers and people receiving services and support through the NDIS. Can you assure the house that, through this particular provision, the alignment of national standards around reporting happens?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In relation to this, I am advised that, as this bill relates to the protection of children, it really is a question on an entirely different subject matter. However, the NDIS rules and the intergovernmental agreement make that provision. In fact, only last week I was visiting the Public Advocate's office—the commission is in the same building and operates there—and I met with the new advocate for disability. He is obviously working through the process in conjunction with the commission. Nothing has been reported to me that indicates that there is any problem there, and it is entirely independent of what we are actually canvassing in clause 12.

Ms Hildyard: That's a bit worrying. It's completely separate.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: You asked questions. I was happy to give you an answer and I have done so for two questions, but clause 12 has nothing to do with the obligation in that regard and I hope you are reassured by that. If you need some more information about the national commission, which, as I say, operates here in Adelaide and has an office here, then perhaps we can organise a briefing

Clause passed.

Clause 13.

Ms COOK: Where the act requires 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, how is the report documented and progressed?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: New section 39A is designed to ensure that both the Teachers Registration Board and the Education Standards Board SA—and any other governing bodies, because a reporting party is referred to in that section—have the capacity to share information. This

is what this is really all about. It is a new obligation. It has the data anyway, but it is going to be obliged to report that information, and it will be capable of doing that because of the other restrictions.

Ms COOK: I think I missed the first one. You said the Teachers Registration Board and the—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Education Standards Board.

Ms COOK: Is there a comprehensive list of the organisations that are obligated to do this reporting process?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They will be created under regulations, and those are the two that we intend to regulate.

Ms COOK: If somebody is reported to the unit by one of these bodies and that process is undertaken because they are suspected of being a risk to children but that is then overturned due to an investigation process or further information, what is the process for that to be overturned?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not entirely sure whether you are asking about the screening or the disposal of the information.

Ms COOK: You are not entirely sure whether I am asking about what, sorry?

The CHAIR: Could you clarify the question, please.

Ms COOK: In terms of the information that is disclosed or reported to the unit, because of a predicted or an unacceptable risk assessment, and then suddenly retracted, changed or altered, what process is undertaken to change or remove that information trail?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is no destruction of the information, but I will refer the member to the Freedom of Information Act, which I am sure she will get used to in opposition and which allows parties to make an application for the correction of records, and that might give some answer to that. We are not in the business of destroying information. Information is presented, and if in fact there is no consequence as a result of the assessment that there is no longer unacceptable risk, the information is there but it is not progressed for the purposes of arguing that somebody needs to be excluded from either employment or work.

Ms COOK: Just to clarify, the information, once presented, remains within the system. So if Joe the goose gets accused of doing something inappropriate in front of a minor, or with a minor, and that gets reported through to the unit and then Bill the goat says, 'I made it up because Joe the goose nicked five bucks from me and I wanted to get him back,' all that information stays there and Joe the goose has a notation within the record-keeping system; it does not get deleted. Is that what you are saying?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Clause 13 requires bodies to make declarations to an assessment unit. Does that include ICAC?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can I ask why it does not include ICAC?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In relation to this legislation, it does not, but, as the member would be aware—he probably knows the ICAC Act better than most people here—as public authorities and public officers, there are obligations to report certain information in respect of suspected corruption and/or maladministration or misconduct. They have obligations under different laws, but this is not relevant to that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will put to the Attorney-General where I think this clause lacks in not including the ICAC. The ICAC has extraordinary powers of coercion. If they are investigating, for example—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If the deputy leader was confronted with this, I think perhaps the ICAC should be considered as a reporting agency. Given what the Attorney has said, I think what she is telling the house is that the ICAC has other ways of reporting these measures. For example, if something was discovered on a computer or through the course of its investigations they make other notifications and those other bodies are then notified—it could be SAPOL, for example—they would be required under this act to then report that to the central assessment unit. But often ICAC does not report these matters to SAPOL until their investigation is concluded.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Attorney-General says, 'No, that's not correct,' that they report as they go along. That is not right.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is great that you are disagreeing with me under your breath, but it is rather disorderly, while we sit quietly and listen to her explanations, for the Attorney to interrupt while I expand on a clause.

The CHAIR: Well, I am not hearing what the Attorney is saying, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is unfortunate, sir.

The CHAIR: I am not able to hear that, so you continue and work towards your question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My point is this: if the ICAC uses coercive powers to investigate a public officer and in the course of that investigation finds other criminal activity, there is no requirement under this legislation that the central assessment unit be informed, but the ICAC may make its own determination to inform SAPOL at a later date. In the meantime, if the person who is a person of interest under ICAC makes an application for a clearance to work with children and the state—and the ICAC is a member of the executive—has information that this person would be inappropriate, this act does not require the ICAC commissioner to provide that information to the central assessment unit.

The question I have is: why not? Why would you not want every agency that has coercive powers and is able to look at an individual's conduct, if they uncover something that would render them incapable or suggest they should not be working with children, to inform the central assessment unit immediately upon learning it? Under the old act, police could inform a central assessment unit on the basis of an investigation, not a charge—that has been removed. I do not accept the Attorney's argument that it is being dealt with later, after having read it more clearly.

Now we have the ICAC, which is not required to report to the central assessment unit. I suppose the fundamental question is: why would you not want every agency that uncovers information to have a legal requirement to report this as quickly as possible in order to keep our children safe?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If information came to the attention of the Teachers Registration Board or the Education Standards Board, which are the proposed parties here as to reporting of unacceptable risk to children, that uncovers material that they consider would be of interest to ICAC, and as a public officer they would have some obligation under different laws, that is a matter for them. As to the rest of the diatribe, I did not understand it; it seemed completely nonsensical.

Ms HILDYARD: Attorney, how will data received by the central assessment unit about persons who pose or potentially pose an unacceptable risk to children be shared with the NDIS commission?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that once the unacceptable risk has been assessed in the positive, that is, that they are, then the screening is revoked and the commission is advised. I do not know whether it is by email, letter, courier pigeon or whatever, but they will be advised. It is by data transfer.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you; that is helpful. Given that nexus between this new provision in the bill, how will the intergovernmental agreement on the NDIS be impacted by this bill being passed, given what you have just said?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This is the bill that enacts the obligations under the intergovernmental agreement. Is there anything in particular? We are still talking about child protection at this end, but we will get to the NDIS shortly.

Ms HILDYARD: That is right, so I am asking what is the impact in terms of any changes needed to the intergovernmental agreement as a result of these new provisions. The intergovernmental agreement was agreed some time ago.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This is designed to meet the obligations under the agreement.

Ms HILDYARD: So, there is nothing that is new or different or alters any of those obligations under the intergovernmental agreement in relation to the NDIS?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will make it clear. These terms are to implement the obligations under the intergovernmental agreement. We do not have some separate model in South Australia; these are under the terms of that agreement. My understanding is that that will be national, if it is not already.

Ms HILDYARD: Given that, can the Attorney guarantee that all the provisions of this bill absolutely accord with the provisions of the intergovernmental agreement in relation to screening?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My understanding is that the proposals in this bill are entirely to implement the obligations under the intergovernmental agreement. I am advised that there is some movement in relation to how that is going to play out because, of course, it is still a new system that is coming in. For example, in South Australia the offence of bestiality is currently in the prescribed list, and it is being proposed in this bill to move to the presumptive on the basis of what is currently being discussed nationally. That particular issue may not currently be in the agreement because that is moving along. So we are agreeing, I suppose, to assume that responsibility.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I draw the Deputy Premier's attention to new section 39A(2):

A notification under subsection (1)(a) must be made in a manner and form determined by the central assessment unit.

As we have canvassed previously, we are seeking to cast the net a little wider beyond the responsibilities of the Commissioner of Police to other agencies. In what manner and form does the central assessment unit require this information to be provided to it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My understanding is that, in respect of these two boards, which is what we are talking about, it will be agreed by the central assessment unit as to how that data is going to be transferred and transmitted—standard form, email or whatever the process is that they determine is going to be both consistent and effective.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is the last word of the Deputy Premier's response that is of particular concern to me, and that is how effective the communication is. Understanding in what form this information is communicated to the central assessment unit and whether it is readily appreciable by the person who receives that information, that there is something about a person who has been informed about that makes it absolutely clear that there should be some sort of disqualification, for want of a better term, of their ability to have a role which allows them to interact with children. That is why I am seeking the information about the form in which this information is to be communicated. I am interested as to whether it can be emailed, etc., but what is actually required to be spelt out in the communication?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think that will change from case to case. In the form, it is expected to be in writing—that is, it will be transmitted via the electronic system—but obviously what is the content of that information will depend entirely on what information each of the boards may be given for the purposes of them making the assessment that there is an unacceptable risk and having the obligation to report it. That will vary depending on the case that comes before them. But the expectation is that this will be in writing and it will be transmitted electronically, bearing in mind that it is the unit that then conducts the assessment.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I appreciate that that will be the requirement, and that is of course necessary and proper. For consistency's sake and for ease of the recipient's use, is there some proforma or some electronic form, or is there some consistent basis by which somebody must

provide information to the screening unit so that when the person receives that information they can look at a particular part of that communication and make a very quick assessment that, yes, this is something that needs to be actioned to ensure that that person is no longer able to interact with children? If there is a proforma, is it possible, but perhaps not right now, for that to be provided?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised there is a form in the system, but at this first instance the monitoring notification may be transmitted not necessarily in the form but in writing.

Clause passed.

Clause 14.

The CHAIR: Any questions on clause 14?

Ms Stinson: I had some for 13, but I was not asked.

The CHAIR: Nobody came to their feet.

Ms Stinson: You did not call for any. She had not finished answering the question.

The CHAIR: What you need to do, member for Badcoe, is stand when you seek the call. I was not aware that you were looking to ask a question. My apologies. Clause 14, any questions? Member for Hurtle Vale.

Ms COOK: Thank you, Chair. In regard to bodies that may need to access information, other than those covered already in subsection (3)(a), do you imagine that there are any bodies that need to access information?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think we are back on No. 13. I indicated that there were two boards that are intended to be incorporated in that, and they are the only two boards at this point.

The CHAIR: Any further questions on clause 14? Member for Elizabeth.

Mr ODENWALDER: Attorney, I have come a little late into this debate, so I apologise if I am taking you over old ground. I draw your attention to 42B(1)(b), where it states that the Commissioner of Police is authorised to disclose information related to criminal history. Could you expand upon the scope of 'criminal history' in that section and whether it is defined anywhere? For instance, does it include just convictions? Does it include charges? Does it include allegations without any charge or conviction? Can you give us an idea of the scope of that criminal history?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will add to this, because it is helpful, in a moment. My understanding is that it would have the date and particulars of the offence and of convictions, and it may well have some of the sentencing details. I will just check in relation to charges that are formally withdrawn and/or dismissed.

Mr ODENWALDER: Attorney, are there any limitations on the types of offences? I understand what you are saying about charges, and charges withdrawn and so on, but is there any limitation on the types of offences? It seems to indicate that it is not limited to offences that are directly related to the act, but are there any limits to those offences?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member is correct: it does not have to be restricted to just child protection offences or child exploitation charges. In response to the earlier question, I am advised that they do from time to time identify areas where charges were laid and, for whatever reason, there was no prosecution ultimately recorded. Obviously, that may assist in the assessment, particularly if there is some pattern of behaviour.

Mr ODENWALDER: Sorry to drill down a little bit further into this—and I understand your point and thank you for making it—but would the definition of criminal history also include allegations made that were never brought to charges? Do you understand what I am saying?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not think I do.

Mr ODENWALDER: There is a police report and then it is dismissed before it reaches the point of charge.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not know the answer to that question, but I would certainly expect not. Bear in mind that, if the police are asked to investigate these matters further—because, obviously, as a result of information that comes through this process they may be looking for somebody of interest who needs to be considered for the purpose of prosecution—I have no doubt that they would continue, under the obligations that we have already referred to in this committee, to refer those back.

To some degree, it is a two-way street: to assist in the screening for the purposes of quarantining, as much as possible, vulnerable children from exploitation and also to alert the police, when looking at the criminal history, as to what the information might glean for the purposes of any investigation they might either be undertaking or continuing to undertake.

Another thing to be cognisant of in this whole division 5 is that it is about information sharing. That is largely to ensure that there is a legislative provision to comply with the Intergovernmental Agreement on National Exchange of Criminal History Information for People Working with Children (ECHIPWC) agreement. I have no idea what that says, but I am sure it is for the benefit of what we are trying to achieve here.

Mr ODENWALDER: This last question is just for clarification really, and I apologise if it is old ground that you have been over, Attorney. In the case of the Commissioner of Police sharing criminal history information with the agencies, disclosing information to those listed agencies, who makes the determination about what the appropriate type of information is? The request comes to the Commissioner of Police. Does the Commissioner of Police have any discretion about what information to disclose or what not to disclose?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If you are just talking about the criminal history, then that is a matter entirely at the discretion of the police. They are obliged to satisfy the obligations under that rule, but that is more in relation to clause 12, which we have already canvassed. Here their obligation is a clause designed under 42B to give other intergovernmental agreed agencies—that is, similar assessment units—access to the police information.

However, if you want to go back to the obligation of the police, that is under clause 12, and the clause I also referred to in addition to that which, going back to the original legislation, I think was under section 42 as it currently stands. In any event, the police make that judgement. When we were canvassing that in the committee—that is, this obligation of what the police have to provide—there is an obligation for certain material that they must provide and there is an obligation for what they may provide. They may well consider in their discretion that there is information that would assist in that assessment.

Ms HILDYARD: My question is in relation to clause 14, new section 42B(2)(b). Does the mention of an interstate screening agency contemplate the NDIS commission and, if not, given the scope of the NDIS, the desire for national standards in relation to NDIS worker screening and the clear nexus between this bill and the NDIS Act, why is the NDIS commission not specifically named in this clause?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In short, the answer is that the commission is not an interstate screening agency under (2)(b), which you referred to.

Ms HILDYARD: Why not?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The reason it is not, if I can just take that as the second part of the question, is that under the intergovernmental agreement the states each have responsibility to investigate these matters and make the assessment, and then, under NDIS law, they have an obligation to report to the commission. The national commission is not an investigative unit. It is not a screening agency or an assessment unit: it is a commission that has a different role under the NDIS law.

Ms COOK: Going back to questions regarding police disclosure and information, does this insertion retain—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Which insertion?

Ms COOK: After section 42, we are inserting these parts here. Does this maintain the obligation for reporting by SAPOL in its previous form?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, this is not an obligation for SAPOL to do anything other than, in a reporting sense, make it available to certain entities, and they are the interstate screening agencies, the central assessment unit, etc. It is not an obligation on them to provide information. It gives them permission to give information.

Ms COOK: And it maintains that integrity.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

Ms COOK: In regard to the other jurisdictions, are there currently provisions to enable the disclosure of information gathered by the screening unit to other jurisdictions? If somebody applies for a working with children check and the department does not issue it because there are risks identified, could that refusal as such be shared with other jurisdictions?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

Ms STINSON: So the answer is yes; it can be shared?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

Ms WORTLEY: Attorney-General, the member for Elizabeth asked a question, on new section 42B(1)(b) I think it was, in relation to allegations being made but no charges being laid. The question was in relation to whether that constituted criminal history. You said that you did not know the answer to that question. I am just wondering if you are able to follow through on that and provide a definitive—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Ms WORTLEY: Pardon?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In short, whilst this clause does not have anything to do with what the police's obligation is to provide information—this is in relation to who else gets access to that information—in the course of the member for Elizabeth's question he was specifically asking what the content of that is in relation to what the police are actually obliged to provide and what they do provide in it. I answered that there was the list of convictions and dates of offences but, in respect of the charges that did not culminate in a conviction, I would get some further information. The member might like to look at *Hansard*, but in the subsequent question I clarified that to say that is not usually provided but it can be, and that is a matter for the discretion of police.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, and in answer to a further question I also went on to say that in relation to other information the police may have, they may provide that; that is a discretion for them that we dealt with back in clause 12.

The CHAIR: Thanks for your indulgence, Attorney. I remind members on the other side to stand when they are seeking to ask a question or get the call.

Ms STINSON: Looking at 42C(2), which talks about relevant offence, referring to 'a prescribed offence, or any other offence declared by the regulations to be included in the ambit of this definition', could the Attorney provide a list of what offences might be included in the regulations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I refer the member to my previous answer in which I listed all the prescribed offences and presumptive offences. I will see if I can find it for the member.

Ms STINSON: Thank you. That would be helpful if you can provide that. That is obviously something that has escaped me. New section 42D—Disclosure of information to prevent harm—talks about the disclosure of information to an appropriate person or body at the judgement of the central assessment unit. Could you detail some examples, at least, if not a list, of who you might see as an appropriate person or body under that section?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Could you just repeat the question?

Ms STINSON: Section 42D—Disclosure of information to prevent harm—talks about the disclosure of information to, and I quote, 'an appropriate person or body' and that is at the assessment or judgement of the central assessment unit. Could you give some examples or a list, if one is available, of who might be envisaged as being an appropriate person or body under that section?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: What is expected to apply there is if, for example, information came forward that needed some urgent attention. It might be that an appropriate person may be a police officer or a member of the MAPS program, which, as the member might be aware, is a coordinated group targeted at dealing with families that are identified and other child protection matters. They are the sorts of circumstances where I would expect it to be applied.

Ms STINSON: Following on from that answer, could it, for example, be a school or parents who might have children in their custody or who are maybe in a position to intervene? I imagine that this clause would be applied in some sort of emergency situation; therefore, one might reasonably expect that those closest to a child who might be at risk might be schoolteachers, someone at a day-care centre, someone at a sporting club or, indeed, their own parents or guardians. Does this clause contemplate disclosing information to non-legal or non-statutory individuals or bodies?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not expect so, and the reason is that to advise a parent, guardian, foster carer, neighbour who might have supervision of a child or even a teacher in a school may well impede an emergency situation. The child protection areas around this are very clear: it is very important that, if a child is at risk, the people who are authorised, experienced and trained are the people who progress the intervention and address it in a way that the child is kept as safe as possible.

It is also important, as the member may be aware, to ensure that evidence obtained during the process of an intervention (i.e., the separation of a child) or a prosecution is kept uncontaminated as it is important to preserve the best chance of a successful prosecution if someone is guilty, that is, not impede the police action but also act to protect the child. So, no, I would not expect that information obligations from this go to the layperson, but obviously, in the course of acting, a child protection worker or police officer or health professional may well act to advise other relevant parties in the reasonable sphere of that child or children.

Ms STINSON: Could the Attorney elaborate on that because the clause is, as it is constructed at the moment, I would contend, considerably vague and does not actually specify that a layperson might not be informed under this. In fact, if you read it, it really gives free rein to the central assessment unit to inform any appropriate person or body that they may see fit to pass on information.

While I accept what you are saying, in terms of the practicalities and risks to an investigation by informing laypeople of a risk, this clause does not say that. It does not restrict the passing on of information to public office holders and, from what I can see, as it is written it provides licence for the central assessment unit to provide information to anyone it sees fit. Could you explain why this clause has been drafted in the way it has, in those very broad terms, if your assessment is that information would not be passed to laypeople.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The only situation where I could see that it would not be appropriate to refer to an appropriate person or body, such as the police or child protection, but to a layperson—

Ms Stinson: Yes, but it doesn't say that.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just trying to explain it to the member, as she seems pretty vague. I think 'child protection officer' or 'police officer' is pretty clear. The only circumstance where I could see it going to an individual person who has no professional responsibility in relation to the child—that is, they might be a neighbour, a friend or whatever—is in an isolated region scenario, for example. It may be that information could be conveyed to someone who is in the proximity of that child because it is necessary to prevent harm being caused to the child. It may be so regionally remote that there is no proximate police or child protection service.

So, yes, there could be circumstances, which is why it is as general as 'an appropriate person or body'. I indicate to the member that this is not designed to be to 'a person' but to 'an appropriate person'. In these circumstances, 'appropriate' means someone who is vested with the responsibility, the necessary powers and the necessary experience to deal with the protection of a child. I indicate to the member that that is most likely to be the police or a child protection authority. It may go as far as a medical person, or it may sometimes involve a member of teaching staff, but I would suggest that it is in that order.

The CHAIR: I am not going to call the member for Badcoe. I bring members' attention to standing order 364, which states:

In Committee...

1. a Member other than the Member in charge of the Bill, motion or amendment may not speak more than three times on any one question...

Clause 14 is a large clause. Because of that, I have allowed the member for Elizabeth a point of clarification and also the member for Badcoe four questions.

Ms Stinson: I have had three.

The CHAIR: Well, to my mind you have had four, member for Badcoe. I ask any other members who have further questions on clause 14 to stand and seek the call; if not, the question before the Chair is that clause 14 stand as printed.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

Ms COOK: I ask again for a description of the rationale of the change, that is, the insertion of that paragraph.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As we have just passed clauses that relate to the provision of information or documents, we are adding into the regulation power regulation capacity in those areas.

Clause passed.

Clause 16.

Mr SZAKACS: Attorney, I draw your attention to new section 8B, the transitional provisions insofar as they relate to certain emergency service workers. I note that this clause seeks to define an emergency service worker as a member of the SAMFS, SACFS or SASES. The Fire and Emergency Services Act does not seek to define an emergency service worker. My question is in respect to the definition of an emergency service worker. Does the bill seek to define a member of one of those three organisations as both a remunerated employee and a volunteer member? If so, are workers under that definition caught only by virtue of their being employed under the Fire and Emergency Services Act or also the Public Sector Act?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I advise that the purpose of this clause is to give members of the emergency service worker class—which, under that definition, include more than the three you have mentioned—a three-year transitional process. As I understand it, the question is: where is the definition of SAMFS, etc.? No. The member is shaking his head. Perhaps he could repeat specifically what he would like to know about those, because my recollection is that they are in the principal act.

Mr SZAKACS: I am happy to repeat the question. The definition, for the purposes of the bill, provides that an emergency service worker is a member of the SACFS, the SAMFS or the SASES.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Plus the other two.

Mr SZAKACS: Yes, but I was referring specifically to those categories under the Fire and Emergency Services Act, under which those three organisations are defined and created. The Fire and Emergency Services Act does not seek to define a worker, therefore we default to this bill to define what a worker is pursuant to the membership of those three organisations. My question is: does the bill seek to define a worker, for the purposes of this clause, as both a remunerated worker and a volunteer member of those three organisations? Further to that, insofar as a remunerated

worker is concerned, is that a worker employed under just the Fire and Emergency Services Act or also the Public Sector Act?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Emergency service workers include paid and unpaid persons. The second reference, if I understand this correctly, is whether these MFS workers who do the emergency work are defined under their own specific legislation or whether they include those employed in these services who are employed under the Public Sector Act. It appears that unless they are engaged in emergency service work—that is, under the Fire and Emergency Services Act—they would not be referred to in the bill.

Mr SZAKACS: I seek to clarify this. A member—and I use the word 'member' even though it is not well defined by any other piece of legislation, but is the key word in this clause—of the CFS, MFS or SES can undertake a function of fireground command and control and a function of air support for fire danger days, but if a member of the CFS, SES or MFS, who is not employed under the Fire and Emergency Services Act, which is the way those categories of employees I have just listed are employed, undertakes a function in the emergency call centre (the 000 call centre), the bill does not seek to categorise them as emergency service workers.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct. I will repeat what I said before. On the advice of parliamentary counsel, they have to be employed under the fire and management legislation, not under the Public Sector Act.

Mr SZAKACS: I note that the SES is listed as a category of emergency service organisations and that the Attorney's previous answer specified that not just paid workers but also volunteers in those organisations would be covered under this section. I note that this section ceases to apply when, and I quote, 'the person ceases to be an emergency service worker'. Can the Attorney clarify whether the various categories of members of the CFS, including non-operational, non-uniformed or in fact honorary members, are covered by the emergency service worker definition under the categories of this clause?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I hope this is helpful to the member. You would need to go back to the principal act in relation to the Fire and Emergency Services Act, to be able to identify that. Just so we are clear here, this whole division, I suppose, is the transitional provision allowing for the three years for what is already defined under the principal law, which is scoped out in the regulations and which has now been given a three-year transition period.

The CHAIR: Member for Hurtle Vale. Member for Cheltenham, you have had four questions now.

Mr SZAKACS: Four?

The CHAIR: You have already. I concede that one of those at least was for clarification, but you have had four. You will have the opportunity, if you have further questions, to pass to your colleagues. I might suggest you consider that. Member for Hurtle Vale.

Ms COOK: Thank you, Mr Chair. In regard to clause 16, is a driving instructor or a driving assessor required to complete a working with children clearance under the child safety act that is commencing on 1 July?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes.

Ms COOK: Is the minister able to indicate a specific clause that provides that authority?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The definition comes as a result of them being within the definition of working with children. They have to be working primarily with children. Obviously, if they are giving driving instruction and assessment and they are working with children as part of that purpose then they have to do that. It does not mean that if they are only dealing with or offering a service for adults. However, if they are working with children that is what scopes them in.

Ms COOK: Based on the information given by the minister, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure (DPTI) is a stakeholder in the context of this bill. It has been mentioned previously that no stakeholder raised any objections in the government's consultation on the bill. Was DPTI consulted on the bill and, if so, how?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is no new provision in relation to putting these people in. That was done in 2016 under the previous government, and as best we know there was no complaint about that at the time. All this is doing is giving them a three-year transition period. I think they might only get one year in this section and three years in the previous section. It is three years for emergency service workers and one year for the rest, as I understand it. It is twelve months from the commencement of the section, under new subsection (3)(b). Does that make it clear? This is no new obligation. They are already in there. We are just giving them a transition to be able to come into the new regime.

Mr BOYER: Attorney, I draw your attention to new section 8B(5)(a) and note that there is no mention there of Surf Life Saving South Australia. Can you tell us why they are not included in any of these definitions of emergency service workers?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The decision for emergency service workers to have three years was a policy decision. Surf Life Saving are really at a much higher level; that is, they are people who work regularly with children and the expectation there is that they do not get a three-year transitional clause. That is why they are not in there. The three years is, I suppose, more lenient in allowing that to be transferred in those categories.

Mr BOYER: Attorney, on the same clause, was consultation done with Surf Life Saving South Australia about them being treated differently from other emergency service workers as part of this clause?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, these people, under the existing law that was substantially rewritten in 2016, are already under the obligation to have their checks, so this is not new for them. What was determined was that there were, in the consultation, real questions raised about if a member of the CFS should be under this category: they might be rescuing children, they might be evacuating kids out of schools or giving training in relation to that, so lots of questions were raised about this.

Ultimately, the policy determination was that the people in this category be given three years to transfer and everyone else is under exactly the same regime. In this instance, people who work in surf lifesaving circumstances where they are regularly exposed to children have a very significant threshold of obligation. They are not being given this three-year period and, to the best of my knowledge, there has been no complaint about this from them.

Mr BOYER: As one final question on the new section 8B(5) in its totality, do any of the provisions or definitions in there include volunteers with St John Ambulance?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Similarly, St John do not get the exemption. It is only these people who are in the statutory bodies as defined here that get the three years. Everyone else has to do as they are ordinarily doing now. Under the current law, they do not get a three-year transition period. They have very high obligations now and, quite frankly, why would they seek relief from that? They know what their obligations are and they do it willingly.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Can I move to clause 16, new section 8B(4). My questions are around the unique identifier. Who has access to the unique identifier and what level of confidentiality have they agreed to to have this access?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The central assessment unit itself and, of course, the person who is issued with the unique identifier. I have referred, in some previous answers, as to how that is actually utilised when the individual has to use it to access information. That information is provided to them.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Can I seek a clarification, as I just want to be clear here. From a human resources point of view, if someone is a registered organisation—in this case, an emergency service organisation—would not the person onboarding this or looking at the human resources aspect be checking that every person on their team has been screened and therefore would they not have to access to their unique identifier?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We will just check with how they get it. Obviously, they do need to be able to do that check, but whether they get access to the unique identifier or not is another matter. They may be provided that information directly. We will just check on that. Again, this is just

the transitional thing, but I think you are asking generally in relation to who gets access to this information.

The unique identifier is provided to the employee, as I have indicated. In the process of the checking of that information, as you know, the whole of the child protection law is centred around ensuring that employers themselves check that their employee or volunteer, according to their requisite obligation, actually has their screen test. That employee can then provide that to the employer for the purposes of accessing and checking that information. Remember here that the obligation in relation to screen testing, generally, is on the employee and the employer. In fact, there are very severe penalties for anyone employing either paid or unpaid employees in these circumstances.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Following that situation, obviously there is a person within the organisation who has access to the unique identifier. My question was around the confidentiality but more so whether there is a process to audit inappropriate use. There is significant value on this unique identifier, so what are the processes around auditing this?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As the member would be aware, there are obligations in relation to the confidentiality of information in different aspects of the public sector and there are significant penalties if they are breached by someone in the public sector. There are obligations to audit, to have plans and protocols around a lot of these things. So, yes, there are levels of confidentiality in relation to this information, and there are penalties and offences where there has been a disclosure.

Under the privacy board, there are also acts to investigate matters and grant approval for the release of information in certain circumstances. That board continues under this government and has a role in relation to that, often approving information to go to universities for research and things of that nature. I hope that is helpful.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: To clarify, how many officers from the screening unit will be allocated to audit inappropriate use?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Is that in relation to the central assessment unit or the screening unit?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Obviously, the central screening unit, which is part of the office of screening as it is called now. This is important to me because a huge percentage of the South Australian population has one of these working with children checks and there is an enormous amount of confidentiality around this unique identifier. While we have systems in place, maybe within the public system, there are obviously not-for-profit groups here, volunteer organisations, private companies. Do we have officers who will be auditing this?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As the member might know, having been a former minister, there is an internal audit unit and there is also an investigation management unit. You will be pleased to know that under the new government we have continued those, so they have a role in relation to that. I think the tail of your question indicated how the information is kept confidential once it has gone out to other individuals or private organisations.

The member might know that there is no tort law in South Australia for privacy. We do not have a state privacy act, something that was consistently resisted by the previous government, so I cannot answer that in relation to any tortious liability. Certainly, a number of those people may be in positions where they have obligations of confidentiality under public sector obligations if they are undertaking work, for example, in an NGO. Again, I cannot answer the question specifically without a particular area or example.

Ms STINSON: I refer to 8B(5)(a). This is the section that the member for Cheltenham was asking questions about earlier. Would a volunteer of the Volunteer Marine Rescue service, which is under the command and control of the Chief Officer of the South Australian SES, be defined as an emergency service worker even though that agency is not noted here and of course is independently incorporated?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would expect so. As the member may be aware, the state SES is an organisation which had its origins and charter within South Australia Police. It was a unit

established to seek missing people and find dead persons, and so on—a rather unsavoury task, actually. Divers in particular units, for example, are often involved in a search in those circumstances. It had a more expanded role once it became a state emergency service, but it works in conjunction with other agencies, sometimes helicopters, sometimes diving, sometimes marine vessels, etc., so I would expect so.

Ms STINSON: Mr Chair, I draw your attention to the state of the committee.

A quorum having been formed:

The CHAIR: We are in committee on clause 16. Are there any further questions on clause 16? The member for Badcoe.

Ms STINSON: Again, I refer to 8B(5)(a). I want to seek clarification from the Attorney about the answer she just gave. My understanding is that the Volunteer Marine Rescue service is separate from the SES, although of course there is a reporting line through the Chief Officer of the SES. My understanding of what the Attorney was just saying is that she is confident that, therefore, the Volunteer Marine Rescue service—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Ms STINSON: That is exactly what I am trying to clarify. Would the Attorney mind clarifying what her position is as to whether the Volunteer Marine Rescue service is included as an extension of the SES or whether indeed it is seen as a separate body and is therefore not covered under the Fire and Emergency Services Act?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will check that, and I am happy to do that, but it will be in the principle act. We will get back to you on that.

Ms STINSON: So you are happy to take that on notice?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is what I said.

Ms STINSON: Thank you very much.

Ms WORTLEY: I want to seek clarification in relation to new section 8B(5)(b) and the question asked by the member for Wright, specifically in relation to why St John Ambulance is treated differently. It is not included in this clause.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct.

Ms WORTLEY: My point of clarification is in regard to why St John is treated differently from SA Ambulance and not included in this clause.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For exactly the same reasons I gave earlier; that is, only these agencies have been given provision for a three-year transition and everyone else has to comply with the general obligation. That is the reason: a policy decision that only these people have that benefit.

Ms WORTLEY: Attorney, I understand what you have said but my question is: why is St John Ambulance treated differently from SA Ambulance in this instance?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Because in the ambulance sector, only the SA Ambulance Service has been given this benefit. Nobody else in the Ambulance Service, for the picking up of people, is covered. That is a policy decision to enable there to be an orderly transition of a very large cohort of people who are in these categories, and they have been given this extended time to do so. Everyone else is expected to comply with the law as it is and has been since 2016.

Mr HUGHES: How did the government come up with the three-year figure in 8A(1)?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: On the advice that we had during the course of the consultation on this matter, it was clear, and probably clear to the previous government, that the very substantial expansion of obligation in this area, largely arising out of the Nyland commission, was one in which there would be literally tens of thousands of people who were going to be covered. So that there would be some orderly management of this, we have done two things: firstly, got on with this process; and, secondly, made sure that we do it in such a manner so that we do not get inundated on day one

by literally tens of thousands of people. This is a cohort of people who, whilst very large in number relative to other agencies, it was felt should have that opportunity.

Mr HUGHES: Could you give me a summary of the consultation process, and were the unions consulted during this process?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not believe that the unions of these agencies were consulted on having a transition. That was agreed to by the government to enable them to have the benefit of a transitional period, so, on that aspect, I do not believe so.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

MOTOR VEHICLES (COMPULSORY THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LIQUOR LICENSING) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today the Hon. Barry O'Farrell, the former premier of New South Wales. Welcome to parliament today, sir. I also welcome year 6 students from St Ignatius College Junior School, who are guests of the Premier.

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*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Remuneration Tribunal—

No. 3 of 2019—2019 Review of Salary of the Governor of South Australia Report
No. 4 of 2019—2019 Review of Remuneration for the Auditor-General, Electoral
Commissioner, Deputy Electoral Commissioner and Health and
Community Services Complaints Commissioner Report
No. 4 of 2019—Auditor-General, Electoral Commissioner, Deputy Electoral
Commissioner and Health and Community Services Complaints
Commissioner Determination

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Rules made under the following Acts—

Magistrates Court—

Criminal—Amendment No. 71

Criminal—Amendment No. 72

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

National Parks and Wildlife—

Excluded Species

Wildlife—General

Question Time

PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE DEPARTMENT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:04): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister advise what functions within DPTI's field services are being privatised?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:05): I think I am trying to get to the heart of this question as in relation to announcements that we made in the budget around road maintenance reform in regional South Australia. Currently, and as has been the case under the previous government, about 60 per cent of all road maintenance work that is done in regional South Australia is done by the private sector, where the department contracts out certain areas to private sector operators, who then conduct road maintenance in those areas.

What we have had is the remaining 40 per cent continuing, at this time, to be done internally by the department. What was announced in last year's budget was a savings measure to take that remaining 40 per cent of road maintenance work and put that out to the private market, consistent with the practice as it has been done in the department for quite some time. We are talking about areas across regional South Australia that will now go out to the private sector, and there is a very strong process around that.

We made announcements on that only a few weeks ago in relation to the next steps on it and the discussions that we are having internally with regard to existing staff in those areas. I understand that that process is now moving to expressions of interest for South Australian civil construction firms about tendering for that work. That process will then roll out over the coming months.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:06): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister confirm that the government is privatising the maintenance of traffic lights in metropolitan Adelaide?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:06): Sorry, are we privatising traffic lights in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Would you like the question repeated?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Yes, I would.

The SPEAKER: Would you please repeat the question, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can the minister confirm that the government is privatising the maintenance of traffic lights in metropolitan Adelaide?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I think I will take it on notice, to get a more fulsome answer to the house. I know that there—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —was a tender that went out in relation to the maintenance and upgrading of a number of the elements of the intelligent transit system that we have right across the network in relation to the series of cameras that exist at various parts across networks at intersections but also at a lot of the tunnels, whether that be the Heysen Tunnels, whether that be the O-Bahn Tunnels or whether that be cameras that now exist on the open lowered motorways. I know that there was a tender called and awarded—I am going to have to say last year sometime—in relation to the maintenance of certain elements of that. But I am more than happy to get a more fulsome answer and bring that back to the house.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister confirm that the government is privatising the maintenance of traffic monitoring cameras?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:08): I think that's what I just said in my last answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is called to order. The member for Morphett has the call.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM INDUSTRY

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on the importance of the screen industry to South Australia's economy?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:08): Yes, I can, and I thank the member for Morphett for his interest in films. He lives in the picture-perfect electorate. I understand why he is interested in films. The Marshall Liberal government is growing creative industries to create job opportunities here in South Australia. In particular, the screen industry is of vital importance. International research has established that jobs in the screen industry are growing at twice the rate of the industry average. This is good news for South Australia—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is good news because we have invested in the screen industry; we have invested in the creative industries in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: And, according to a report released last week by Deloitte Access Economics, the South Australian screen industry has contributed \$119.5 million to the state's economy in the past financial year.

This year, already the Adelaide studios at Glenside have produced *Escape from Pretoria*—remember, that was the one with Daniel Radcliffe—and *Never Too Late* with Dennis Waterman, Jack Thompson and Jacki Weaver. Some of the more senior members would remember the work of Dennis Waterman in particular. Also, 18 projects have been completed in the past financial year, including the international film features *I Am Mother* and *Storm Boy*, all shot here in South Australia.

I have a significant announcement today: an historic movie deal for South Australia. The South Australian Film Corporation has secured the production of the movie *Mortal Kombat*, which will be shot in the South Australian Film Corporation's studios at Glenside. It has been talked about for years, but it is happening here in South Australia at the end of the week. At the end of the week they are starting work on pre-production.

The video game has sold 35 million units around the world over the past two decades. It will be transformed into a movie blockbuster as the biggest film production in South Australia's history, and I am also advised, bigger than anything that Victoria has even been able to pull off, and we have done this by utilising the state's creative film industry talent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —and selling it to Hollywood. It's no good having a talent here if the world doesn't know about it, and that is what we have been doing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: This is a fantastic opportunity. It will add \$70 million to the local economy and create 580 skilled jobs in those fast-growing creative industries. It will employ up to 1,500 South Australians as movie extras. There might be some in this room who might have a crack at that. You know what they say—politics is Hollywood for ugly people!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The Warner Bros New Line Cinema deal will see pre-production start at the end of this week and then production by the end of the year. It will involve world-renowned Australian filmmakers Simon McQuoid as director and James Wan, who was the producer of *Aquaman*, utilising world-class crews, acting talent and post-production to take place in the state's visual effects and post-production facilities.

A mission to Hollywood earlier this year involving the film industry delegation led by Premier Steven Marshall contributed to the signing of this lucrative and highly successful deal because we were out there selling South Australia. It is so important that the rest of the world knows what we have here and what is for sale, and we were very pleased to make this important announcement, which highlights the importance of the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to support the creative arts as an industry that delivers exciting new careers for young South Australians.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Wright and Reynell, the Premier, the member for Mawson and the member for West Torrens; and the member for West Torrens has the call.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:13): Thank you, sir. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. What advice has the minister sought about security and privacy risks that the privatisation of traffic monitoring cameras pose to South Australians?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:13): Well, again, I think this forms part of something that I am happy to get a more fulsome answer in relation to, but we have a traffic management centre here in South Australia, in Adelaide. That traffic management centre continues to undertake the functions in relation to the storage and any dissemination of footage in relation to that in the same way. There certainly hasn't been anything from my ministerial perspective that has seen a change in that process.

However, again, I think that right across government, whether that be in my portfolio or any portfolio across government, there need to be very strong privacy protocols. Many areas of government deal with very sensitive information—essentially personal information—and as a government we need to have strong privacy protocols in relation to that. That would be no different from my department, whether that be in the public transport space.

Certainly, the CCTV footage from buses, or, for instance, the new body-worn cameras we are rolling out to our operations people, is making sure that we can collect more evidence when we see people commit assaults on our bus drivers. Again, there needs to be a strong protocol across government. I haven't seen anything that suggests that that has changed.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister rule out privatising traffic monitoring cameras in South Australia?

Ms Bedford interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:15): I think we are talking about who owns the traffic camera. Depending on which intersection we are talking about obviously, if it is on a state-owned road and it's a state-owned intersection I would make the assumption that we own the camera, so I am a little bit puzzled as to what the question is implying. Again, I am more than happy to get a more fulsome answer, if there is one.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:15): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will the minister rule out privatising one or more of Adelaide Metro train or tram services or contracting out the operations of any of the tram or train network services?

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Attorney-General is called to order. Minister for Transport, did you catch that question? I ask members to not interject while the question is being asked.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:16): I think I can now understand what the theme of what the shadow minister is trying to get at in relation to the privatisation agenda—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order. The member for Waite is called to order. Members on my right, be quiet. The minister is trying to have a crack at the answer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —forests, the lands titles office. I will tell you one thing that we are actually having to look into at the moment, and that is the privatisation of the motor registry, because a deal done by the former government forces us to have a look at it. What's interesting here is that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —what we have at the moment is a privatised bus network. It has been in private hands for a long time. Again, if this was not a good way to do business, then the former government had three iterations of contract to change that. What we did have under the former government was a privatisation of parts of our road maintenance network. Again, if there was a problem with that, the former government had plenty of opportunity to change the way those contracting arrangements worked to bring them back in-house. They chose not to.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: the minister is talking about bus networks. I am asking a question about tram and train networks. I ask you to bring him back and stop debating the question.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is for whether the minister is replying to the substance of the question. I suppose he is speaking about transport germanely. I will allow him some time to warm up and then I ask him to come back to the substance of the question. Thank you.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sure, Mr Speaker. Can I say that we also announced last Friday our model in relation to what the South Australian public transport authority is going to look like. That model is one that will stay inside the department. That model will essentially provide an authority for us to bring together all of the elements of public transport that existed in quite a disparate and disjointed fashion right across the department.

What we have been able to do now is bring together the bus, the heavy and the light rail operations, to bring the public transport planning people together with those back-office functions that support that so that we can actually finally have a single area that has very clear reporting lines that allows us to improve our customer focus and essentially—

Mr Malinauskas: After you've made the cuts.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —delivers on that promise—

Mr Picton: Are you going to privatise?

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that we took to the last election. That was very much that we wanted to create a customer focused organisation. We believe that the best way for that to happen is the model that we announced last Friday, that model that brings together all of these—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: debate again, sir. My question was very simple: is the minister planning to privatise our train and tram services?

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I believe the minister is concluding his answer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sure.

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland has the call. I will come back to the member for West Torrens.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

ROAD SAFETY

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. With last week being National Road Safety Week, can the minister update the house on what response the government is taking to address driver behaviour?

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee was called to order, and now he is warned. Minister.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:19): I thank the member for Newland for the question and note that he is a very big advocate for road safety in his community. In fact, I know he has contacted my office a number of times around some issues in his community, and the member for Newland's engagement with SAPOL has proactively got policing out on Hancock Road, Bowen Road and Elizabeth Street in Tea Tree Gully and Milne Road in Ridgehaven. I thank him very much for that fine work that he is doing in his community. Those extra patrols have made sure that he is keeping his community safe, and he does an outstanding job with that.

Last week was National Road Safety Week right across the country. It is an annual initiative that was put together by the Safer Australian Roads and Highways Group (also known as SARAH). I was fortunate to meet the founder, Peter Frazer, back in March and have a wonderful sit-down chat with him. Sadly, he set up the SARAH Group after the tragic death of his daughter at 23 years of age—her name was also Sarah—back in 2012.

The SARAH Group's mission is very clear: it is to help reduce the number of preventable and foreseeable deaths and traumatic injuries on our roads. This year, the theme of National Road Safety Week was 'Drive so others survive'. I think that's a really great message and one we should all be pushing in this house. I have said it many times before in this place and I will say it again: one death on our roads is one death too many.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: With another life lost on our roads overnight, sympathies for people in car accidents are turning into frustrations with the number of times this is happening. People are asking the question, 'Why is the road toll growing as it is?' I have said before, too, that the term 'road toll' is one that I don't like to use—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —because a toll indicates it's the price we have to pay, and it's not. There are a lot of things that people can do. I hear the member for Kurna chuckling on the other side, and I think it's very disrespectful to a very, very serious—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —situation we are looking at.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kurna is warned. Minister, please do not provoke the opposition.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In the past 12 months, approximately 1,200 people have died on Australian roads and thousands more have sustained serious injury. We know already that the road toll is moving up and up here in South Australia this year, and it is totally unacceptable. Interestingly, the number of serious injuries on our roads has been going down. It's an anomaly that we would love to get to the bottom of and, again, I think everyone in this place is in agreement on that.

We have been injecting more money into road safety advertising campaigns in the last nine months than in the time under the previous government. We have committed to working with stakeholders, as well as SAPOL and DPTI, to make sure that we do everything we can to reduce our road toll here in this state.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: A big thankyou to the Minister for Infrastructure, who secured more than \$2 billion to improve our roads. We know they were neglected for many years by those opposite, especially in the regions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are going to be doing everything we can to improve our roads.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: SAPOL, as well, are doing an outstanding job. In fact, they have initiated their own campaign through *The Advertiser*, the campaign around 'Enough is enough', and I think that is very much how we all feel.

We also had our speed camera review, and we had some great findings from that. You will notice bigger speed camera signs, bigger safety signs, are going up, putting up the speed limit and also pointing out where red-light cameras and speed cameras are to make sure that people are slowing down on our roads.

We are holding a forum tomorrow to have a meeting with some of the key stakeholders, again, to get everyone in the room talking about what we can do to reduce the road toll here in South Australia. It's something that everyone in this place should be working on, and the Marshall Liberal government is very focused on it.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:23): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Is the minister aware that on the SA tenders website documents make it clear that the government is seeking contracts being offered to manage traffic signals, level crossings and over 3,000 traffic management devices?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: the member presents what he describes as facts without seeking leave.

The SPEAKER: I think he is asking whether a fact is true. I take the point of order.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, I will handle this. I am going to allow the question, but I will continue to monitor this theme of questions very carefully. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:24): Mr Speaker, if the member is referring to documents that are on the Tenders and Contracts website then, quite clearly, that is publicly available information and he can go and read it at his leisure.

The SPEAKER: That is true. The minister could also elaborate on an answer. Is that the answer? Thank you. Member for West Torrens.

SPRINGBANK ROAD INTERSECTION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the minister stand by his public statements that the numbers don't lie and the numbers confirm that the Marshall government's solution for a double T-junction at Springbank Road-Daws Road will deliver faster travel times?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:25): When you upgrade an intersection, yes, it does result in faster travel times and that still is very much the case. Regardless of which model you use, if you are going to upgrade to add increased capacity to intersections, it does increase travel times. That situation is the same but, again, I will elaborate a little bit on the question that the member is asking

and that is in relation to the Goodwood Road/Springbank Road/Daws Road intersection, which I did go out and make some statements on last Monday. The government has changed its position and that is because, again—

Ms Stinson: To save your candidate in Boothby.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —as the numbers changed, so we changed our information and so we changed our mind. I am not embarrassed one bit by the fact that we moved to a different intersection because it's going to provide the best solution and the best outcome. What I think would be more embarrassing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is not making a change to do what is otherwise the best thing with South Australian taxpayers' money. I did it last Monday. I'm more than happy to do it again any single time that we think that there is a better idea on the table. But there is, to be clear, a very different contrast between what those opposite were proposing when they were in government—unfunded, but they were proposing it—and what we are actually going to deliver. The model that the former government had on the table—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —was going to cost \$45 million more than the solution I announced last Monday. It was also going to take two years longer to deliver, which is why we didn't go with it. It was more expensive and it was going to take longer to deliver—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and it wouldn't have delivered the same traffic outcomes as our solution that we put on the table. In relation to this, we are going to be undertaking a lot of civil construction work around South Australia. With the last federal budget, we have been able to secure \$2.6 billion worth of new money to deliver on—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —seven intersection upgrades and two grade separations, as well as getting a massive injection of money to get on with the next sections of the north-south corridor—a huge investment in road upgrades in metropolitan South Australia. That is going to mean that we are going to have to go and change the shape of parts of our city, and that means we are going to have to talk to people about acquiring their land. It's a very difficult process and one that we undertake with extreme care and caution because we are disrupting people's lives. I think we do that in full knowledge of what it is we are doing because we are making a broader commitment to help the tens of thousands of people a day who go through these intersections.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But what we as a government should be doing with the way that we design this—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is seeking to minimise the amount of land acquisition that we undertake with any proposal. Why we have now moved to the design that we have is to minimise the

number of people who are impacted as a result of this upgrade. I think that is prudent, especially when it's cheaper, quicker and disrupts people less. I think that that is the best way to go about things, so I would be more than happy to stand up and explain how we are making sure that we eke the best amount of value out of every single taxpayer dollar that we have. I will stand up here and talk about that anytime anyone would like me to.

UNITED STATES, CYBERSECURITY

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house about how building closer ties with the United States will benefit South Australia, especially in the cybersecurity industry?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28): I have really enjoyed an opportunity over the last 10 days to be on the front foot selling the state over in the United States, but I must say that it's good to be back. It's good to be in this place and updating you, sir, on the great opportunity—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that there is in the United States and the wonderful opportunities that we have here in South Australia. It follows on directly from what the Minister for Innovation and Skills was mentioning to this house only a few minutes ago. I would like to congratulate him on the great work that he did over on the West Coast in January, working with his team to secure *Mortal Kombat*, a great production for South Australia, bringing Warner Bros and New Line Cinema to South Australia and creating sustainable long-term jobs in the creative sector and the screen sector for South Australia. Congratulations to you, minister.

One of the major focuses of my recent trip to the United States was to attend the Sea-Air-Space Expo, which was held in Washington DC. This was a great opportunity to speak to some of the largest firms in the maritime sector in the United States. Of course, we have a lot to talk about: offshore patrol vessels, Future Frigates and Future Submarines in South Australia. I have to say, we were warmly welcomed. That was followed up with the great opportunity that I had to deliver the keynote speech at the G'Day USA USA-Australia defence dialogue. This opportunity was created because the federal government is in caretaker mode. This provided, if you like, a unique opportunity for South Australia to be showcased at this very important dialogue—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, be quiet.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —a dialogue that is now in its sixth year and features leaders from Australia, the United States, the defence sector and, of course, the defence industry. There is just such an enormous opportunity for the defence sector in this state because of the continuous shipbuilding program that the Coalition has put in place over the last six years, commissioning 54 separate vessels.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We hear the squawks from those opposite, but let's be very clear: in the previous six years, they didn't commission a single vessel—not a single vessel.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is the Coalition that has done the heavy lifting with regard to this important sector. I also took the time to meet with NASA officials at the NASA headquarters in Washington. In that meeting, I was able to showcase the great opportunity that the establishment of

the Australian Space Agency will provide for this very important sector—again, another Coalition investment here in South Australia. We're so grateful for the work that the Coalition has done to see these important industries in South Australia. I look forward to multiple future generations getting involved in the incredible opportunity of the space sector.

The other sector that I think provides enormous opportunity is cybersecurity. A lot of other people talk about the risk and the threat associated with cyber and, if you like, cyber attacks. These are very large; there is no doubt about that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But the flip side of that—the flip side of the risk, the flip side of those attacks—is the opportunity for businesses to be created around dealing with that risk. That's the opportunity for South Australia. That's why I took the time to go to Maryland to speak to the great capability that they have in their industry sector, in their university sector, in their training sector and, of course, in their National Cybersecurity Center of Excellence. It was an excellent trip that will bring many opportunities for our state going into the future.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Ramsay, Kavel, Morphett and Heysen. The member for West Torrens has the call.

SPRINGBANK ROAD INTERSECTION

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Could the leader and the Premier please cease whatever this is. You can continue after question time. The member for West Torrens has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Given his previous answer, why did the government tell South Australians that it had done its homework, and that a double T-junction would deliver the best outcome for motorists and the local community, then several weeks later adopt Labor's plan for a four-way intersection?

The SPEAKER: Minister. There is a fair bit in that, minister.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:33): If we had adopted Labor's plan, then I would have announced a \$105 million intersection that is being completed in 2024. That's not what I did. I announced a \$60 million intersection that is being completed in 2022. As to what changed, when we look at this traffic intersection dealing with roughly 55,000 motorists a day, we evaluate and model the performance of that intersection based on the number of people who use it but also the projections of the number of people who are going to use it between here and a point in 2036.

The feedback that we got was that there was a whole heap of people who were avoiding this intersection whose data wasn't included because they don't drive through the intersection because they actually avoid it. Whether they are going down side streets to get around the Repat, or whether they are going down side streets to get around the back of Bedford, they were avoiding this intersection because of the existing traffic delay. We worked with the Mitcham council to get that data together, feed that into the model and see what that said, and we used that updated modelling to then put on the table the solution we put out.

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is still interjecting. She is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It's fine. I think the public couldn't care less about any sort of gotcha moment or government changing its mind. In the end, what people want is a government that is going to do what is in their best interests—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —not what is just politically advantageous. What is very interesting in this case is that, instead of putting out a design that maximised land acquisition but in the end was going to cost more and take longer to deliver and, whilst they were in government, not actually having a budget line in the budget that identified any funding source, what we have actually managed to do is deliver the money in the federal budget as well as in the upcoming state budget.

This project will be funded for the first time. This is a project and a problem that has been around for 30 years plus and all we saw was lip service being paid in the dying days of the Weatherill administration. We haven't promised anything, other than what we actually have money allocated for and identified in the federal budget. I think that is a massive win, and it is a testament to the fact that we have been able to have a constructive relationship with the federal government that is actually going to see money delivered for this intersection where there was none before.

I think that is a great outcome, and the people who are going to drive through that intersection every single day after it is upgraded are going to say thank you to the ones who turned around and got it done, as opposed to the ones who just talked about it endlessly.

DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. When was the minister first made aware that part of the Darlington project had collapsed?

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: That would have been a bad call.

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay, you can leave for the rest of question time.

The honourable member for Ramsay having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:37): I was made aware on Monday, when it was apparent that this situation was more than just a minor defect the project would deal with internally, essentially when it got to a degree of seriousness that the contractors then had notified the department and the department came and spoke to me. This was outlined to me on Monday.

PUBLIC EDUCATION AWARDS

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the 2019 Public Education Awards?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:38): I know that all members of parliament will be pleased to learn more about the 2019 Public Education Awards, and I hope that many will take the opportunity to encourage members of their community to make nominations. I am very pleased to receive this question from the member for Kavel. I know that the member for Kavel has asked me as both a candidate and a shadow minister and, since the election, as the member for Kavel to visit a number of his local schools to engage with parents and to engage with teachers.

Indeed, when we were visiting Mount Barker South Primary School, I reckon that we met one of the teachers and heard about some of the ways that she had put the reward for winning a Public Education Award towards the benefit of her school. The member for Kavel is also the son of teachers who spent time teaching in the public education system. I know he is very passionate about this and I thank him for that.

These awards are significant in South Australia, and I think they are one of the better things that were instituted by the former government during their time. They are certainly awards that we

are keeping going strong because of the benefits they provide to our school communities, our teachers, our families and our communities more broadly.

There are 10 categories. Congratulations again on the opportunities that were given to the school communities of last year's winners: Amanda Pedder, who was our Secondary Teacher of the Year; Kelly Rivett, the Primary Teacher of the Year; Peta Tooley, the Early Years Teacher of the Year; Antoinette Jones, the Teachers Health Leadership Award; Annette Hammond, the School and Preschool Support Award winner from the member for Flinders' electorate; the Early Career Teacher Development Program for their System Excellence Award; Katrina Tjitayi, who won the Aunty Josie Agius Award; Paint the Inner West REaD community group, who won the Community Engagement Award; Mike Hawkey, who won the Innovation in Practice Award; and Roger Nottage from the Frome electorate, who won the Performance Through Values Award.

I think the opportunities that those teachers have given their students through their work have been profound. All 30 finalists win something. The 20 runners-up get \$2,000 that they can put towards professional development or indeed professional development opportunities for their whole school. The winners win \$10,000.

Just to highlight a couple of those examples, when the members for Napier and Schubert and I were up at the Two Wells Primary School a few months ago, we met a fellow called Mike Hawkey, who was encouraging his students to be engaged with robotics and the opportunities in science industries and space industries in particular. He is a tremendous fellow who has inspired his students, and we have seen him around the place.

He has put his money towards attending a STEM conference in Canberra; the CONASTA STEM tour to Singapore, where he is visiting the Singapore Space Agency; a NASA science tour; and he is spending a week at a space camp in Alabama. I am absolutely confident that he will bring back those experiences and share them with his classrooms for many years to come. Also, I know that he collaborates across the South Australian Science Teachers Association and shares those experiences more broadly.

I know that the member for Frome and I would be interested that Roger Nottage, who will admit he is towards the end of his career, is using his money to benefit the whole Port Pirie community by bringing Michael McQueen to Port Pirie to deliver a Futuristic Forward 2030 presentation to educators across Port Pirie as well as the local business community and local agencies who work with the school.

All the winners have done worthy work to get the awards, and they have used their reward money in worthy ways. I can't wait to meet the award winners for the 2019 awards. I encourage all of our members of parliament to be ambassadors for the award. But, of course, I am pleased to say once again that the official ambassador for the award is the great Adelaide Crows footballer Eddie Betts, who is very keen to talk about the advantage of education. I hope that, through his advocacy, many people will be brought to make nominations for these awards.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is called to order. The member for West Torrens.

DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Why did the minister fly to Mount Gambier to attend a Liberal Party fundraiser before attending the site of the collapsed embankments at the Darlington Road project?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:42): This gives me the chance to correct the falsity in the member's question. I didn't fly to Mount Gambier. After having briefed the press on Wednesday about the latest information as it was unfolding down at the Darlington interchange and the work around there, giving the media answers to all of the questions they asked, I then proceeded to go with local MPs—I was with member for MacKillop—and the federal member for Barker, who for quite a while had been asking me to look at what are some pretty awful roads in their electorate.

We started off having a look at essentially the highway and the Monarto turn-off and some money that has just been awarded through the federal Black Spot funding program around a particular issue there. We then—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is on two warnings and continues to interject.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —moved over to just south of Bordertown to look at Frances Road, where we have seen some recent fatalities. Unfortunately, that is what sparked again some money being put along a four-kilometre stretch, three to seven kilometres south of Bordertown, on Frances Road, a road that is extremely narrow in those parts, has no sealed shoulder and does not have much separation at all. In fact, while we were there we saw trucks trying to pass each other on that road—and there ain't much clearance between those two. It is quite a dangerous situation. Again, we were able to look at where the money from the federal Black Spot funding program is going to fix this problem.

The member for MacKillop then took the opportunity to show me certain parts of the Riddoch Highway that need some further investment, and I have certainly taken those on notice at this stage. We also took the opportunity to look at a whole series of other roads, whether that be Carpenter Rocks Road or Clay Wells Road, going down through Mount Burr.

The other road we ended up on, on the Princes Highway out of Millicent, was the one that really stuck in my mind because we drove past what is a collection of about seven or eight fatality markers. Those markers have been there for a little while, but what I got from the federal member for Barker was a detailed history of who those people were. Essentially, it was a sporting team coming home, after celebrating a win, that came to grief on that road. That was a very stark reminder to me that a lot of these fatalities—and we look at the fact that we are now up to 44 or 45 fatalities for the year on our roads—are on country roads. I think statistics from last year show that two-thirds of the fatalities were on country roads.

When these things happen, local communities know about them because they know the people involved. I can tell you a story about someone who was known to my community who came to grief on the Sturt Highway at Truro only a couple of months back. We can tell the story about the young girl who came to grief somewhere just off the Thiele Highway only a couple of months back; in fact, a number of people I know knew this girl quite well.

This is a big and diverse portfolio and yes, there is an issue that is unfolding at Darlington. I was in full and constant communication to get the most up-to-date information but also to share that with the media as soon as that was ready.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned for a second and final time and the member for Waite is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We cannot, especially considering that we have just had National Road Safety Week, lose sight of the fact that there are an unacceptably high number of deaths on our country roads. I think that putting some time and effort into that issue is important, hugely important—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and I'm extremely proud that we went to have a look at those roads. And I will continue to do so for the foreseeable future.

DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Were any of the 46 DPTI employees who received targeted voluntary separation packages involved in the oversight or project management of the Darlington project?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:47): Finally, he actually tells us where this figure comes from. Over the last week, in the media the member for West Torrens has been using a figure that somehow 46 senior executives from the department are no longer there, and that is why there is something wrong with the place. We could not for the life of us work out where this figure came from.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: It was tabled in parliament.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Laugh, sure—but now we actually understand—

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —where the figure has come from, and we are talking about targeted voluntary separation packages.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Yes, the member is correct—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that there are 46 members, across the entire organisation of 3,000 people, who have taken TVSPs. I kept thinking that I don't even have 46 senior executives within the department, and I must admit that I don't know where they went.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, I was wondering whether or not he was speaking about the mass exodus of departmental staff who left when the former chief executive Rod Hook was sacked and the whole host of senior executives at that time I now come across—because a lot of them are working in private industry—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and tell me about what happened during that time. Now we've got to the heart of the issue, and I can categorically rule out that there have been 46 senior executives who have gone anywhere in the department. But I can say that the staff who are working down there—the senior project leads as well as the people those project leads then report to within the department—are all still there. They are all the same people. They were there under the former government and they still exist there under the new government.

At the lower levels, there may have been some personnel change, but certainly the people who report to me are very much still there and they are very much going to continue to be there because of the host of knowledge they have in relation to building projects across our state. We are dealing with our Hindmarsh clay soils, we are dealing with a lot of very specific issues that are unique to Adelaide, and they have a history with the projects the department has previously undertaken. They are still there, and I certainly hope they continue to be there well into the future.

DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the minister received any advice advocating the closure of South Road directly above the Darlington embankment that has subsided?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:49): This is fantastic. Thank you, member for West Torrens, for allowing me to tell South Australians once again that there is no issue with South Road. The only person—the only person—who is out there trying to create fear in the community around that section of road is the member for West Torrens, and his behaviour—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The bloke should be out there chasing ambulances and leaving the rest of us alone. I don't mind being accountable—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I don't mind being held to account. I don't mind answering legitimate questions—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for West Torrens, I understand you have been provoked, but you are on two warnings and the minister must get on with the answer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —but when we have the CFMEU out there showing photos that they purport show the cause of some water thing, which is actually down the other side of the project and has absolutely nothing to do with anything to do with the revetment wall, and when you have the member for West Torrens in front of cameras last week telling people that South Road needs to be closed completely because there are issues, it's disgusting and it's wrong. What we have done every step of the way—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —is give people the correct information. We give people the correct information.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We have done that. We have done that on a daily basis, and we will continue to do this on a daily basis. For those tens of thousands of motorists who use that road every day, they should not have to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —have stuff that's just made up and said in front of a camera that is fundamentally not true.

BIOSECURITY MANAGEMENT

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the state government is working with industry to improve biosecurity in the Northern Adelaide Plains?

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell can leave for the rest of question time, thank you. When she does, the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development will have the call.

The honourable member for Reynell having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister. Thank you.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:52): I thank the member for her very important question. I know that she was very excited to join me and the member for Grey, recently, down at Two Wells to make the

announcement. It was a fantastic opportunity because I know that the member for King is a very fastidious, clean and particular person, particularly being an advocate for on-farm—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: Those on that side might not even know what immaculate is.

Mr Hughes interjecting:

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

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: What I can say is that government have provided the funding for—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —the initiative for Clean Your Farm. That announcement was made last week, and, as I said, the funding has come from a government who is delivering an election commitment to grow our economy and open up new export markets. We were joined by AUSVEG. It was also great to have the chair, Kingsley Songer; the CE, Jordan Brooke-Barnett; and the spokesman for the Vietnamese Farmers Association, Charlie Luong. Charlie Luong has a huge amount of respect within the Northern Adelaide Plains food producing area, and he has been a long-time advocate for that area to clean up its act to make sure that we have strict hygiene and cleanliness and tidy farms.

The initiative has been brought to the fore because we are dealing with issues around biosecurity. We are dealing with issues about the perception that we have a farming sector and a food producing sector that are second to none. I know that the member for King has been a very strong advocate for the drumMUSTER program, as well as now working with Jeffries in recycling the Rockwool products. Those Rockwool products that many of you see sitting on pallets around many of our glasshouses are now able to be recycled. When they are recycled, it means it's cleaning up the areas in which we are growing food.

When we have our markets come to the Northern Adelaide Plains, they now have a perception that we are clean and green and that we are responsible farmers with biosecurity as an absolute priority. It is also important to note that, working with the Northern Adelaide Plains, there are huge opportunities now with the construction of the Northern Adelaide Plains irrigation district—the extension that will now see more and more opportunity for growing more food, to grow products that we can export to the world.

This is the opportunity the Northern Adelaide Plains has been given not only with the extension of the water pipeline but also it is now a young set out there, particularly led by a young fellow, the Young Grower of the Year, who is known as Aussie Kev. Aussie Kev is the face of the young farming sector out in the Northern Adelaide Plains. The advocacy that he shows, the leadership that he shows, is by example. He doesn't go out there and tell the farmers how they need to be doing it. He leads by example, and he now has a following. Wherever he goes, the people follow him. They do what he does: cleaning farms, growing good produce and growing what the world is looking for. It is a great initiative.

Clean Your Farm is a great initiative. I am sure that all of us in this chamber would be very proud to see those farms out there clean up, making sure that they are leaders when it comes to food production and making sure that we adhere to the biosecurity regime. We know that we have had scares back in 2017 with the cucumber mosaic virus. We know that we had the potato spindle tuber viroid back in 2011. We don't want a repeat of those situations, and that is why Clean Your Farm is a great initiative, because #RegionsMatter.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:56): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will government savings measures applied to Public Trustee services make it harder for people to access affordable will and power of attorney services, and what flow-on costs are anticipated from inaccurate or incomplete wills as a result of the reduced services?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:56): I thank the member for the question because we have announced an important initiative in relation to the Public Trustee, that is, that it resume its core business of operating to provide for services for the poor and vulnerable.

For those who are not in that category—that is, who are able to pay for their own wills and not have that service—two things have happened; one is that the Law Society has provided a list to the Public Trustee to ensure that anyone who wishes to in future have that service but who are able to actually access a legal adviser will have a list to refer to.

Bear in mind that even though a free will historically is prepared by the Public Trustee, that does not mean that you get a free distribution of the estate. In fact, the Public Trustee takes a very significant percentage of that estate upon the death of a party. So it is not a free service, but the provision of the will part of it is—you get a bit of a kick at the end.

We have determined that that is a service, as I say, that should no longer be provided by the Public Trustee, and it has been welcomed, I think, generally. To ensure that there is an orderly transfer for those who had that service, a variation to the will or codicil has been offered for three months up to 30 June for anyone who wishes to change their will, collect their own. That would be provided for as well as, as I say, the additional referral service.

We don't see there being any impediment to those who previously utilised that service. I expect for small or moderate estates, in fact, we will have ultimately saved them a lot of money rather than them having to pay a significant percentage of their estate, as operates under the Public Trustee regime.

PUBLIC TRUSTEE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:58): Supplementary: can the Attorney elaborate whether this loss of income for the Public Trustee will have any impact on the Public Trustee itself?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:58): There is an income over a period of years that could be lost, that is, in the sense of revenue from estates. But what we discovered when we looked at this issue was that, although there is revenue from some of the estates, a significant number, I think close to half of the wills that are prepared, are ultimately not followed through; that is, the party has changed their will somewhere else, or has moved interstate, or has a circumstance where they have remarried and the will becomes no longer valid—those sorts of circumstances. So what might have been seen to be a significant financial income stream for the Public Trustee actually hasn't necessarily translated to that.

We felt that it was very important as one of the initiatives in this area and, secondly, that we look to ensure that our 700 clients who are currently serviced by the Public Advocate also have proximate access to the Public Trustee. We have about 700 persons in South Australia who are clients of both, and so there are other initiatives in train for them. There is some restructuring and coordination that we think will better serve, without any intended reduction in staff or anything of that nature, to restructure those services for the most vulnerable, who need those services the most.

GLOBELINK

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the minister stand by the commitment made by the member for Waite that the government will remove freight trains out of the suburbs and Hills?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:00): I don't I think I am responsible to the house for what the member for Waite says, otherwise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —I would be asking the Premier for a pay rise. What I can say is that we took to the last election a policy of providing \$20 million worth of funding to look into a visionary transport and infrastructure project called GlobeLink, an idea that we can get our freight trains as well as road freight infrastructure, as well as dealing with airports and intermodals—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can leave for the rest of question time.

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

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite can leave as well.

The honourable member for Waite having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is to reroute train and road freight around Adelaide. It is a visionary idea and we have put \$20 million on the table. We've got a stage 1, stage 2 business case currently being completed by AECOM and KPMG, and we eagerly await that coming out at around the middle of the year.

But what I find most interesting is that there is only one party that is talking about traffic congestion issues in the Mitcham Hills and that is the Liberal Party. There is only one party that has actually put money on the table to fix freight issues in the Mitcham Hills, and especially in relation to the Fullarton Road and Cross Road intersection, and that is the Liberal Party. There is only one party that has put \$20 million on the table to upgrade Old Belair Road as well as Main Road, Blackwood, and the corridor there, looking at strategic improvements that we can make to improve the traffic flow in the Mitcham Hills corridor, and that is the Marshall Liberal government. That money is all there. It is all in the budget.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: this is clearly debate. The question was about removing freight trains.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. There was a cacophony of noise. Two members have been ejected. I ask the minister, however, to come back to the substance of the question. Thank you.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The question is very much about traffic in the Mitcham Hills corridor, which is why you want to get the freight trains out of there—

The SPEAKER: Facts—thank you.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —so it is easier for cars to get around.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, it is only this side of the house that is tackling any of these issues.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: the question was about freight trains, not traffic. I would ask him to come to the answer.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I believe the minister is wrapping up his answer and will conclude very shortly.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Do freight trains interact with roads somewhere?

The SPEAKER: They do. Order! Let's get on with it. I am trying to allow another question, if I can.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: You can lead an MP to policy, but you can't make him read it.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The fundamental essence of GlobeLink and the reason you want to move the freight train is so that it can improve traffic outcomes, which is a specific issue.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We are doing exactly what it is that we said we would do prior to election. We are doing right now exactly what we said we would do in relation to this project, and we will keep on doing it.

Again, I reiterate that it is only this side of the house that is talking about these issues, and we will be the champions for improving traffic in the Mitcham Hills. We are already getting on to deliver the next stage of the project in relation to the Belair triangle, and we are going to continue to do it because the money is there in the state budget.

Grievance Debate

CLIMATE CHANGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): The majority of the population, the vast majority of scientists and, I would venture to say, almost every member of this parliament understand the importance of climate change, understand that it is happening, understand that it is caused by humans and understand that it needs to be addressed or it will cause irreparable harm to the planet and to our way of life.

That consensus first emerged indisputably around 1990 with the first Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, released by the UN, which demonstrated a broad range of scientific evidence that this was occurring. Yet we have seen all too little action, largely, I would say, because we have had too many conservative politicians, otherwise known as 'coal fondlers', who have been vigorously in denial of its occurrence and vigorously unwilling to do anything about it.

Let's just think about what has happened recently, even though we have known indisputably about climate change since at least 1990. As we know, last summer was the hottest on record in Australia. Across our nation, 200 temperature records were broken. Since 2001, across the planet 16 of the 17 hottest years on record have occurred. For the last 30 years, every month has been hotter than the average temperature of the planet in the 20th century.

The last time there was a month that was not hotter than the average was in February 1985. It is not those averages that actually matter—they are indicators—but the extreme events: when you shift the bell curve of the frequency of the very high temperatures, as the temperature moves across generally you will get more and they will be hotter. You need only talk to the residents of Port Augusta about having temperatures of nearly 50° in January to understand the very real impact of extreme events.

The risk we see here is that we take too long to take these issues seriously. Last week, the UN came out with another intergovernmental panel report on biodiversity and ecosystem services, and it is essential not only that we take it as seriously, as we have now taken climate change, but that we do something before it is too late.

One million species across the planet are threatened. The biomass of native animals has dropped 82 per cent in recorded history. Right now, 40 per cent of our amphibian species are on the endangered list. Thirty-three per cent of marine mammals are threatened. Thirty per cent of re-forming coral species are threatened. Seventy-five per cent of our land and two-thirds of our marine environment have been significantly affected by humans. One-third of our land, and 75 per cent of fresh water, is devoted to crops and livestock. We have had a massive impact on this planet and it is showing the strain.

Turn your mind very briefly to the benefits we get: healthy fisheries from which we can feed our people, pollination services, healthy topsoils in order to grow the food that we require, fresh water for ourselves—a very precious commodity under threat—and sea level rises. Of course, if we do not

have the carbon sequestration syncs provided by ecosystems, particularly the ocean, then we will see an increase of 4°. We will see one day in eight in South Australia being a heatwave. I do not think that anyone thinks we can survive at all in those conditions, let alone the way we do now.

So what do we need? We need politicians to take this seriously, and this government is not the government to do that. This government is the one that is led by the coal fondlers in Canberra—the climate deniers, the people who think that carbon is funny. The biggest challenge—the reason we are suffering from biodiversity collapse—is, number one, climate change. This government has cut \$11 million out of the department. Number two is land use.

What is this government doing with its Natural Resources Management Act? It is removing nature from it. What is it doing to the department that cares about nature? It is hacking into the jobs. What about water use, another threat to biodiversity? Well, just look at the River Murray and the absolute disgrace of the way Canberra led this government by the nose into not extending the royal commission and into doing a dodgy deal with interstate irrigators.

What have this government done about the overexploitation of species? They have come in saying they are going to do something awful to marine parks but are being silent about exactly what. Pollution is another threat hacking into the EPA budget. What we need is a government that is prepared to listen to experts and listen to young people because they have never known a normal climate and they will be looking to all leaders to do something about this before it is too late.

KERNEWEK LOWENDER COPPER COAST CORNISH FESTIVAL

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:10): I rise today to speak about the Kernewek Lowender Copper Coast Cornish Festival, the largest event staged in the Narungga electorate, which has attracted in the vicinity of 45,000 people every two years for the last 40-plus years. I note that my grandfather was on the inaugural committee that set up this wonderful festival. The festival is currently underway this week in the towns of Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta and it runs from 13 to 19 May.

I encourage everyone to come and visit the wonderful Cornish festival. I advise them that, if they are planning to head out to the Copper Coast this weekend, there are plenty of election booths to vote at and an early voting centre in Kadina, which will remain open until Saturday night, catering for the expected influx of tourists from interstate who have not already voted at pre-poll locations. It does not matter what your postcode is; you can vote at the Copper Coast, so do not let the federal election stop you from travelling to Kadina, Wallaroo and Moonta to visit the Cornish festival this weekend.

The program is packed with entertainment, Cornish food and all the traditions the festival is famous for, like maypole and furry dancing, the Moonta street parade and the Cornish pasty bake-off. I was talking to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment earlier this week, who recalled, with some jocularity, his failed effort at a pasty at the last iteration of this festival.

The entertainment also includes the classic cavalcade of cars and motorcycles, concerts, Cornish ceremonies, markets, feasts, exhibitions, the tourist railway, cemetery walks, miner's cottage open houses and gardens, the Dressing of the Graves events and the bards ceremony conducted entirely in the Cornish language. I am advised that new to the week's program this year is a Wallaroo street party featuring Swanky beer, live entertainment and a Nos Lowen music event, which means 'anchors a-weigh'.

I wish all well for a successful event that can reward the efforts of the hundreds of volunteers it takes to stage such a huge event, as well as all the local businesses that participate, resulting in many working diligently in Cornish costume, which adds so much of the flavour of the week. It really is a wonderful event that has been the flagship tourism event for the region for decades and is renowned internationally due to the authenticity of the activities on offer and the efforts of the hardworking volunteers on the organising committee, hardworking community groups that help stage all the events, supportive local businesses and loyal sponsors.

Major partners this year are the South Australian Tourism Commission and the Copper Coast Council. Gold sponsors are Newbery Chemists, Apex, Drakes Supermarkets, the Moonta National Trust, NYP Rotary, RAA, 5CS and Magic FM 105.9. The festival would not be possible without this financial support and the support of other multiple silver and copper-level sponsors.

At the risk of singling people out, I am moved to mention the Kernewek Lowender Organising Committee Chairperson, Lyn Spurling, and Executive Officer, Glenys Blacker, who work tirelessly to make sure this event happens. I would also like to mention the NYP Rotary Club, the Wallaroo traders and town development group, the Moonta Progress Association and local Apex club members, who are all kept particularly busy over the weekend.

Some 300 volunteers from the three towns work together for the common cause, which gives an idea of the size and impact of the Cornish festival for the local area. The Marshall Liberal government is also proud to be a supporter, providing money from its Tourism Events Grants Program to ensure this major state cultural festival is promoted intrastate, interstate and overseas to the standard that it deserves.

I was also pleased to note the Moonta Mines Museum was the successful recipient of a South Australian Heritage Grant for wall conservation and that the Moonta Mines National Heritage precinct received \$88,000 of Australian heritage grant money to develop a conservation management plan for the precinct. I am also pleased to advise that the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment, the Hon. David Ridgway from the other place, is officiating at the festival's official opening this Friday at Moonta, which I will also be attending, and I look forward to opening the coveted Kernewek Lowender Art Prize later that day.

Regional tourism is recognised by this government as vital to the state's economy and it is a topic that I have spoken about regularly in this place. Current tourism expenditure on Yorke Peninsula is \$198 million. The aim is to grow that to \$302 million by 2020. We are on track, with the latest International Visitor Survey results showing that South Australia has grown its international visits by 7 per cent and its expenditure by 8 per cent, both outstripping national averages.

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth, you have drawn attention to the state of the house with just a few seconds to go in a grieve, but I note that there is no quorum.

A quorum having been formed:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Narungga.

Mr ELLIS: I am done.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are done. Before I call the member for Elizabeth—

Mr Odenwalder: I wanted a full house, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Indeed. I will give you the call. As one of Cornish descent to another of Cornish descent, I look forward to seeing the member for Narungga in his Cornish national tartan tie on the weekend. Member for Elizabeth.

EMERGENCY RELIEF SERVICES FUNDING

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:17): Thank you, sir. I would not dare interrupt you. The people of South Australia were rightly shocked by the severity of the state budget last year: the \$46 million cut to public transport; the \$38 million cut to SAPOL; the cuts to road safety, road maintenance, community safety grants, CCTV and managed taxi ranks in the city; and the cruel cuts and closures in the courts, TAFE, the Motor Accident Commission, Crime Stoppers and, of course, Service SA branches.

People were shocked by the severity of the cuts and the closures, but was anyone really surprised? It is in the Liberals' DNA. It is in the way they do things not just here but federally, too. The Morrison government—the government of Nicolle Flint, the government of Tony Pasin, the government that James Stevens aspires to join—has plans to cut the funding for many emergency relief services at the end of the year, a \$5.5 million cut to relief services for the most vulnerable in our society.

Many of these services operate across the northern suburbs in my electorate and in adjacent electorates such as Ramsay, Taylor and Light. They pick up the pieces when people's lives take a turn for the worst. These services operate on a shoestring. They are largely volunteer driven, and they do things such as provide support to vulnerable people who have nowhere to turn. They provide

food hampers when needed; funding for fuel to attend specialist medical appointments, job interviews and those kinds of things; and other financial assistance. It is a cruel cut, and the federal Labor Party has plans to reverse these cuts to emergency relief organisations.

On the weekend, Nick Champion, the member for Wakefield and shadow assistant minister for manufacturing, announced new funds to provide a much-needed funding boost to some of these life-saving organisations across the north. I am really pleased that one of those organisations is the Playford Community Fund, which, if a federal Labor Party is elected, will receive over \$400,000 over the next four years. I have had a long and fruitful association with the Playford Community Fund that goes back long before I was the local MP. Indeed, I was introduced to them by my predecessor, Lea Stevens. She has remained a strong supporter of the fund and its work in Elizabeth.

From their humble offices in the old library building on the eastern edge of Elizabeth City Centre, Dennis Jarman runs a tight ship, but he does not do it alone. He is of course ably assisted in all things by his better half, Joy, and by his board: my old friend and Deputy Mayor of the City of Playford, Marilyn Baker; Meredith Keage from Women's Safety Services; Bryan Sellers, who is a pastor at Northern Communities of Hope; Barbara Kotesic, who volunteers with Peachey Place; Michael Scott from Telstra; Shirley Wissell, a former councillor for the City of Playford; and Diane Hickman, who is the current secretary and public officer.

As I said, I have had a long association with the Playford Community Fund, dating back to my life before this place. Like Lea Stevens before me, every year I collect non-perishable food and household items from the public and from church groups—and organise local school kids to run casual days and so on—for the fund to package up for families in need over the Christmas period. Of course, this is not nearly enough and we often ask people who are themselves doing it tough to help their neighbours. Most years, I go in and help give out these food hampers over Christmas. While it is an easy day's work for me, it brings home the real need out there and the absolute need for government intervention and help when people are in real need.

We on this side of the house and on this side of politics believe that government does have a role in helping people who are in need, who are doing it tough or falling through the cracks. This election is a choice between a Shorten Labor government with a plan for the services our communities need or more cuts and chaos from the Morrison government. The charities and not-for-profits that do this work are increasingly stretched and need more resources. Nick Champion, Nadia Clancy and all of the Labor team are committed to giving them more.

A federal Labor government will make sure our charities and not-for-profits have the resources they need to support our fellow Australians. Of course, this can only happen if people like Nick Champion are re-elected, if Nadia Clancy is elected and if the Labor team are all elected to government across this country. A re-elected Liberal government and a re-elected Nicolle Flint, Tony Pasin and James Stevens will continue the cuts and closures that we have come to expect from Liberal governments. I have faith that the people of South Australia will elect a government that cares about people in need.

STUART ELECTORATE

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining)
(15:21): I rise with great pleasure to share with the house information about a trip that I took recently to some schools and station homesteads with the Minister for Education, the member for Morialta. It was terrific that he accepted my invitation to come and spend two days in Stuart. He flew from Adelaide to Whyalla and I picked him up at Whyalla Airport.

I took him to the Port Augusta Special School, where we were greeted by principal Sarah French and were able to see the facilities, meet the staff and meet the students in what is an absolutely wonderful learning institution in Port Augusta, greatly supported in many ways by the broader local community. From there, we went to Holowiliena Station, where we were greeted by Frances and Luke Frahn and their two wonderful children, Stella and Todd. Very importantly, they were able to show the Minister for Education what it is like for School of the Air children and mothers or governesses who teach their children in their schoolrooms.

It is very easy to go to see distance education at Marden or perhaps even to the School of the Air office in Port Augusta, but it was a great opportunity to see the other end, the household end, where the students actually do their learning in their classroom. At Holowiliena Station, Stella and Todd were learning in the same classroom that their mother had learnt in and the same classroom that their grandfather had learnt in. It was a wonderful experience.

From there, we went to the Hawker Area School and were greeted by its principal, Daren O'Neill, who was able to show us some of the wonderful features of his school, including the importance of an area school going from reception all the way through to year 12. We met many of the staff there and were very impressed with their enthusiasm and the breadth of different learning opportunities on offer.

From Hawker, we went and stayed the night at Marree and it was terrific to be there. I had only been at Marree a few days earlier, as it happens. We were able to meet with a group of young mothers, who have children of preschool age and in school, and to learn what they think the important priorities are for their children's learning for the next five to 10 years. It was great to have that opportunity and I thank them for coming in, particularly Lisa Edwards and Jess Bell, who were very strong advocates not only for their families but for the entire district.

The next morning we went to the Marree Aboriginal School, where their acting deputy principal, Mr Sunil Kumar, met us. He and some of his staff showed us into their classrooms. It is an absolutely outstanding school. I will just say a little bit extra about that because the Marree Aboriginal School very recently had three year 12 graduates. That is very special, I have to say, for a very small, remote school 680 kilometres north of Adelaide. Savannah Willis, Jeconan Wingfield and Shaqkodan Warren graduated year 12, received their SACE certificates, and all of them are starting apprenticeships, two as boilermakers and one in carpentry and construction. It is a huge achievement.

It was a who's who of the Marree community at a wonderful graduation dinner in Adelaide a few weeks ago to celebrate that tremendous outcome. A lot of family and friends were there. I must mention Mr Maurice Saah, the immediate past principal of the Marree Aboriginal School, a man with extraordinary vision, presence, care and energy, who has helped not only these three graduates but the entire school. The next morning, we were able to visit the Marree Aboriginal School and see what was going on there. They have terrific programs that start with child care, a creche program, and go all the way to year 12.

We then went to the Leigh Creek Area School and were met by principal Jan Love, who showed us around her school and all the wonderful things that are happening there. The school now really is the hub of the community of Marree. There are a lot of other positive things going on, but it was terrific to show the minister that.

We then went to Upalina Station in the Flinders Ranges and were met by the Reynolds family: Mija and Matt Reynolds and their two children, Aurelia and James. Again, we got to show the minister a School of the Air classroom in action. I thank all those people for hosting us so well.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:26): Safe and secure housing is not a privilege reserved for the wealthy: it is a human right. Without a home, access to basics such as education and employment is severely reduced and health outcomes are diminished. The federal Coalition's hands-off approach to the profound challenges in our housing system has resulted in a failed market, an affordable housing crisis, which is affecting millions. Under six years of the Liberals federally, home ownership is at a record low, rental stress is preventing young people from saving for a home deposit and homelessness is skyrocketing.

A recent Productivity Commission report showed close to 600,000 low-income Australian households are in rental stress. We now have a situation whereby young Australian taxpayers are subsidising overly generous tax breaks for investors. These same investors then turn up at auctions and outbid first-home buyers while purchasing their fifth, sixth, seventh, or more, property. The nation's pre-eminent housing research body, the Australian Housing and Urban Research Institute (AHURI), estimates a shortfall of more than 525,000 affordable rental properties across Australia.

AHURI projects a further 727,000 social housing dwellings will be needed over the next 20 years to meet rising need.

AHURI and other independent experts, such as the Community Housing Industry Association, have consistently raised the need to address the gap in funding needed to leverage strong institutional investment. The Liberal's hysterical and unsubstantiated claims about Labor's tax and housing policies further highlight their inability to address a failed housing and rental market. It is frankly pathetic that Treasurer Josh Frydenberg continues to ignore expert Treasury advice on Labor's housing reforms. As the Grattan Institute notes:

Rapid growth in house prices has lowered home-ownership rates among younger and poorer households, contributed to widening wealth inequality, and left the economy more vulnerable to economic shocks.

By reforming unfair negative gearing and capital gains tax concessions, a federal Shorten Labor government will be in a position, over the next 10 years, to partner with the community housing sector and institutional investors to build 250,000 affordable dwellings, which will be well designed and have low energy consumption. This will be done by offering 15-year incentives and \$8,500 per year to the community housing sector to build new houses, conditional on them being rented at 20 per cent below market rent.

By retaining negative gearing for new dwellings, the McKell Institute found that Labor's policy will encourage new rental supply and put downward pressure on rents. It will also boost the Australian economy and create significant employment opportunities across the country because for every \$1 we spend \$4 will be invested by the private sector. This will enable people on low to moderate incomes to escape rental stress and save to buy their own homes. It will mean that hospitality, retail and other workers on low to moderate incomes can rent a home closer to their place of work and save for a home deposit if they choose to.

Labor's plans will also create affordable housing options for older Australians who do not own their own homes, including older women, who are experiencing homelessness in record numbers. The federal Liberals' failing housing policy, or lack of policy, is constraining economic growth and productivity and negatively impacting social wellbeing.

Access to housing stands as one of the biggest challenges in addressing intergenerational inequality. There is a persistent and increasing wealth gap locking Australians out of the housing market. The Abbott/Turnbull/Morrison governments' criticism of Labor's housing plan is simply to cover the fact that they do not have any substantive housing policies of their own. The Coalition's sole priority is to maintain the world's most generous tax concessions for wealthy investors to the detriment of renters and first-time buyers.

Labor will take a different approach. Our priority will be ensuring a housing system that delivers for hardworking, lower to middle class Australians, who will benefit from that support. After almost six years without a coherent housing policy, the Coalition have just this week woken up to the housing affordability crisis with their five-minutes-to-midnight housing deposit announcement—too little, too late.

This divided and dysfunctional federal government have overseen an affordable housing crisis, stagnating wages, immoral banking practices and record homelessness. Do not let them get away with it. Remember the last six years of pain. Saturday is the day we can all make a difference, and I urge every South Australian to vote Labor.

COLTON ELECTORATE

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:31): I welcome any opportunity I can get to speak about the wonderful electorate I am fortunate enough to represent, and a lot has happened in Colton since I last had the opportunity to update the house. On 4 May, I had the pleasure of attending the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club presentation night. It was a night of genuine recognition for the many surf lifesavers and volunteers within the club and it was a real pleasure to see the sense of community and camaraderie in the club, a direct reflection of the success it has had and will continue to have well into the future.

I would like to take this opportunity to recognise and congratulate the major award winners from the presentation night. The Kay Dempsey Female Club Champion for 2018-19 was Alyson

Hettner and the J. Edwards Senior Club Champion for boys 2018-19 was Matthew Zuill. The Cadet Female Club Champion was up-and-comer Tayla Dawkins, and the Cadet Male Club Champion went to Eddy Newberry. The Junior Female Club Champion went to Stella Bengler and the Junior Male Club Champion was won by Harry Dawkins. Last, but certainly not least, the Master Club Champion was won by Glenda McArthur. All the award winners are highly respected members of the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club, and I congratulate them on their success throughout this season.

Whilst on the topic of the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club, earlier on in the year both the West Beach and the Henley Beach surf lifesaving clubs held their major fundraisers. As well as supporting our communities through patrolling our beaches and keeping us safe during the summer season, both surf lifesaving clubs undertake fundraising activities and initiatives to support the broader community and other charities.

This year, I attended two great events run by those clubs: The Big Row, which was run by the Henley Beach Surf Life Saving Club and held on 2 February, and the Pink and Blue Swim, organised by the West Beach club, which took place on 9 February. Both clubs did a truly remarkable job, and I thank them for the important contributions they have made and they continue to make to our community in both protecting our beaches and more broadly.

I have also attended other presentation nights over the past few months, including the West Torrens District Cricket Club. While the club had mixed results this season, it was recently recognised by SACA as Club of the Year for its tremendous work both on and off the pitch—a huge recognition. The West Torrens District Cricket Club has gone from strength to strength in my time as patron, and I look forward to getting down there for a few more games next summer.

In March, I attended the Club Holdfast Lawn Bowls and Croquet Club end of season presentation night and got to hear about the club's success over the summer season. I also attended the Lockleys Bowling Club presentation night the following month and took the opportunity to congratulate the deserving winners and volunteers within their club. Both clubs, and many others throughout the electorate, do not run easily, and it takes a lot of hard work and sacrifice to make it through each and every year. I congratulate both Club Holdfast and Lockleys Bowling Club on an impressive membership base that is reflected through their presentation night. I wish them all the very best for their next season.

Last, but certainly not least, I went to the Glenelg Baseball Club end of year celebration. They had a successful season this year, and it was great to hear about not only the players' success but that of the club itself. The Glenelg Baseball Club also received some wonderful news with a commitment from the supportive local federal member, Nicolle Flint, that a re-elected federal Liberal government will provide \$100,000 to upgrade their change rooms to be family friendly, to meet the needs of their growing female teams and to improve the male change rooms. This is welcome news for the club, which is more than deserving of this important commitment.

The federal Liberal government has also come on board with another fantastic commitment not only for the electorate of Colton but more broadly for the whole of South Australia. This is to build a new home for the Vickers Vimy aircraft, an amazing piece of South Australian history currently tucked away within an Adelaide Airport car park. Almost 100 years ago, two South Australian brothers made world aviation history, with Sir Ross Smith and Sir Keith Smith becoming the first people to fly between England and Australia in less than 30 days.

A re-elected federal Liberal government has promised, in conjunction with the state government and the Adelaide Airport, to move the Vickers Vimy to a new prominent location within the Adelaide Airport terminal, which will present and preserve this icon and keep it on display in all its glory for everybody to see and appreciate. As you can see, it has been a busy time in Colton, and I look forward to getting out and being in our community as much as I possibly can.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SCREENING) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 17.

Ms COOK: In regard to progress through these clauses, could the Deputy Premier give any advice about what advice was sought, and from whom, regarding the email from minister Lensink to members of the house outlining a determination to finalise debate by 5.30pm today?

The CHAIR: Could you repeat the question, please.

Ms COOK: During the week, members were sent an email from the minister in the other place—

The CHAIR: As in members of this house?

Ms COOK: —yes—outlining that there had been a determination and advice that we need to finalise debate on this bill by 5.30pm today. I can table a copy of the email, if you wish.

The CHAIR: I am not aware of that email.

Ms COOK: I was just asking about that judgement.

The CHAIR: I rule that out of order, member for Hurtle Vale. I have had no suggestion to me as committee Chair that that is the case, so I am going to suggest that we move on to the next question.

Ms COOK: Given that then, could the Deputy Premier explain the rationale of changes to the clause 17 countenances?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The deletion of subsection (1) of section 43. I am advised that the transitional arrangements, which are what we are dealing with, require the new amendment to remove two amendments to be made to the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016, which made bestiality a prescribed offence.

Australian jurisdictions initially agreed to the national standards for working with children checks that bestiality should be considered a disqualifying offence known as a category 1 offence with no right of appeal. Jurisdictions also took the same approach in the NDIS Workers Screening IGA (that is, the intergovernmental agreement).

However, since these standards and IGA were agreed, jurisdictions have been working through specific and detailed offence mapping for each offence category for the purpose of the NDIS worker screening. As a result of this work, jurisdictions have identified specific instances of offending that may be captured by the offence of bestiality that should not result in the person being prohibited indefinitely.

For example, jurisdictions have encountered instances where a young adult offender may have been found guilty of a bestiality offence; however, the young offender may have engaged in that behaviour while drunk or through a dare, not amounting to sexual intercourse, and since that time has not engaged in the same type of offending.

Jurisdictions are mindful that these offenders would be excluded from ever being permitted to undertake child-related work because of an offence committed as a young adult when the individual has not engaged in any other offending over subsequent years and no longer poses a risk to children. As a result, an amendment is required to ensure that bestiality is not considered a prescribed offence to allow for these circumstances, which is a bit more expanded than I advised earlier in the committee. I hope that covers it.

Clause passed.

Clause 18.

Ms COOK: Again, I ask about the rationale for the changes at clause 18.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This clause makes a consequential amendment to the long title of the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 to enable the act to provide for the NDIS Worker Check Scheme.

The CHAIR: A comprehensive answer. Any further questions?

Clause passed.

Clause 19 passed.

Clause 20.

Ms COOK: In the other place the minister said:

The advice I have received is that in terms of the logistics, explaining to people who contact the screening unit, it is relatively easy to explain to people about seven days; if you try to explain to them about the 150 hours, that is going to be quite an extensive operation to even get people to understand that.

My question is directly related to what the reason is that we cannot have a period of hours of work provided so that it is very clear for people within the act as opposed to what is loose and days where hours are not prescribed within those days.

We have not been able to get an answer at this point regarding any definitive number of hours to be worked by somebody, and it puts people at risk of breaching the act, whereas if there are a prescribed number of hours to be worked it would be very simple for them and leave nothing to chance. Why is it so difficult for the unit to do an hour count versus a day count? Why can people not understand it, according to the minister?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think all the reasons that were traversed in the other place when an alternative proposal was put by the Labor Party representatives to consider having the 150-hour option make it very clear that the capacity for ease of understanding is to be able to be employed on the seven-day rule. Why? As I say, apart from all the reasons that are put there, the seven-day period is not an uncommon feature in relation to other legislation and has an ordinary meaning for the purposes of its employment.

Certainly, there has been exposure in the debates as to whether a day is a full day or just an hour on a day, and all that debate has taken place. From the government's point of view, we are satisfied that, for the purposes of making it as easy as possible, it is fair to apply the seven-day arrangement rather than the 150 hours. We are persuaded by the arguments that have been put on keeping some kind of log of the number of hours over a period of time. That is why we are maintaining that position, and clearly most of the Legislative Council thought the same.

Ms COOK: It is all well and good for the Legislative Council to think the same, but people are still making presentations, to me at least, regarding the worry about getting caught inadvertently and unwillingly in a trap of suddenly being in breach of an act where there is quite a hefty penalty. I believe it is right for us to challenge this to the extreme so that we look after the best interests of people. That is why we are doing it.

Also, the case presented to us in regard to this clause was that there are people who will transition from being volunteer contributors in the community to suddenly working within a non-government organisation, for example, and getting paid. The case was put to us that the reason that this needed to happen, that they then paid for a screening, was that people would take advantage of the circumstances, apply for a volunteer screening and then just wait—get their volunteer screening, go for a job and not have to then pay for this said screening. An individual would do that and would plan to do that. Is it still the case that the government thinks that is why we have to charge all people, because they cannot be trusted to go from volunteering to paid work legitimately?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will try to be as brief as I can on this. Prior to this proposed legislation, as is operational today—except for a policy initiative of the new government from November last year giving relief to volunteers—everyone had to pay, volunteer or working. We have accepted an idea formulated into policy that volunteers ought to be able to have those checks for free. What the government have been alerted to is that it could be exploited by those who might want to avoid the payment by registering as a volunteer and then going on to paid employment just to avoid the fee.

I would hope—and I think it is the view of the government—if this occurs, it would be at a minimal level, but it may not be. We have to be alert to the fact that, good idea as it may be, we have to protect the taxpayer against any inappropriate use and exploitation of the offer that we have made. That is why it is there.

We have tried working a model of how that might apply and most easily be managed, particularly by the volunteer who might transfer to work on a day's basis. Obviously, the opposition

has a different view as to how that should be applied. It has been debated, the merits have been considered and the government maintains its position that we are committed to giving volunteers a free check, but we also maintain a position that you pay for the check if it is for employment. If there is a circumstance where someone might abuse that, they will be caught. We consider that to be a responsible approach without there being any unfair impediment on volunteers or any unrealistic evasion of that by someone who is actually working.

Ms COOK: Just to clarify, if somebody gets a clearance to volunteer with children and then in the crossover they go to work, perhaps for a disability support organisation, which is where our concern lies—there are those very short shifts of one hour when they just pop in and out of a house to provide some minor assistance—does that qualify them as a worker within the context of the same screening? Do they need to reapply? What do they need to do? What are the instructions for those people?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, you do not have to apply for your working with children check in those circumstances.

Ms COOK: For working with a disability—

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct.

Ms COOK: So it just transfers across and you have to pay.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They are separate checks; is that understood? As I say, we are now on the disability workers' side of things and they have a different origin. Their law is set out in the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 and has an entirely different origin. That is why there are some complications with having two separate checks, but we are updating both of them.

Ms COOK: To be able to share information with people in the public, there is no separate different application process with a waiting period that would need to happen? They would just alert the department to the fact that they are working once they get that trigger point, and it then converts; is that what would happen?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: An NDIS volunteer commences working, gives notice, pays the fee and is able to continue working, but they have simply paid the fee at that point. Ultimately, they get their notice of that being approved.

Ms COOK: As we said before, there will be an education process we will go through and an instruction process for organisations. This week, I have had four emails from organisations that I have referred on to the department. One of them was from a large organisation, Lions, who are quite confused about the new process, and I have explained to them that it is not actually in place at this stage.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I look forward then to the progressing of this bill so we can start the advertising campaign.

Clause passed.

Clause 21.

Ms COOK: In regard to clause 21, how will the government internally ensure that the unique identifier numbers are not able to be used or accessed by staff to identify a person involved in a screening application unless it specifically relates to the provision of a screening? How will that be protected?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It seems to me that there is a concern that the unique identifier in some way is a number that might carry information that, in the wrong hands, could be made available to someone else. The unique identifier number, I am advised, is a bit like a driver's licence number: it does not actually carry any data about how hopeless or good a driver you are; it simply provides a number for identification purposes. It is a number that is utilised for the purposes of the recipient being able to access information themselves and to provide to their employer for the purposes of their doing the check that the proper screening has occurred. That is the idea of it. It does not carry on its code any relevant data in relation to that person.

The information about a person in the unit is, as I explained earlier in the committee, protected by all the obligations in relation to public sector confidentiality and privacy and their obligations to maintain that material on a confidential basis. Just as any other person in the public sector or health department is not allowed to go in and look at other people's notes and use them for purposes other than the provision of health services, this is exactly the same scenario. The identifier itself is really just an access code for that person to be identified and to access information for themselves.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Where will the information be stored?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It will be stored in the departmental secure systems, which includes the assessment unit, where it is stored now and has been for as long as I have been around.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Attorney informs the committee that it is not stored at a data centre anywhere external from government through contract. It is stored on site on your own servers and in your own databases. That is news to me. It is a fascinating revelation. The question then becomes: what capacity—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are talking about a unique identifier. It could be—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Getting frustrated is not an excuse for poor manners. I know that the government regularly buys space to store its information at external data centres, but the Attorney has informed the house that all that data will be stored on site, so my second question is: what is the size of the data management capability of the department?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As the member would well know—I have referred to the data previously and I will confirm again—it is secured in the public sector server systems. A lot of this data is in the iCloud, as the member well knows, but that does not mean that, because it is in that format, it is in some way insecure.

The unique identifier is an entirely independent issue. It does not carry data in itself. It is simply a number that is given to the client for the purposes of them being able to access information themselves or to provide that information to their employer, which is part of the regime here to make sure that you have a check—you do not work with children unless you have one—and that your employer has obligations to make sure that you have that check before they employ you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I just asked for the size of the agency's capability to store this on site. The Attorney-General just said that they are not storing it on site: they are storing it at a data centre or in the cloud. That was my initial question, which the Attorney scoffed at, saying, 'No, we are storing that inside the department.' Now we realise that we are not. My third question from the uncomfortable laughter of the Attorney-General is: what security measures has the department put in place around this information on top of the ordinary measures in place for government data that is held?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is exactly the same security system that operated pre-March 2018.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What is that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not have the details of that, but I am sure that—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Perhaps you can get a briefing back to the committee rather than laughing it off arrogantly.

The CHAIR: The Member for West Torrens is called to order. The Attorney has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The information that is stored in this unit is potentially very sensitive. It is being accumulated and made available for assessment for very good reason, namely, the protection of children and the vulnerable. It is a position that the government maintains is imperative to that. There is nothing to my knowledge that suggests that this information—which has

been collected not just since this bill or the legislation in 2016; it has been around for a very long time—has not been maintained securely. We have no reason to doubt that it will continue to be.

If the member has any information to suggest that there is some release of or access to this data that is unlawful, I urge him to report it to the relevant authorities. I am happy for him to forward correspondence to me if he is concerned about that or has any indication that is occurring. It would be a very serious breach, and it would be a matter that we as a government would take very seriously.

Ms COOK: With respect to the unique identifier, what modelling was undertaken, and from where, regarding the creation of this system that has been established?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not have particulars of that. The unique identifier was established under the 2016 legislation, so there was a previous government at that time. I do not think that it is anything particularly different from the processes operating in other states, but it predated our time, so I cannot—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Such an idiot. I do not have that information for the member.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: I ask the Attorney to withdraw and apologise for calling me an idiot.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will withdraw it.

The CHAIR: I did not hear what the Attorney said.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Apologise.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have withdrawn it.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, member for West Torrens and Minister for Education! I am asking the committee to come to order. Member for West Torrens, you have been called to order once. You have had three questions. I did not hear what the Attorney supposedly said. I will ask her to return to her answer to the question put by the member for Hurtle Vale.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have finished the answer.

The CHAIR: Any further questions on clause 21? The member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Who develops the unique identifier?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, I was not in government at the time this was established. My adviser does not have particulars on specifically who does that, but I imagine it is similar to someone who is allocated a number on their driver's licence. I expect that it would be a random allocated number. Once it has been allocated to a person, it would be recorded as their identifier. It is a key for that person to access electronic information. Importantly, it is something that they are able to utilise, as I have explained earlier in the committee, for complying with any request from a prospective employer to check that they have had their screening check to avoid any consequences themselves.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: On the basis that this is an automatically generated number, similar to a driver's licence number, as the Deputy Premier advises us, it must be done by some information technology system, some computer-based system. My question is: who manages this computer system and who manages the cloud-based service in which this information is stored?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised the registrar of the unit.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Just to clarify, the government wholly administers and curates this database and the cloud data services to which the Deputy Premier has made reference.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct.

Clause passed.

Clause 22.

Ms COOK: In regard to the process to establish the process in this clause, was there any consultation with private companies—businesses, small businesses and the like?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that the provision here, which is to identify what steps employers have to take when they are employing a prescribed person, is exactly the same as already exists under the protection of children regimes. Really, all we are doing is adding it in under the NDIS structure. This is not new to employers; it is simply that we have created under the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 a new structure to deal with the vulnerability of those in that category, and that is then being transferred into the legislation.

Ms COOK: Are you able to expand and elaborate on what the prescribed positions are that we are referring to in the clause?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The prescribed position under section 19 of the Disability Inclusion Act is:

- (a) a position in which a person works, or is likely to work, with people with disability; or
- (b) any other position, or a position of a class, prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition;

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is both (a) and (b), as I have just read out.

Ms COOK: Sorry, I did not hear because there was talking.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I did not talk about paragraph (a) because that is not regulation. It provides here:

prescribed position means—

- (a) a position in which a person works, or is likely to work, with people with disability; or
- (b) any other position, or a position of a class, prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition;

So it is two categories: one is those who already work with people with a disability, and obviously that is all in the principal act, in section 19.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If you do not meet the criteria of the two subsections the Attorney introduced—that is, an employer who does not necessarily work with disabled people in terms of delivering a service but is contracted to deliver a service—are they then required before they contract with any potential provider to undertake a series of checks before they can deliver that service, or is that the responsibility of the person who is contracting the service?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I did not understand the question. If the question is about who has the obligation, this section clearly sets out 'the employer'. If the employer is going to employ somebody in a prescribed position, which is basically someone who has worked in disability, or regulations can enhance that, then they have to do all these things, and that is what we are adding into the act.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My question then is: do contractors who are brought in to do work for agencies, where their employees would come into contact with disabled persons or minors before contracting or tendering, have to undergo these checks and services before they are eligible to apply?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In this area, we are working with two checks: one is in relation to an NDIS check, where there is a provider through that system, and the other is generally in relation to disability. They are obliged to be provided if you are working with somebody with a disability, however you are paid.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I understand that the Attorney said earlier in her remarks that this was the case already and that this amendment seeks to strengthen current provisions. In the intervening time since March 2018 until now, has the minister undertaken any consultation with Business SA or any employer groups regarding this clause?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I cannot be certain about this clause, but it is fair to say that there has been comprehensive and continuing negotiation to develop both this bill and the regulations that are proposed to go with it to enable its effective introduction come 1 July. At the moment, because this new level of standard of screening, both expanded and to apply at a higher level, is going to affect thousands of people, it is important that it is carefully developed in a manner that is achievable for the legislation to be completed this week, to enable that advertising campaign.

I think the member for Hurtle Vale is a prime example of a member who is receiving inquiries and would like to have some capacity to give answers to very frequently asked questions, which commonly comes with these things. That will need to happen over the next number of weeks. We effectively have six weeks until the end of the financial year and we need to get on with it if we are to achieve that deadline. I think the indications from all the contributors to this debate is that they agree that it is a matter that needs to be progressed. Its legislation starts back in 2016. We do need to get on with this; the public does expect us to actually progress this.

I hope, in answering that, that it is clear there are agencies, there are NGOs, there are people in the disability field, there are people who work in child protection, there are industry providers of a number of these services. We want to get it right to ensure that children, vulnerable and disabled people in our community are protected.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As a preamble to my question, I reflect briefly on the questions and answers we had on clause 21 regarding the unique identifier that is, again, mentioned in the current clause 22 we are discussing.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Is it?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, it is. In response to a number of questions, the Deputy Premier advised us that the unique identifier is one that is automatically generated, not dissimilar to other automatically generated identification numbers in other government databases and for other government purposes, that this was a cloud-based data management system.

You will recall, Chair, that I asked a question about whether this was a data management cloud-based service that was one of the government's or whether it was some other arrangement. The Deputy Premier replied that it was a government cloud-based system, and, in fact, advised that it was the registrar, I think, who was responsible for it. Reading a little further on this clause, we see the requirements of new section 22D, which require a records management system to be provided and administered by the registrar.

First, I just want to check that the previous discussion about the unique identifier and the answers given pertain to that records management system and not to some other cloud-based service. Is that correct?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is an existing system, which has been referred to by the member. The obligation here—bearing in mind that we are enhancing this service and it is going to an expanded group, etc.—is that the registrar must establish and maintain a records management system for this new regime. It will basically be using the same data system that operates in the department in respect of the information collated. This is just setting out an obligation that the registrar has to maintain that as a specific records management system.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: And that relates to the identifier as well?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The identifier is just the number that operates to get access to some of the information in it, yes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I appreciate the Deputy Premier's explanation. My second question is in light of the provisions of 22E. Moving on from the requirement to provide a records management system and its superintendence by the registrar, new section 22E provides the capacity for a person to inspect the records management system. I gather that the rationale behind that, from the government's perspective, is that a person should have an ability to check what has been recorded about them to see whether what has been recorded about them aligns with their understanding of their personal information.

However, I would have thought that the information being stored in the records management system as it relates to screening checks, and indeed the unique identifiers, would be very sensitive information. Unfortunately, and I know this will provide fertile opportunity for the Deputy Premier to wax lyrical about Shannon McCooole and so on—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, in fact, not just once. It is not beyond the realms of possibility that, unfortunately, we might find a government employee who is motivated to become involved in horrendous and nefarious activities and seek to exploit children. In the provisions of this bill, it appears that we have a records management system, which is important and necessary, of course, but which can be freely inspected by a person. I have made the assumption that it is for the purpose of somebody being able to check their own personal information. I might be wrong, and I am happy to be corrected by the Deputy Premier.

My question is whether there are protocols for an individual to access this database and what restrictions there are on individuals who seek to access the database. Can the Deputy Premier outline some assurances that there are fairly tight restrictions on what people can access when individuals take advantage of the abilities conferred on them in this clause?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For the benefit of the member, who obviously has not been listening attentively to all the contributions in this committee, I will repeat the following about access to information and who gets to see it and for what purpose. I would like to indicate to the committee that this whole records management system is identical to section 34 of the prohibited persons act, which is legislation passed under the member's former government which establishes the central assessment unit records management system for the purposes of the screening.

The purpose of having an identifier number allocated to the worker or volunteer, paid or otherwise, is that they can access material, maybe for the reasons that the member has highlighted as an example—that is, to check whether information is correct or updated—but also to provide to their prospective employer for them to check it. It is a means by which an access is obtained for the prospective employer to check that that person has actually done the screening test, remembering that the employer also faces very significant penalties—significantly increased in 2016, post the Nyland inquiry—if they employ anybody without having that check if they propose to be in a circumstance of working with children.

So it is twofold: it is a replica of what has already been there for the purposes of the aspect that we are adding to, which relates to people with a disability and it works on the basis that the employee or volunteer gets the number and that that is an access point and they can provide it. Therefore, proposed section 22E sets out the inspection arrangements for that purpose.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: To be clear, it is the bill which requires a records management system to be established and maintained. Yes, there is a provision in the bill, under 22D(7), that the records management system required in this bill may be combined with the prohibited persons act.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: No, it is the same as.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Is it 'the same as' or is it the same?

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: It is the same. It is the exact replica.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Is it a replica or is it the same database?

The CHAIR: Is that your question, member for Lee?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: No, I was responding to an interjection.

The CHAIR: Do not be tempted to do that, member for Lee. There is a discussion going on here, but you should continue with your contribution and questions.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: While the Deputy Premier works out whether it is the same database or a replica of the database—and I look forward to her advice there—in any event we have an established database, which either is being used or is the model for the operation of the database required under this act. Given that we have a database in operation, the protocols that currently exist for access to this database should be clear to the Deputy Premier, or indeed her adviser, and so I

ask the Deputy Premier to provide the committee some advice about the protocols for access to the database, and in particular what the restrictions are in terms of accessing information within that database.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This records management system that is proposed in this clause is identical to section 34 of the prohibited persons act and establishes the central assessment unit's records management system for the purposes of the part 6 screening, which can be combined with the same records management system established under the prohibited persons act. So the law is identical. That is what is proposed, so there are exactly the same access obligations, recording and provision of the unique identifier, etc.

The database, I am told, electronically is one system that operates within the unit. I think it is clear that the identical replication is of the law, and that is designed to ensure that this central assessment unit, which has the job, as you say, of having the practical application of this and having protocols to do it, is set out in these divisions.

That is why we have specific provision for what the employers have to do, the advice they have to give and, in addition to that, who can inspect the records and in what circumstances. That is what they are there for. If it helps the member, the records management system must include:

- a part recording by name, date of birth and unique identifier, if any;
- persons who are prohibited from working with children;
- a part recording by unique identifier persons to whom a prohibition notice has been issued;
- a part recording by unique identifier the date on which each working with children check is conducted in respect of a person;
- a part recording by a unique identifier persons in relation to whom a prohibition notice has been revoked; and
- a part recording identifying a person to whom a unique identifier has been issued.

I hope to make it abundantly clear that if the member for Lee were on it, the list would not read 'Stephen Mullighan': it would have the identifier number.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As a point of clarification for this same area in new section 22E, new section 22E(2) provides: 'The records management system may be inspected (without charge) by any person.' Can the Deputy Premier just clarify for me what process will be required to enable any person to inspect the records?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In addition to everything I have just said, my understanding is that if a person comes in and seeks to have access to what is proposed here, the protocol in relation to that has not yet been determined. That is still being worked through as to how it will apply and what information will be made available.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I have to say that that is very concerning to me because this is incredibly sensitive information that we are going to hold for South Australians. We should remind ourselves that more than 22 per cent of South Australians have a working with children check, so this is a very significant proportion.

Following on from this, if a person is accessing and looking at this record system, how are they restricted from altering information on the system? Obviously, if they are looking at it, it is not a printed copy they are looking at. They are going to look at it as a database.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not really understand why the member, who has been a former minister in this space—perhaps she did not ever avail herself of the opportunity to find out how this operates—but we have a unit—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Ramsay, I will direct the Attorney to the answer.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I appreciate that the member says she is concerned. I am concerned that she does not know about this. Nevertheless, let's be clear for the benefit of others in the committee as to how this is going to operate.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have just read out a very comprehensive—

The CHAIR: Attorney, do not respond to interjections, please.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, I am ignoring him.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: why is it appropriate for the Attorney to impute improper motives of members and insult them and then, when the member fights back, the Chair of the committee attacks the opposition? How is that appropriate?

The CHAIR: What I said, member for West Torrens, if you recall, is that I asked the Attorney not to respond to interjections and to return to answer. I am going to ask her to do that again. Thanks, Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The inspection of records is not like some public register where everybody can just walk in like they are at a library and plug in and just read everyone's history. This list, which I read out, sets out those who are prohibited. It does not have the details of the circumstances or whatever, but it is a list for the purposes, particularly for prospective employers, of checking whether someone who is proposing to come and work or volunteer with them actually has already been identified by virtue of a conviction under previous offences, the presumptive disqualification that is going to come into effect, etc. That is an important tool.

The member's government brought into this parliament a regime that severely penalises anyone who employs someone, paid or volunteer, in their industry or workplace or government or non-government organisation, that utilises services in working with children. That is why it is there. It is there to ensure that any prospective employer, who could be very severely penalised if they do not, checks and is able to do that.

We have to have a system like that because this is not just a system where we are punishing those who are convicted and then try to work with children. We have introduced a regime and tightened it under the former government to ensure that as much as possible we impose a very severe obligation on the employer not just on the employee. That big increase in penalty has got to have a means by which the prospective employer is able to carry out their responsibility to diligently employ that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have a point of order. It is very simple: the member asked if, when inspecting this list, it can be altered while inspecting. It was a very simple question.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, she did not.

The CHAIR: And the Attorney is continuing her answer.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: When this occurs, it will show a person who is the subject of the search's name, the date of birth and the unique identifier number, where available. For example, where there are multiple John Smiths, the date of birth and UIs help ensure the result is the correct person as provided. So, if there are 15 Stephen Mullighans out there (hopefully not; one is bad enough), each of those will have a unique identifier number to ensure that that is the reference the applicant viewer can see to ensure that that is done. They then have the capacity to say, 'I have checked the register. The checks been done. They are not a prohibited person and I am satisfied for the purposes of taking this person on that I have complied with my applications as an employer.'

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Following on from some of my earlier questions on the bill, I understand that in the past a requesting organisation would identify people within the system to have a working with children check and that an individual in that organisation would have the ability to check for a unique identifier. What is the process of that individual in an organisation being registered to be able to identify and log onto the system? Can you detail that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There are two things; one is the process I have just outlined. The employer in that scenario will have accessed that material and have the capacity to continually update that, which is another important initiative in that regard. I think what you are saying is that, as an example, if the Burnside Lions has a regular person who wants to check whether their volunteers are in order, not prohibited and still current, can they in some way register as an organisation that can just check whenever it likes? Is that what you are asking me?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: What is the process not just of the company or organisation registering but of the officer within that company? Within the Lions Club, it may well be the secretary or the president. What is the process under this amended act for that person to be identified?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is no statutory regulation around how they appoint somebody or who it is. Remember, this is the process. If the person wants to work or volunteer, they are issued a number because they have gone through the right process. They go along to the Lions Club or prospective employer, and that person then has an obligation to check. They cannot just fill out a form and say, 'I've done my check.'

That has to be checked if you are going to employ these people because this is the new regime that we have introduced for employers, and so on. They then follow that up and register interest in that person, but they cannot register in a block forever. That is, you cannot go in and say, 'I'm with the Burnside Lions and I now want to check on Zoe Bettison.' You cannot just get in the door and then look at whatever you like. You can only look in to check whether that number of your worker is there.

The CHAIR: Member for Ramsay, I am not going to give you the call. You have had four questions, and I concede that one was a point of clarification. The member for Playford has the call.

Mr BROWN: Under new section 22A, the new act will require employees to provide their full name, address, date of birth and unique identifier, which comes from the check they have previously performed. Knowing that this information allows employers not only to check people's information on the register but to potentially get other information from the department, what protections exist for employees that their unique identifier will not be disclosed to third parties by their employer?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There is not a regulatory regime in this legislation to say what information may be disclosed. Obviously, if your employer now keeps a copy of your driver's licence in the file they might have on you, a record of your employment, your number is on that. I suppose that could be accessible to other people who work in that business or that NGO or church group, whatever the organisation is. What is perhaps being misunderstood here, and I want to make it absolutely clear, is that it is just a number. A code of details about personal information does not come with it.

It is not a code that you go into and get all this personal information. The purpose of it is to be able to access whether you are on a list. We have to have it because we are making it a penalty for people who are in an employment situation if they do not do it. They can be prosecuted and fined severely; I think there is even a prison term under the new rule in some areas. You cannot just come along and say, 'I didn't know. He told me he had a check and I just took him on the next Monday.' You are not allowed to do that.

As a parliament, in 2016 we imposed a much higher standard in relation to this matter. So, firstly, we have to be able to provide a means by which the information about this is kept in a secure repository, which has been the basis of questions by other members of the committee, and, secondly, we have to make it accessible to those who have the legal obligation in relation to this matter.

That is the process. Some of that information—that is, the identifier number once it is provided by the worker to the prospective employer—will presumably be on their file of some kind. It might be scanned into some computer file on the employer's records—Burnside Lions, if we want to still use the same organisation—for the purpose of then doing that check.

Mr BROWN: Obviously, there are no additional protections?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Not in this legislation.

Mr BROWN: The legislation sets out a process for how data will be matched against the register. What, if any, controls will be taken on those who actually perform the match on behalf of organisations? Is there any recording and checking with other third parties, for example, the police, on who is actually doing these checks?

I might clarify that to assist the Attorney. New subsection (1)(c)(ii) says that they must provide the name and contact details of the person who verified the matters referred to in paragraph (b), which is that the screening check was conducted and the person is not a prohibited person. Are any third parties—for example, the police—going to be checking those names to make sure that nothing untoward is occurring?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not think so. I think I understand the question. The central assessment unit is the repository of information. It gets it from other sources, and it may be from the police. We have been through that before. Importantly, the information that is there, accessible via this number, has to be able to be continually accessed. The reason for that is that the central assessment unit needs to have registered who the Burnside Lions are, or some employer, because, if that person becomes a prohibited person, they need to be able to say, 'I will now contact that employer and advise them.' In the real-time upgrading of this, they are immediately notified and then there are certain processes that they can undertake in respect of suspension from employment or whatever.

The important thing here is that it is a list in a secure repository of information. You cannot just go in there and look it up, like on a library computer. We have to make it available to the person who is seeking to do the volunteer work and/or employed work and we need to make it available for the prospective employer or supervisor of the volunteer service. It needs to be ongoing for both so that that information can be real time, which is exactly what we are all trying to achieve.

Mr BROWN: I note that new section 22A talks about the fact that the screening check needs to be verified in accordance with the regulations under 22A(1)(b). Will those regulations enable, for example, a third party provider to do that or does it need to be the central unit that does that verification? Could a private provider do those verifications?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The provision for the screening check under new section 22A(1)(b)(i) is that it is exclusively by the central assessment unit.

Ms HILDYARD: Attorney, can you please outline how information about these new requirements will be communicated to NDIS LAC personnel?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If the member is referring to how the local area coordinators under the new scheme will be informed, essentially, if and when this legislation passes, there will be a communications package. I have referred to that earlier in the committee. In addition to that, the NDIS will have its own communications arrangements to ensure that it is followed through. In fairness, some members have had inquiries. Certainly, the member for Hurtle Vale has indicated that she has had inquiries from, I assume, constituents who are saying, 'How is this going to work for me? What do I have to do?', etc.

Obviously, we are not in a position to go out with that communications package, the website material and the details that I referred to earlier in the committee until legislation has passed. Assuming it does, that will go out almost forthwith so that we can ensure that we have the transition in the next six weeks. There will need to be a concentrated communications program and website information to ensure that is done, but I understand that, as the commonwealth is obviously involved in the NDIS aspect of it, they will also have their own direct communication.

Ms HILDYARD: Attorney, given that LAC personnel often have roles as direct employers, as advisers to employers in a particular area and right across the state, as advisers to carers and as advisers to NDIS participants themselves, what additional responsibilities does the Attorney see coming about through these new requirements? What additional supports would be provided to LAC personnel given the complexity of their role and, often, the duality of their role in relation to these new requirements?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The local area coordinators are commonwealth-funded positions. I think that they have a very strategic and important role in the rollout of the new system, but they are not really participants in relation to the obligations under this legislation.

Ms HILDYARD: But they are. They absolutely are. They are often direct employers as well as advisers.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They are staff, maybe, but I am simply making—

Ms HILDYARD: They are.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member can argue the point in that sense. The obligations here relate to the working with children checks as to the volunteer or employee and the employer, whereas the coordinators are employees of the commonwealth structure.

Ms HILDYARD: They are also employers. That is my point. They are also direct employers and advisers.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, you are called to order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If the question is, in fact, as an employer—

The CHAIR: Attorney, just a moment. I am going to talk to the member for Reynell. You have asked your question, and you are repeatedly interjecting. I am calling you to order. Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If the question is, as an employer, do the local area coordinators have any obligation other than under this legislation, the answer is no. They are the same as every other employer. Do they have any other resources to undertake their obligations in relation to this? This is the law. The reason we are doing this is to protect children. Every employer has to do this, whether they are going to pay them or have them as volunteers. They have to comply with the law. Local area coordinators, if they employ somebody in this area, have to comply with the law. It is as simple as that.

Ms HILDYARD: Given that they are direct employers, advisers to employers, advisers to participants and advisers to carers, they have an incredibly complex role as well as being direct employers, as you state. Will there be any additional communication or any additional support provided to these lacks, particularly given the issues that were experienced over some time due to the federal government's lack of speed with which they appointed those local area coordinators?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure that the rapidity with which someone was employed is relevant to the question, but they are not paid for or provided by the state. It is not proposed to give them any extra money or resources to do this job, the same as we are not going to give it to the Burnside Lions and we are not going to be giving it to employers anywhere else in the state. This is the law; it is going to be national law. It was actually introduced by the member's government and we supported it. We have been working hard to try to bring the practical aspects to ensure that it actually comes into effect and we will be doing everything possible to ensure that it commences on 1 July this year.

Mr BOYER: New section 22A(1)(b) talks about a screening check being required for the preceding five years. Does a screening check from another jurisdiction in Australia qualify under that?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think it has been clear in the debate on this and on previous legislation that each state has its own screening process. They are not all exactly the same. Obviously, everyone is trying to work to all be in real time and I think that has been occurring over a number of years. I will check as to whether that is transferable or inter-recognisable between the jurisdictions

I am advised that as a result of the fact that they are still not all exactly the same, the transfer of that will not be adequate. Therefore, we impose South Australian standards for those in South Australia. We think it is going to be pretty good. We will not necessarily be recognising others as an immediate transfer and what we call mutual recognition of other jurisdictions at this point, but we are working on it. Once the NDIS screening nationally is mirrored, then we will get on with it.

Mr BOYER: You spoke about mutual recognition from other jurisdictions. Will there be no mutual recognition from any other Australian jurisdictions recognised or provided at this point?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that no-one has actually started this yet because this is the NDIS regime we are talking about here. We are aiming for 1 July 2019. We understand that New South Wales is looking at 1 July 2020. As they come online, I expect, if there has been an advancement in relation to the harmonisation of this sort of matter around the country, we will see recognition come into place. At the moment, none of them have even started yet, so we are going to get them started and as others catch up, in the sense of a standard of some harmonisation, then we can look at some mutual recognition.

Mr BOYER: Am I right in thinking, then, that if this bill were to be passed and come into effect at this point in time, we still accept screening checks from other Australian jurisdictions that potentially do not have the same veracity as the South Australian one that will be conducted out of the central assessment unit?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: At the moment, we do not accept those as a standard that obviates them to undertake a state South Australian one but, in the future, that may come to pass.

Ms COOK: On new sections 22A, B and C, can I ask you for clarification on the final notations in each of those sections, that the proceeding direction 'does not apply in relation to a prospective employee who is an excluded person'? Can you clarify what that means? I believe it is the same in all of them.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The meaning of an excluded person under the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016 is:

- (a) a person who undertakes child-related work in the same capacity as the child or children to whom the work relates;
- (b) a person who employs a child, or who supervises an employed child, where the work undertaken by the child is not child-related work;
- (c) a member of South Australia Police or the Australian Federal Police;
- (d) a person to whom subsection (3) applies—

I will come back to that in a minute. The meaning also includes:

- (e) any other person of a class declared by the regulations to be included in the ambit of this subsection.

Subsection (3) relates to persons under the seven-day arrangement, if I can paraphrase that. That is what is in the act. It is proposed that exactly the same definition for 'excluded person' will be part of the disability aspect, and that is why it is in each of those.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No, unfortunately, or fortunately, whichever way you look at it.

Ms COOK: To clarify, that is people who are not required to go through the screening process?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Correct.

The CHAIR: The member for Cheltenham may have a question. Before I give the member for Cheltenham the call, I am going to—

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! I am just going to speak briefly. I know the member for Reynell feels that she may have had only two questions. However, she had the call three times and, although she made the point that it was a point of clarification, to my mind at least it was a separate question. I just thought I would make that clear.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: No, there is another question. The member for Cheltenham.

Mr SZAKACS: Attorney, given the slow pace at which the LACs were implemented in South Australia and given this new set of requirements that LACs will now have to contemplate, did the minister advocate at the most recent ministerial council for additional resources to enable them to be equipped to provide advice to the NDIS employers and their participants?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: First, I did not attend the council referred to, so I cannot tell you about the detail of that; it is not an Attorney-General's agenda item. However, I am advised that all of that process relating to the obligations of the coordinators that are part of the new process, the new model, is really all within the commonwealth framework and a matter I am not privy to. As far as I know, they have been appointed, a full complement for South Australia, but I do not know about the other jurisdictions yet. I think we are a bit ahead of the curve in South Australia because we had the benefit of having a trial for the children's disability aspect as one of the early uptakes of that.

Nevertheless, as I said, I cannot answer that in relation to what else has been canvassed there, but they are in place and we are trying, as best we can, to make sure that our end of the deal is fulfilled, including getting this legislation through so that we have a suitable regime for the purpose of implementing the protections set out herein.

Clause passed.

Clause 23.

Ms COOK: I have a general request for clarification around what this clause actually does in the bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: This is a provision equivalent to section 18 of the prohibited persons act and is included to ensure consistency with that act. This clause requires that an employer must not continue to employ a person working with people with disability unless a screening check has been conducted in relation to that work in the preceding five years. So it is to be consistent and just repeats that obligation in this bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 24.

Ms COOK: In regard to increasing the fine, the expiation, from \$10,000 to \$50,000, what modelling and consultation happened around that increase?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Regarding the insertion here for fines now to be set at \$50,000 for offences against regulations, the amount is necessarily raised to \$50,000 because the regulations that will operationalise aspects of part 6 of the screening regime that are not required in the act will likely incorporate similar offences that are contained in the prohibited persons act that attract penalties of up to \$50,000. In short, the former government thought it was a pretty good idea to set those penalties: so do we, and that is why they are there.

Ms COOK: Just to clarify it, there was no additional consultation regarding that at all?

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Well, I did not come back to ask if they wanted it even higher.

Ms COOK: There are a number of clauses in the uncommenced Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016 that place obligations upon employers—part 4, division 2. I understand the Statutes Amendment (Screening) Bill seeks to amend the prohibited persons act. How then does the Deputy Premier see this operating for those individuals who are undertaking child-related work but who are not employed?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can the member be a bit more specific? I am struggling to find the sections she is referring to.

Ms COOK: They are in the prohibited persons act, part 4, division 2. I do not actually have it in front of me; I shredded it, sadly.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have a copy of it here. You say that part 4, division 2, is the part that has not yet been proclaimed—and therefore what?

Ms COOK: How does that operate for people who are undertaking child-related work but who are not employed?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Do you mean that they are just not at work; is that what you are saying?

Ms COOK: If they are volunteers and such.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think the law is pretty clear. If you are working with children, whether you are paid or not, you are caught by this regime. The provisions of part 4, division 2, give the steps employers must take in relation to employing a person under the prohibited persons act. As best as I understand it, all that commences on 1 July. You are right that parts of the prohibited persons act were held back until we had sorted out what the regulation was, and we then added this bill in here. You are right in the sense that some regulations have not been proclaimed to commence yet, but they are ready to go. Everything is designed to start on 1 July, if we can. Obviously, completing this bill will help that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When will the government publish the regulations before proclaiming them?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Can I say that I know that I have signed off on regulations. I know that it was the practice of the previous government sometimes not to even have regulations drafted, most often until after the bill was passed. We have been working very hard in the last 14 months or so (and the same people have been doing this for two years before that) to try to make sure that the law, in statute form, and the regulations are all ready to go. I am advised that the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Regulations 2019, which I have in front of me, are the ones that are effective on 1 July 2019 and that the balance, to go with the Disability Inclusion Act 2018, is yet to be finalised.

Ms COOK: Can the Deputy Premier advise the committee about who provided submissions in relation to the draft regulations and how many were received?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure that we provided that but, if we have not, we will get a list of those in relation to the regulations. It was a very long list, I know that.

Ms COOK: I looked on the Attorney-General's website—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: I am glad that somebody does.

Ms COOK: —it's very nice—to look for submissions in this round of consultation, but there is not any information there. Is there an intent to post those types of lists, or is that not something the Attorney will be doing?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: No. I think I have said this before, and I will make it clear for the purposes of this legislation, that whilst we provide a list of and are agreeable to information being provided as to who is consulted, the particulars of those consultations, if they are government agencies, are not made available.

Certainly, I invite members to look at independent stakeholders in relation to matters. Groups such as the Law Society of South Australia often provide comprehensive and useful submissions in relation to a lot of our law down here, and they go online on their own sites. A lot of this work was done across departments and across agencies.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What is left to be drafted of the regulations pertaining to the Disability Inclusion Act?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not know.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What is the time estimate of when that drafting will be completed and those regulations will be available?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that we do not know the answer to that, but they are on their way.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Is it the government's expectations that the regulations will be finalised and available before the sought commencement date of the act?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think we are going to be pretty much ready to go on 1 July in relation to the prohibited persons legislation. We have the regulations ready. They are out, published and ready to go.

The national scheme in relation to the NDIS, which we are aiming in South Australia to commence on 1 July, we cannot be certain of yet. They are still working through some of the aspects of it. So, we are a little bit held up with the advance at that level as well being part of the national scheme. However, it has started, and, as I say, rather than waiting until legislation is passed, we are getting on with trying to make sure as best we can that that is ready.

For example, if the disability aspects do not actually commence, if the scheme does not commence on 1 July 2019, we will still have achieved everything in relation to the prohibited persons legislation because that regime is complete and ready to go. Actually, that is not through the commonwealth parliament yet, so I suspect it will be a little while before it gets through there.

Ms HILDYARD: Attorney, what consultation was undertaken about the regulations with unions who represent workers in the disability sector?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In relation to the disability sector, because they have not yet been completed, nobody.

Ms HILDYARD: Are you saying that no unions were consulted about the regulations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: They have not actually been completed to be drafted to actually consult on yet.

Ms HILDYARD: You said that there was a comprehensive list of agencies that you spoke with about the regulations in drafting them.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: There are two sets of regulations. Perhaps the member was not listening to that. We have the prohibited persons act regulations. They are out there and they have been consulted on. There is a long list. We have been working on them for years, blah, blah, blah. They are out there ready to go on the basis that the act commences there on 1 July 2019. Disability is not yet completed to be drafted, so it has not actually gone out to anybody to consult on yet, including a union.

Ms HILDYARD: Will the Attorney consult those unions who represent workers in the disability sector when consulting about those regulations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am happy for the member to refer any list of people that she thinks should be consulted in relation to those matters. They can be sent to my office. I will ensure that they are passed on to the Minister for Human Services.

Ms HILDYARD: In the rollout of the NDIS, and given the last group of participants were those who were impacted by mental illness, and they were the last group of participants to transition to the NDIS, can you speak a little bit about the consultation in relation to the regulations with those organisations that advocate for people with mental illness?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not sure what regulations are being sought, but I did mention during the course of the committee on this that last week I actually attended at the Public Advocate's office and met with a number of people, including the new disability advocate, Mr David Cowdrey, who is consulting with and coordinating discussion with the Department of Human Services personnel and Public Advocate personnel to ensure that all of this is in place. I did not have any indication in the discussions I had with him that there were difficulties in relation to that.

As you know, the Public Advocate has a strong role in relation to disability and mental health—obviously people with cognitive impairment and other aspects as well. For the area you are particularly focused on, I am not aware of any concerns, but you are right to the extent that in due course we need to look at how we are going to manage and make provision for the mental health sector. At the moment, that is not before us.

Clause passed.

Clause 25 passed.

Title.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have a question on the title. It is not unprecedented, sir. I understand that the Chair has made a ruling, which I will adhere to. I received an email from the Hon. Michelle Lensink from another place advising this house—this committee—that if this bill does not pass the committee stage and house by 5.30pm this Tuesday 14 May the bill cannot commence as the government outlined.

I ask the Attorney-General to explain that email to the house because the house is the master of its own destiny. The idea that a member of the Legislative Council can dictate to this committee the timing of our conduct and our examinations of legislation is highly disrespectful. There should be no quarrel between the houses, but this minister has sought fit to email all members of the House of Assembly, demanding that we pass a bill by a certain date or time. In past parliaments, that could be considered a contempt of parliament. I do not think that will occur here, because of the iron laws of arithmetic, as Malcolm Turnbull would say, but I find this message strange, offensive and not in keeping with the good conduct—

Mr Duluk: Is this a speech or a question on the title?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Both. It is a committee. You are entitled to. I know you are new, but perhaps you can learn.

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So I put to the government that I would like for them to explain—

The CHAIR: Member for West Torrens, can I just respond to the member for Waite and to members more broadly. On page 89, standing order 364 states:

a Member other than the Member in charge of the Bill, motion or amendment may not speak more than three times on any one question, nor for more than fifteen minutes on any one occasion;

So the member for West Torrens and any other member is entitled to do that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Perhaps he lost wisdom when he shaved his beard. That was the problem.

An honourable member: Yours?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Mine was a thing of beauty, though. That is the difference.

The CHAIR: Back to the matter at hand, member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There was never any question of bipartisan support for this legislation, but the idea that the house cannot inquire into it and to have a junior member of the cabinet tell this parliament when it can and cannot conduct itself or when it should be completed by is offensive. I cannot think of another time in my 21 years here when a minister of either persuasion, other than the Hon. Michelle Lensink, has done this.

I do not remember any time under the Brown-Olsen government or the Kerin government when they ever demanded of the then opposition that a bill be passed by a certain time or date. I do not remember any demands on us. I stand to be corrected on this, but I do not recall demanding that the house or the Legislative Council consider a bill or motion by a certain date or time. It is the height of arrogance and I think it demeans not only what we are attempting to do here but the minister herself.

The Hon. Michelle Lensink, I think, devalues the role we have in a bicameral parliament where we have two houses considering a measure. Both houses are independent, and both houses are able to go through a bill, clause by clause, as set out by standing orders, so that members can get a good understanding of what the bill does and whether there are any unintended consequences. Indeed, there have been some very good amendments made in committee on the basis of

questioning from crossbenchers and sometimes by learned government members who have asked questions of their own executive about the implementation of a bill.

So I will not be taking any advice from the Hon. Michelle Lensink. To try to play politics with a bill like this I think is appalling. Again, every member in this entire parliament comes to this bill and comes to this committee with the intent of trying to get the best outcome possible. Why? Because we all want to protect the most vulnerable in our community: those little ones and the people who need protecting. The idea that there has to be a set deadline, given the fact that there have been delays since coming into office in having to consider this bill, and given that the bill that we are amending was passed in 2016, is a bit rich indeed.

The minister in the other place should have a long, hard look at herself for what she is demanding of this house. All we have done is to execute our duties to the best of our abilities. Not one member, including the Attorney-General, who has answered our questions, has done anything other than attempt to do the right thing by the committee of this parliament. To have this member email everyone en masse, as if she is some authority from on high, and demand of us that we pass a bill should upset every member of this committee, not just the opposition members, because it does an injustice to government members who may have questions of their own bill and their own executive.

It is a great tradition in this parliament to have crossbenchers. Indeed, I remember the former father of the house Graham Gunn would speak at length on every clause of every measure of a bill because he believed it was his right, and he would not have been lectured to by anyone about having to sit down and be quiet and to pass a bill by a certain time. I ask members opposite who are not in the executive to consider this email and what it represents. It represents the height of arrogance from a member of the executive trying to impose their will on the parliament. Parliaments are established to keep the executive in check, not the other way around.

We do not answer to the executive in this chamber: the executive answers to this chamber and this parliament. It works differently, and this minister clearly misunderstands her responsibilities. It behoves her to apologise to members of the parliament for attempting to somehow set a deadline on us in executing our duties. We have executed our duties diligently. We have asked appropriate questions, we have been given answers and we are satisfied. That is how the process should work—not by some sort of edict from the honourable member in the other place to the members of this house about how we conduct ourselves.

It has other repercussions because it could aid the disorderly conduct of this parliament to have the other place dictate to us when we should and should not complete our deliberations on a bill that they have sent to us. It goes to show the inexperience of this minister, the inexperience in this minister's conduct of her duties and the arrogance, already 14 months in, of this minister and the processes of the parliament.

The CHAIR: Before I call the Attorney to respond, I am going to suggest to the committee that the Attorney is responsible for the carriage of this bill. She is not necessarily responsible for an email sent by another minister. Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am going to read the email that went out on 9 May, which I am presuming went to all members of parliament. It states:

Dear colleagues

Please be advised the Government has sought advice regarding the timing of debate on the Statutes Amendment (Screening) Bill 2019. To allow commencement of this legislation as soon as possible, the House of Assembly debate needs to be concluded by 5.30pm this Tuesday 14 May. If you have any concerns about this proposition, please contact me.

Michelle Lensink

Minister for Human Services

I utterly reject the statements made by the member that some kind of issued demand has come from the minister as to how we conduct our practice in this house. I agree with the member that it is entirely up to the house to have the conduct of its own affairs here and we are entitled to maintain that. It is perfectly appropriate for the minister to alert members to the time frames that we are working to, and

she has done that by the email that she has issued. That is not a demand: it is a piece of information that has been circulated to us.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That is false.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The member asserts that it is false but, in any event, that is the information she has made available to us as members for us to consider in our deliberation of the bill. I do not know, perhaps I was waiting for some sort of valedictory speech or something from the member for West Torrens in that little missive, but I utterly reject what he said in relation to this matter. We are in control of the destiny of this house. If members in this house do want us, though, to progress this matter to give it its best possible chance of being implemented and effective from 1 July 2019, which will be three years since we passed the law on this matter, then I would urge them to bear that in mind and maintain a position of the swift passage of the matter in this house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would ask the Deputy Premier if she can advise the house who set this arbitrary time line and why was it deemed necessary?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I suggest these matters be taken up with the author of the note. I am just indicating the way I read it. I thought it was helpful information, but if other members want to take it up, do as she suggests: get in touch with her.

The CHAIR: As I indicated earlier, member for Lee, my feeling is that the Attorney is responsible for the bill that we are in committee on now, not for an email sent by another minister.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, the Deputy Premier has taken on the responsibility to bring the bill before the house and we are discussing the timeliness of its proclamation and when its contents come into effect. This house, indeed this whole parliament, has been advised that there is an issue of timeliness in the passage of the bill. I do not think it is too much to ask that we put to the minister responsible for the passage of the bill through this place why this deadline was set and on what basis it was set.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Ask her.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You just read it out.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: And it says, if you have any questions or concerns about it, ask her.

The CHAIR: Yes, I think the member for Lee and the member for West Torrens have made their point and now the member for Kaurana is going to make his point on this matter, on the title.

Mr PICTON: My question is to the Attorney-General. Has the Attorney-General had any advice given to her in regard to when the bill needs to be proceeded through this house to allow proper implementation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Only from the advisers I have here today and had on the preceding day. I think I have repeated this many times. To facilitate the commencement on 1 July, the communications program, which the member for Hurtle Vale has asked diligent questions about, and the program of completion of regulations, etc., would require us to pass this today on the basis that it gets back to the Legislative Council.

On the information I have, we put at risk the orderly progression of the bill as of 1 July, when it currently proclaims to commence the residue of the act. I am advised that we need to move it along if we are to achieve that. If the house decides that they want to hold it up, or you have more questions or whatever, then so be it, but you are on notice.

Mr PICTON: That is an interesting turn of phrase. Given the Attorney says that she has received advice in terms of the need to pass it today, has the Attorney received any advice as to what particular time today the bill needs to be passed in order for those processes the Attorney outlined to be put into effect?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: It is now 5.30pm. It may well be that the other place has risen, but I do not know. We do not know yet.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Only the government could adjourn the council. Did you adjourn it?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For goodness sake, Mr Chairman—

The CHAIR: Order! The member for West Torrens does not have the call. Attorney, do you have anything else to say?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not have anything else to contribute to the committee. Obviously, if they do, and it is a contribution of positive information, we will sit here and listen to it.

Ms HILDYARD: So that I am really clear and understand your explanation about a particular program of communication and regulations needing to be developed to meet a particular deadline, could you specifically talk about the consequences of passing it by 5.30pm today, as opposed to 5.30pm tomorrow, 11am tomorrow, or whenever it might be? Why 5.30pm particularly today? It seems to me that there must be a very, very tight time frame to have such a specific time of 5.30pm on a particular day suggested to us. Could you talk about what the consequences are between 5.30pm today and, for example, 5.30pm tomorrow or 11am tomorrow or Thursday.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, we have your question and your point. We have just heard word that the council is up. Attorney?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, then there is not much point in my answering.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (17:32): I rise to speak again on the Statutes Amendment (Screening) Bill. Firstly, I want to put on record how disappointed I am with the conduct of the minister in the other place in regard to the email discussed during the committee stage and also some of the other conduct around the bill. After the last sitting week, allegations were made on radio and social media that the opposition was, in fact, unduly wasting time or trying to delay the passage of the bill. Nothing could be further from the truth.

We merely sought to apply scrutiny to the bill, based on the consultation and questions that had been offered to us during the course of events leading up to the stage when the bill came up for debate, while we were deliberating on it between being given our briefings by the government. Between times, they were made aware of a whole range of consequences that we felt, and had heard, and raised ourselves about the change to conditions around screening for volunteers. The perception of people who came to us was that this would be a breach or a broken promise by the government.

To reiterate what members said earlier, to receive an email this week demanding that we have this bill dealt with by 5.30pm today was surprising and in pretty bad taste, to be honest. We have gone through this bill deeply. We raised valid questions, I believe, about how and why the money will be paid by volunteers once they become employed. We raised some valid questions, I believe, around how that will be scrutinised by the department and how it will be policed by the department. Through committee, we managed to really dig into the data sharing and a whole plethora of other issues.

From my personal position, I would like to thank the Attorney-General, members of the department and advisers who assisted during that process because it provided us with a huge amount of information that we did not have before out of briefings. When you are in a chamber across from the person you are opposing in terms of a portfolio, it is very difficult to have that opportunity and to have the Attorney and advisers be able to provide such a range of answers to us. I appreciate that and thank them. One of the issues to raise when we are accused of delaying—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale, I remind you that this is a third reading speech and that the content of your contribution really needs to pertain to the bill itself and the clauses within the bill. I have given you some latitude thus far, but I bring you back to the bill itself.

Ms COOK: Thank you for your guidance on that. What we were trying to do throughout the course of our questioning was to ensure, for example, that someone who volunteered 3,000 hours a year did not have to pay for a working with children check if they undertook a few hours of employment. We have been told that that constitutes delaying the bill, and I disagree. I think through the range of questions we asked we have been able to confirm exactly what is happening so that we can better inform the thousands of volunteers who live in our community.

When the bill came into this house two weeks ago, the government did the second reading explanation and then adjourned the debate. We went through, expecting that we were going to do our contributions at that time, but we had to wait until the next day. That is the last point I will make on delays.

In terms of the substance of this bill, the opposition still remains concerned about the ability, and the pathway, to get the money back from people who translate from volunteer to even a tiny amount of paid employment. We hold that that is a break of the election commitment to ensure that there are free screening checks. There was never a statement that the free screening checks will only be for people who are unemployed. We find out now that that is not the case, and we believe that the scrutiny we applied to the clauses was valid.

In terms of linking some of the election commitments with the bill itself (and I understand that the bill is complex because it ties together a whole range of other complicated legislation), a document was released 18 months or so ago by the now government saying that volunteers are a vital part of the non-government and non-for-profit sector and that we need to foster an environment that encourages the next generation of volunteers to get involved, particularly young and new retirees. I could not agree with that more.

However, when we then look at what has happened within this bill, where volunteers who undertake a few hours of paid work—and, potentially, they are the young people going into paid work—I am not sure that that does encourage the next generation of volunteers to get involved. I have received correspondence from clubs, community groups and members of the public who are not happy about these changes. I thank them for that.

There are questions around the \$315 expiation notice, which is spoken about in this bill. In many circumstances, a person who undertakes a few hours of paid employment and has that volunteer check could have to pay, on top of the screening fee, a \$315 expiation fee if they go over seven days of work, which is not clearly defined.

It is pretty gobsmacking, to be honest, but I am sure that we will see the hurly-burly advertising campaign and marketing come out to explain to the people exactly how this seven-day trigger will happen and how they will be notified. As you have heard today and last week, Mr Deputy Speaker, we asked a lot of questions about that. We are not satisfied with that warning. In fact, during debate, I believe that the Attorney was not able to get advice that people would be given a warning or some sort of notification that they were about to be in breach or had entered the 28-day period.

I hope that the government's reflection on that part of the debate happens and that, through regulation, they make some commitment to people that a sufficient warning will be provided before they get hit with the \$315 fine, which they can ill afford if they have only had seven or eight hours of work. I believe that is vital in terms of people's fear and anxieties around this bill and how it changes the commitment to free checking. Mr Deputy Speaker, I am sure you know that, for many families, this \$100, \$200 or \$300 will take food off their table. It is a lot of money for some people to have to pay, and it worries me that they are not going to get any warning of that.

I think that the government should have consulted a little more proactively on this bill prior to setting some of these rules in place within the legislation. I know that there was no broad consultation because the people who I expected would have been consulted came to me after the bill was tabled in the upper house and said that they had not been spoken to. I will not relate directly to those people or reflect on them or leave it open for anyone to question their honesty or integrity. I will just say that

they came, and it worries me that that did not happen. The impact on the community in regard to their expectation around the free screenings has not yet been fully appreciated.

There has been repeated questioning about the payment and the process. Some of the innuendo that has been thrown around has veered into territory that is, frankly, a little insulting. Implications have been made about people deliberately taking out a volunteer check so that they can rot or extort, or whatever term you want to use, a free screening for employment. The notion is that someone would say 'I'm going to get a free volunteer check and then go for a job in two months' time once my check comes through' to avoid paying \$107.20 or \$108 or whatever it is. I do not know how people think like that.

It would never cross my mind that somebody who intends to work in a caring sector—and, let's be honest, most of the sectors that we do screening checks for are caring sectors—would pre-emptively go and scab a free volunteer check so that they do not have to pay for it when they work. It is beyond me. I find that pretty insulting. I find it a bit strange that people who come into this place and who want to serve the community and work with the community have that type of view of people. It just shows that they do not trust the people of South Australia in relation to this matter.

The government thinks that people are out to do the wrong thing in that respect, and that is unfortunate. I hope that we have pointed out clearly enough that at least the people on the our side of the chamber would never intend to do that and that by asking many questions on the legislation through the committee stage we have been able to provide some accountability to our constituents and show that we are standing up for them.

Many of the people who came to me and said they had not been consulted, and who said that they did not like the changes that were happening, actually did not want to be named. They felt that they would be punished by a vengeful minister and that it might put some of their funding at risk. However, I have assured them that they have not been named in the speech or during the committee stage of the bill. I thank them for all the hours of conversations that I have had with them, and all the questions that they provided for us to ask the government.

The government is meant to be for all the people, not against any people. The South Australians I know are not out to get cheap or free volunteer screenings and not pay the bucks. They are not out to deliberately extort \$100 from the government. That being said, the opposition does support the original intent of the bill, to streamline the screening process and to ensure that it is nationally consistent.

We understand the time frame for when it has to get through. We understand that this is the next logical step in making the screening system easier to understand for everyday South Australians navigating employment with vulnerable people and also potentially simpler for the department to administer. We want to make sure that screening does not inhibit the work of volunteers so that they can keep doing their fabulous work, giving up their time for their community, but most importantly it will keep children, NDIS participants and vulnerable people much safer. Without any further words, I commend the bill.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:47): I rise to make my customary brief contribution on the bill. Like the member for West Torrens, I was at the very least surprised to learn of the minister's urgency in seeing through the passage of this bill, in particular because the bill was first presented to the parliament, as I understand it, on 14 February—or Valentine's Day as some people might be coerced into believing that date to be—and it sat in the other place until it arrived here on 1 May, so a good 2½ months.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, as I indicated to the member for Hurtle Vale, the scope of the debate is more restricted in third reading speeches and limited to the contents of the bill. You are coming to that, I am sure.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Indeed, yes.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am sorry, did the Minister for Transport have some interjection or disorderly conduct he wished to furnish upon us? No, back to his ministerial complaining about—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, you know as well as everyone else that it is disorderly to interject—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: —and it is also disorderly to respond, so continue.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, sir. I consider both of us warned. I found it interesting that despite there being 2½ months to consider all 25 clauses of the bill, all 41 pages of the bill, we were only afforded the opportunity from Thursday 2 May, the last sitting date preceding today's sitting date, and, if my memory serves me properly, we were given up until 7pm. In one instance, that would make one think that we had many hours to canvass the bill but it was only slightly over four, and now here we are today given approximately the same amount of time. I realise things do not move at a great pace upstairs, if indeed they move or sit at all. We find ourselves the only house sitting at the moment in the South Australian parliament, which is not an unusual circumstance, unfortunately.

The expectations of the minister about dealing with all 25 clauses of this bill might be slightly different from that perspective than it is from this particular perspective. When it has come to those clauses in particular where I have sought further and better information from the Deputy Premier—I am specifically talking about the discussions that we have had today with regard to clauses 20, 21 and 22, regarding the requirements for the establishment of a records management system—on not so much just the information that is held within it but more particularly the security of that records management system.

Given how important these screening checks are, and given the capacity under the terms of this bill in clause 22 for anyone to access that records management system, I feel like there have been some parts of the bill, particularly with regard to the records management system in clause 22, that have not been adequately worked up.

We have had so much time for the bill to be developed. We have had from 19 March 2018, when the government was formed. We were promised that within the first 100 days all the election commitments, including introducing free screening checks for volunteers, were going to be enacted. Here we are, 14 or so months down the track, and we are still grappling with the terms of this bill and we are grappling with the terms of the provisions of the clauses in this bill within a very tight window in this place.

As the member for West Torrens said, when it comes to those clauses, like clause 22, with regard to the records management system, or when it comes to some of the earlier clauses that we were discussing on the last day in the committee stage, when we were talking about clauses 7, 8 and 9, I think the responsibilities of this place are most important in making sure that the law we are seeking to enact is sufficiently robust. We have concerns, despite our commitment to support this bill and its passage through both houses, that not a lot of this has been sufficiently worked through. We have had the Deputy Premier tell us that there are still regulations that need to be drafted with regard to the Disability Inclusion Act.

Surprisingly, we were told that, while the bill itself might be ready to be proclaimed and enacted by 1 July, which is the target date, we have no such confirmation that these regulations will be necessary. I refer specifically back to the line of questioning today about the records management system, where the Deputy Premier advised us that we do not have any protocols yet that have been established for—and I am quoting from the bill here and from the clause—any person's access to this records management system.

We know, because we are treated to the Deputy Premier's frequent recollections of her thoughts on the Shannon McCoole case, that unfortunately there are some members in our community, including some people who end up working in child protection agencies, who are the last people who should be accessing this sort of information and who are the absolute last people who should be given access to a records management system.

We do not know from the line of questioning on clause 22 whether there will be any restrictions on what information—again, I quote from the clause—any person can access in this records management system. We do not know from the line of questioning to the Deputy Premier whether there is any control over whether somebody accessing a records management system can edit the information in that records management system.

We are talking about screenings for the purposes of the National Disability Insurance Scheme. We are all aware that there is a deluge of new organisations which are seeking to be service providers to those deemed by the NDIA to have a disability and so are entitled to support from the government. That deluge of organisations has an even larger deluge of employees who either are or are seeking to work for those organisations in the future which need to avail themselves of the terms of this bill.

The last thing we want to see is an environment where a new organisation with a body of employees has some sort of capacity to check not just the bona fides of their employees and whether they have the appropriate screening checks or whether indeed the opposite is true and they are prohibited people but whether one of those employers seeks to amend that information to try to ensure that to all other people the perception is that all of their employees are fit to be working with disabled people or indeed fit to be working with children. That is not beyond the realms of possibility.

What we should be seeking to do here is make sure we are enacting law that is as tight and robust as possible to minimise the chances of people engaging in such behaviour. We do not have that because we do not have the regulations and we do not have the protocols established. This place cannot be satisfied that even when those regulations are made and those protocols are developed, they will be robust enough because apparently they are still in progress, according to the Deputy Premier.

If the department is still yet to turn its mind to completing these regulations, then I do not see why the hurry is on for 5.30 today, when in fact the other place could not even make it to 5.30. Maybe not enough 20¢ coins went into the slot to keep the lights on up there; who knows?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It is a full two-hour day.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is a full two-hours day's work, that's right. So I wonder why that deadline was set. Of course, the challenge will now be that we are in the uncharted territory of the minister still working beyond 5.30 and still contemplating her bill, contemplating whether she can still, in the six or seven weeks left to us, avail herself of enacting this legislation and all the clauses within it, to which I am making specific reference.

I would also say that one thing that is most unsatisfactory about the terms of this bill, and the subject of a lot of the questioning during the last brief opportunity we were provided to contemplate this bill, was the circumstance under which a volunteer might be required to repay fees. We were promised that volunteers—any volunteers—would be able to have a free screening check; they would abolish the fees. That was the now government's commitment at the last state election, and now we see this attempt to claw back people who are subsequently deemed to be doing work.

The only problem is that the government cannot tell this place what constitutes work. The Deputy Premier said it was remunerated employment. We know that is not the case because the term 'remunerated employment' is not in the bill. It is quite likely, for example, that we will see volunteers at community clubs, sporting clubs and so on, who are exerting energy in an effort to derive a specific outcome, which I believe is a reasonable definition of work, and who might be provided with some sort of recompense for their efforts.

It might not be money; it might be something else. It might be a slab of beer. It might be some other goods or services that are able to be conferred on that person who has conducted some level of work. That leaves them open to an allegation from somebody else at that organisation that they have conducted paid work, and we have a bill here with clauses within it that do not sufficiently stipulate how we are going here.

Sitting suspended from 17:59 to 19.30.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We were canvassing some of the important clauses that had arisen during the second reading and the committee stage of the Statutes Amendment (Screening) Bill 2019. Prior to the break, I placed on the record my surprise at the missive we all received from the minister about the necessity to expedite the passage of this bill far speedier through this place, where there are far more resident members of parliament than there are in the other place, which, of course, is furnished with many more days to consider the bill than we have been.

I left my comments at clause 9 and the unsatisfied questions and concerns that the opposition raised about the requirement for a volunteer, who is deemed to have conducted work for more than seven days in any 12-month period, to repay the fees for the volunteer screening, which they had hitherto received free of charge. Not only were we unable to unearth a definition of 'work', but we have also been unable to unearth how the department would assess whether somebody had conducted work, other than being advised that the screening unit would essentially rely on other people dobbing in volunteers who were perceived to have conducted work.

This then raises a whole other series of questions about how the department can then make an assessment about who is to be believed in this matter, whether it is the volunteer or whether it is the person who has drawn the department's attention to the fact that that volunteer may not have been able to avail themselves of a free volunteer screening.

We are talking, presumably in the majority of cases, about a \$315 expiation fee, but there is a maximum penalty of \$5,000, and this is important for us to contemplate. This is an enormous impost that people could be threatened with, let alone be liable for, if there is a determination by the department that they have been conducting work other than as a volunteer beyond which the soon to be act provides for.

It is important that we settle these matters, and we have been unable to settle these matters. Nonetheless, the opposition has indicated its support for this bill. We understand that the minister is most, most anxious for the speedy passage of this bill regardless of these unanswered questions. Notwithstanding the fact that we have not met the hard deadline of 5.30 from the minister in the other place, that thus far we have breached this drop-dead date by two hours and four minutes, that perhaps, among some gnashing of teeth, knitting of brow and wringing of hands, the minister and her—

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Furrowing? What did I say?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Furrowing of brow.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, there can be knitting and furrowing of brows. Perhaps the minister can somehow see fit to divert the attentions and resources of her vast bureaucracy to ensure that this bill is given effect by 1 July.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (19:34): Mr Speaker, it is an honour and a pleasure to have you in the parliament again.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Is this a valedictory speech?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you resigning?

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: No, you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, why would I resign? I am in my prime. I am deeply disappointed in the government's conduct on this bill. I think what they are attempting to do is meritorious and, having gone through a robust committee stage of the bill, I think it is fair to say that there is a great deal of commitment on both sides of the parliament to keep the most vulnerable in our community safe from those who mean to do them harm.

What disappoints me is the manner in which the government has conducted itself. I think the Minister for Human Services has done her party and this state a huge disservice in the way she attempted to politicise this issue by calling into question the motives and the operation of the House of Assembly committee on the bill. The minister informed the public that the Labor Party, the opposition, was attempting to delay the passage of the bill. Let's unpack that.

This government was elected in March 2018, ministers were sworn in shortly after that, the bill that this seeks to amend was passed in 2016 and the amendments were brought into the parliament nearly 12 months later. Yet, because we dared to ask questions on two or three occasions on this bill, somehow the delay belongs to us and not government members. It is offensive to me because I have two daughters. It is offensive, I think, to all members of this house and discourteous to the good conduct of this house that the minister would make such an assertion.

To make it worse, the minister, a member of the executive, took it upon herself to inform members of this house that if the bill did not pass by 5.30pm today it could not be enacted in time. I think that claim is false, that claim is not accurate and, in fact, I say that that claim is misleading. It is not backed up with any evidence, it is not backed up with any fact and the truth is that this house is the master of its own destiny.

As to the idea that a member of the executive would inform this chamber and a previous committee that examined the bill that if the bill had not passed by a certain date and time—and time—it could not be enacted, in days gone by that would have been considered a contempt of parliament. I make no such assertion today because I suspect, as I said in my remarks during the committee stage, that it would be ignored by government members to protect their minister.

We have gone through a number of issues in the bill that I think were worthy of examination by a committee of the parliament. What were they? For example, the government went to the election as an opposition promising the people of South Australia that if they were volunteers they would receive free screening checks—free. There was never any qualification of that commitment about having to reimburse the cost of that screening if you did some work later; indeed, if you did do some work later, you would be in breach of the law if you did not pay it back. We know how these things cascade. It was worthy of us to go through that committee stage.

I think that there are far too many examples of the government saying one thing before an election and another afterwards. I think our examination here of what the definition of work actually is shows how difficult it will be for the government to administer this. In effect, the government is criminalising people who may be forgetful and whose only crime is to have received a free screening check—which they thought they would get under this government—but then later on, in a certain time frame, received payment for work they have done. That is not a very good message to encourage people to volunteer.

I do not think the government has thought this through. I think the message we send out to people is important. The message we give people about the value of volunteering is very, very important. I am a former minister for volunteers, and to this day my mother still volunteers. She volunteers for Greek Welfare and prepares hundreds of meals per week that she delivers herself to a number of people in the western suburbs of Adelaide.

That sort of community spirit is alive and well across South Australia. You only have to speak to our Governor about all the agencies and volunteer groups he visits on behalf of all of us to thank them for their contribution. Indeed, as the Speaker would know, there are hundreds if not thousands of volunteers within his own community.

All we wanted to do was make sure that people who volunteer are not turned into criminals because they forget to declare to the government that they have been lucky enough to get some work in very difficult economic times. Often people who find themselves unemployed, or not working, find solace and comfort in volunteering; it is one of the things they do to keep themselves active.

I see it all the time. I see people who are no longer working—actively looking for work but no longer working—who volunteer to keep busy. If I am lucky enough to reach the milestone set by the Deputy Premier, I may consider retirement, but I am still a young man in my 40s—

Mr Picton: A whippersnapper.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —in comparison to some, yes—and then I might like to volunteer my time for the Australian Labor Party in the seat of Bragg.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I could; there are plenty of Independents who would like my support in the seat of Bragg.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I would have to vote for you? It's compulsory, is it? Democracy Vickie Chapman-style: you can vote for anyone you like as long as it is me.

The SPEAKER: Order!

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Did we? I hope not. I would hate to lose the Deputy Premier. If we lost her, we would have to invent her. We would have to have someone else to take her place.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: You had Rick Sarre—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Rick Sarre—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is the difference between me and the member for Bragg: I do not think that putting yourself up for election and not being elected is a failure; I see it as participating in the democratic process. What a great service people who run in safe Labor or Liberal seats for the opposing party do for democracy. For example, we run in seats in some regional centres where the Labor Party has no chance of winning, but what a great service we are doing for democracy. Of course, the member for Bragg sees it as a form of treachery for anyone to stand against her—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: I invited him to our declaration of the poll party: he came.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: 'Our declaration of the poll party'. So what are we now? 'We are pleased we have been elected. We have invited you to our morning tea.' Wow! How very cute, the coronation. I would love to be in a backbench committee to hear the explanations, but back to the bill.

In the email sent out to members by the other minister responsible for this act, the Minister for Human Services, we were told that it had to pass by 5.30 today. The explanation we were given by the Attorney-General was that the Legislative Council may rise by 5.30. In my experience, it is the government that adjourn either house and it is the minister who moves the adjournment, and if the government wanted to wait for this bill to pass tonight—as we have done previously, waiting on the Legislative Council to pass legislation—they could have sat, but the Marshall government decided to adjourn the Legislative Council and not sit to receive this bill tonight.

Mr Picton: They could have brought on the rate capping bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There are many things the Legislative Council could debate, but it chose not to. Yet the government wrote to House of Assembly members telling us that we had to pass it by 5.30, and the explanation we were given was that the house may adjourn. That destiny is in the control of the government, and I thought it was a poor excuse and a poor reflection on the conduct of the Hon. Michelle Lensink in trying to bully this house into passing legislation and then giving us information that was false, just not true. It is not true.

The passage of this bill at 5.30 today, or 9 o'clock tonight, or 10.30 tonight will make no difference to the commencement of this bill, and every member of this house knows it. The question then is: why send that email? Why? If that statement had been made in this house, I would be on my feet a minute later moving a matter of privilege because it is just not true. Then you have to ask yourself: what does the opposition do when a member of the executive who has coverage of this bill writes to us and says that unless it passes by this date and time, the bill cannot be enacted by 1 July?

We know it is not true. Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition has only one option other than to accept what we are told by the executive is truthful. We have to accept it. There is no other option for us. We cannot accuse them of lying. We have to accept that what they tell us on these matters is true, yet we know what we were told is not true. All I can surmise is that in a clumsy, childish, adolescent way, the Minister for Human Services has attempted to make a political point about the

passage of this bill, which we all support unanimously. Why? What is in it for her? What is in it for the Liberal Party, other than to demean them? I think it was a poor reflection of the way that minister conducts herself in one of the most important portfolios in government.

Mr Speaker, I just want to quote from a document that you, and indeed every member here in the parliament opposite on the government benches, published in February 2018. It states:

If elected in March 2018, a Marshall Liberal Government will abolish all fees payable by volunteers for screening...

The same document goes on to say:

Volunteers are a vital part of the non-government and not-for-profit sector and we need to foster an environment that encourages the next generation of volunteers to get involved, particularly the young and new retirees.

There is nothing in that statement that says 'and, by the way, if 11 months later you get any paid employment and you don't notify us, you could be guilty of a criminal offence, so repay that money'.

Mr Picton: And a \$5,000 fine.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And a \$5,000 fine. Thank you for your efforts volunteering, but you have this definition we call 'work' that will be given to us through the regulations. I think it is a very poor message. The truth is that reality hit the government in the face when they were elected. They made this commitment before the election, thinking that through the power of the personality of the Premier they could make it work. They get into office, the Treasury gives the incoming briefs, and then the government realises the cost of their policy, so they begin tinkering with it around the edges.

All it has done now, in truth, is give people cause for concern the next time they make commitments in Newland, in Colton, in King. It will give them cause to consider, 'You didn't tell us this last time. Why should we believe you this time?' Imagine you are a volunteer who wants to get work but has not got work. You have a free screening, you are offered a job in the intervening period and one of the first things you have to do to avoid a \$5,000 fine is pay that money back or the government will accuse you of being a criminal. That is what the government has done.

Marginal members on the backbench, who rely on the front bench to give them policy that they can go out and campaign on, have to sell this. They have to go out to the public and volunteers in their community—lifesaving clubs and other organisations that have volunteers—and tell them, 'By the way, there's a clause that we didn't tell you about at the last election. If you do volunteer but then find work, you have to pay the money back. If you don't pay the money back, there's a fine.' If members opposite do not tell them that, have no fear: we will. We will.

I have to say that the outrage from clubs and volunteer organisations about this move by the government is justified. They did not see it coming. There was no anticipation that this is what would occur. They were not warned and I think the consultation was token. I do not think that the government can relate to the economic impact this will have on people who overwhelmingly volunteer. Again, it is a misreading of the public mood and the public sentiment towards volunteers and the way they view what they do. Members are going to be hit in the face with a lot of these decisions in the upcoming budget, when they will have to go out and sell things like privatising our trams and trains, which we have just learned about today.

I also think it will have the impact of dissuading people from entering the workforce. Those of us who are here and on \$180,000 a year or more might not think that repaying \$315 for a screening test is a lot of money, but if you are unemployed and volunteering and you apply for a job and the pay cheque is prospective rather than retrospective, and you have a certain period of time in which to pay that money back, it can be a burden. Again, it shows how quickly out of touch the government have become with those people they are attempting to serve. While the government claims that they are fulfilling an election promise here, they are not.

I also question the government's narrowing of the scope captured by this screening. The legislation that we have amended overwhelmingly had broader interpretations and allowed a wider catchment of people to be screened or checked. The government has deliberately narrowed that

right down and has been very prescriptive about who is tested, who requires a test and who pays or does not pay for a test.

The legislation passed in 2016 was a lot broader. It gave more room for a broader scope of test and check to make sure that anyone who could potentially be working with children or vulnerable people would have to undergo a check. It gave the police commissioner a broader scope. The government has narrowed that right down. Basically, I think they have been overly prescriptive, and the regulations will bear that out. I am sure a lot of members opposite who consider themselves to be liberals would be very surprised at that. I support a broader scope for assessment, and I am disappointed that the government has attempted to narrow that.

In my concluding remarks I will say that there were a lot of contradictions in the answers given to us by the Deputy Premier—contradictory remarks that did not make real sense. I suspect she was not well briefed on the subject matter, but I give her this: her intent was there and she tried. However, I think the committee was let down by some of the answers it received. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (19:54): I rise to give a third reading contribution in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Screening) Bill 2019. As per what the member for West Torrens was saying, on the face of it you would think that this might be an attempt by the government to implement their election promise, when they said to the people of South Australia that they will be introducing free volunteer screening checks for South Australians. Nowhere in that discussion, nowhere in the election campaign, was there ever a mention that a part of that was going to be the sting in the tail, which was presented in this bill, in clause 9—insertion of section 33A—which is the employment test.

The employment test put in place by this government is going to rule out so many volunteers from being able to get access to this supposedly free screening. I think about clubs in my electorate. Whether they be football clubs or surf lifesaving clubs or other community organisations that do voluntary work, there are not many people who do not do some level of work. They might be predominantly retired but they might have a very part-time job or a small business where they do some work, or they might be people who work full-time or part-time in the community and also volunteer in those clubs. Based on the election promises presented by the Liberal Party before the last election, those people would have been thinking that they would be able to access free volunteer screening.

What we are now presented with is that that is not the case at all. Those people who undertake work, and it is a very low bar in terms of employment—seven days in any 12-month period—will have to pay for a screening check. They will not get a free volunteer screening check at all. Even if you are volunteering a huge amount of time in the community and working a very small amount of time, you are still not able to access this check. I think that is very disappointing. It is something that we in this chamber have been trying to get to the bottom of in our assessment of this bill, and we have done that not only today but also on the last day of sitting prior to this, in examining this legislation and how it was put together.

There are a lot of unanswered questions in terms of how this test is going to be applied, how this test was devised, what the criteria are going to be and what the penalties are going to be in terms of how they are going to be applied. But we do know, because the government has made it clear in their legislation, that there will be an offence. They are creating an offence against volunteers in this legislation, an offence with a maximum penalty of \$5,000. For instance, if you are at the Moana Surf Life Saving Club, and you are one of the many volunteers there who works hard patrolling the beach, you also have a job to feed your family, pay your bills—

Mr SZAKACS: Point of order, Mr Speaker: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr PICTON: I welcome so many members of the government here to hear my contribution, where I will talk about the new section 33A(4) that is being inserted by the government into this act.

Members interjecting:

Mr PICTON: I think it is important that your side listen to this, Attorney-General, because you are the ones inserting section 33A(4) into this legislation, which is creating an offence that will

be punishable to volunteers. A person who fails to comply with subsection (1)—that is, if you undertake work, you need to pay for your check—will be guilty of an offence. The maximum penalty of that offence will be \$5,000. I did not see that in the propaganda put out by the Liberal Party before the election. I did not see that in any of their policy documents in relation to this policy, but that is the sting in the tail that they have introduced into this legislation.

I think that is going to be particularly devastating for many volunteers who expected that they were going to get a free check under this government, but they absolutely are not going to because of this clause. Not only are they not going to get the check but we are particularly concerned that there will be people who will, unfortunately for them, slip up in this process when they thought they were doing the right thing. They thought they were entitled to access a free volunteer screening check. They undertook some work—not very much work but some work—in the community. They did not then think, 'Oh, well, I now have to pay this additional money because I am doing a small level of paid work,' and they are now subject to a maximum penalty of \$5,000.

I do not think that is a very good way of rewarding our volunteers for their hard work in the community. In our questioning of this, the government was unable to explain how that discretion is going to be applied in terms of who they will prosecute. The actual work test itself seems to be very fuzzy. We asked a number of questions that could not be answered in terms of how that was going to be applied and how many hours would be required for that, so I think it is going to leave volunteers in a state of doubt, a state of confusion.

Firstly, I do not think that they are actually going to know that this clause is there. I do not think that the government is going to promote this clause to those volunteers, so they are not going to be aware of it in the first place. Because they are not aware of it, they will not be of the understanding that, when they undertake a small amount of work, they have to then go back to the government and repay the fee, otherwise they could be subject to this penalty. I think that it was perfectly reasonable and appropriate for Her Majesty's Opposition to examine that in this house and in this committee stage of this debate.

Unfortunately, it was not the approach of the government that that was appropriate. We had the minister responsible for this in the other place criticise members of the opposition for daring to question her bill, daring to question what I believe is a breaking of their election promise to offer free screenings for volunteers and daring to question this new penalty in section 33A(4) that is going to be put into the legislation. The minister not only tweeted her objections about questions in relation to these clauses but also said that this house had to pass this legislation by 5.30pm today.

What we found out in the questioning through the committee stage is that the Attorney-General did not have any reason why that 5.30pm time was put in place. There did not seem to be any rationale. Any failure to meet the 5.30pm deadline was not going to create any problems for the government whatsoever. Hence, I think that basically the minister was lying. The minister was lying when she said that there was a 5.30pm deadline for this house to pass this legislation. I actually think that it infringes upon the privileges of this house to have a minister from the other place instruct us on how we need to deliberate our business.

I note the other place went home pretty early today, as it usually does because it has no work to do under this government, but they could have stayed around if they wanted to pass this legislation. If the minister was so insistent that this had to go through their house tonight, then they could very easily have stayed and debated any number of their pieces of legislation that they have had sitting on their books for many months. But they did not do that. They went home. They are at home having a glass of port or whatever members of the Legislative Council do.

Basically, we have found out that this email directive that we received from Michelle Lensink was completely false. I think that is another area which we needed to examine in terms of the debate tonight and I think that it was clearly completely false. I think it would be very difficult, certainly on our side of the parliament, for us to believe anything we hear come out of the lips of Michelle Lensink after that completely ill thought through and made up email that we received in relation to this bill.

Apart from the fact that section 33A is a massive breaking of their election promise, when you look at the detail of this legislation there are so many unanswered questions. There are a number of areas in which we had some issues in terms of the way the government has drafted this. The

amendment I moved was in relation to the ministerial powers to add additional things into this legislation, which I believe was under clause 7, where clause 7 says in terms of functions that they were going to add:

to conduct screenings for the purposes of the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 and to perform such other functions as may be assigned to the central assessment unit under that Act.

When you look at the original act, there is already an ability for additional functions to be assigned to the unit under the act. However, for that to happen, there needs to be the agreement of the minister to do that whereas the clause, which has been drafted by the government in clause 7, section 21(1)(da), would not have the minister involved in that process at all. It has it completely open to the department to decide what additional functions would be assigned to the unit under the Disability Inclusion Act 2018. So that is something we disagreed with. We moved an amendment in relation to that matter because we believe that is an important principle.

Unfortunately, the government did not believe that and, of course, they had the numbers and carried the day. I think when you look at the detail of this, how this has been drafted so sloppily is an area where this house deserves to have a proper examination of this legislation. I think for people to criticise us for doing that perhaps shows up their house, which they supposedly view as the house of review, but it is lucky to sit for two hours a day. This house has been doing the review function of this legislation that has been sloppily drafted in the other place. I believe that is an area deserving of significant scrutiny.

Clause 8, which inserts the new section 26A, in relation to people who are presumed to pose an unacceptable risk to children, is a significant new section in the act. It is unrelated to the screening payments for volunteers but it is an area that deserved significant scrutiny. I think there was a lot of information that we drew out through questioning the Attorney-General in relation to that clause last sitting week about how that is going to be applied and also about how the government still has a lot of work to do on how that is going to be applied.

I asked the Attorney-General a number of questions in relation to clause 12. Clause 12 relates to how the Commissioner of Police will provide information to the central assessment unit on the charging of certain persons. Perhaps because I was the minister for police for a brief time, I have a feeling that there is a bit of work here that needs to happen from the police's end. We had some very disparate answers from the Attorney in relation to whether the police's system is up to speed for doing this. Firstly, she said that a whole lot of work had been done with the police on this, but then later in the questioning it came out that nothing needed to happen in relation to this.

This is something that we will have to watch continuously, to see whether or not it will involve additional work that needs to take place in regard to the new section 39. As we know, IT systems always carry a significant pressure in terms of updating them in the legislation that we pass in this house. Certainly, with the police it is no different. Sometimes, the police feel frustrated that legislation is passed in this place without significant regard for how much work needs to occur to update their systems and implement measures so that it can be actioned at their end, particularly when we place an onus on police to inform.

That might seem like a very appropriate thing to do, but it is appropriate for the parliament to know that the government executive has done the proper work with the police to make sure that is all going to be in place and to make sure that process is going to work. If the process does not work, it will potentially create a concern in relation to the screening process. If we are not getting those notifications—in this case, in terms of the prescribed offences or presumptive disqualification offences in relation to new section 26A—it will make the whole system not work very well. So I did not feel particularly confident in relation to the answers that we had from the Attorney-General that it had been sorted in this regard. I hope that it is the case. I hope that perhaps the Hon. Michelle Lensink, Minister for Human Services, has more information in that regard than the Attorney was able to provide.

I know from my experience that it is sometimes frustrating that bills are passed here, and it takes a lot of work at the other end for the police to implement their systems to ensure that it happens. In one example, both sides of the house strongly supported increasing a range of drug-driving

penalties. Thinking back now, that would have therefore led to a significant amount of work by the police to implement their systems to ensure that it happened. It cannot be done at a click of the fingers. So we welcome this bill and we support this bill.

However, we are concerned, particularly in relation to what is a broken promise. The government are not doing what they said they would do at the election. Ultimately, the government will be judged in a number of regards when it comes to the next election and how they performed against the promises they made. This is one area where what they promised and what they have actually delivered are two very different things. By not delivering that for people, potentially the sting in the tail of creating offences for people who fall foul of that—not through their own deliberate actions, but because they did not understand this very confusing piece of legislation that the government have drafted—will be a problem for them.

If people are prosecuted needlessly under this legislation, we will be highlighting that and holding those members of the government to account for promoting and bringing before the house this offence against volunteers who perhaps did not know that they were doing the wrong thing.

Mr SZAKACS (Cheltenham) (20:13): I rise to make a brief contribution further to those of my colleagues, and I do so as a relatively new member of the house. It has been an interesting exercise and I appreciate sincerely the Attorney's contribution and her answers to questions at the committee stage as the carrier of this bill through this house. However, it leaves me in no better place on a couple of key clauses than when we started the process of going into committee. I want to talk about a number of those key clauses which have yet to provide further clarity to the satisfaction of us on this side of the house and, importantly, further clarity for the volunteers who would potentially fall foul of the implementation of this bill.

There have been a number of questions posed by members of the opposition in respect to the circumstances under which a volunteer would be required to repay their screening fee that had been remitted. Much has been said about the qualification of hours or days worked and I would not seek to provide anything further on that. What leaves me with some confusion still, despite the best endeavours of the Attorney, is under what circumstances a volunteer undertaking work would be required to pay back their remitted fees.

In various answers before the house, we have heard different words used. We have heard the word 'remuneration'; the definition of remuneration of course means something. We have heard 'work'; work means something altogether different. We have heard 'paid work'; paid work is a bit different from work. We have also heard 'paid employment'. All those definitions have particular meaning under various pieces of legislation in this state. Of course, the South Australian Fair Work Act provides certain definitions. The commonwealth Fair Work Act also provides certain definition and guidance in respect to those words. The point I make is that they are all very different.

We could also look to the guidance provided in operational standards and guides issued by ReturnToWorkSA in respect to remuneration and those circumstances that were taken in guides, particularly in respect to the types of remuneration that employers need and should declare for the purposes of remuneration—non-monetary items. So here we have the confusion between the Volunteers Protection Act, which provides some guidance in respect to when voluntary work still is voluntary work because of a genuine honorarium, but then we are taken to the ReturnToWorkSA guidelines which provide similar circumstances where similar cash or non-cash benefits would, for the purposes of an employer declaration, be remuneration.

What I put in this third reading contribution is that if it is confusing for us here, what does it mean for SAPOL, which is going to be forced and asked to implement these laws? What is it going to mean for volunteers who, frankly, are not sitting at home tonight listening to the committee contribution, as exciting as it is? I am sure that the viewership has probably spiked a little since I got to my feet, but I think maybe just my mum at home is listening.

The point I make is that for a scheme to operate well it needs to be digestible, it needs to be consumable and, most importantly, if this were to be a piece of law to fulfil the commitments made by the government in respect to their election commitments, then it should be easy to operate. This piece of law will not be easy to operate, certainly not for those volunteers who will be forced to pay back their free volunteer screening.

Another interesting point that was raised through the committee stage, which as far I could see certainly was not dragged out—again, I have not been around for that long, but I would expect there to be in my—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: You had to learn to read Katrine's handwriting!

Mr SZAKACS: I did. So I settled in. I have passed the first test of the member for Reynell's handwriting. I dare say that there are going to be longer and more fulsome committee stages than the one we just embarked on, but we did, through the prudent questioning of those on this side of the house, establish that there are now, both in the eyes of the government and the eyes of the bill, various classes of emergency service workers. An emergency service worker within the same emergency service organisation, whether it be the MFS, CFS or SES, will be treated differently for the purposes of the transitional provisions and that is the requirement for periodic screening to take place.

This is not about us on this side saying the screening should not take place. It is us on this side saying that, if you are a 000 call centre operator doing the same job, the same work and employed under the Fire and Emergency Services Act, sitting in the chair tonight next to someone employed under the Public Sector Act, which is precisely what is happening, then it is simply ludicrous for the piece of law that this government is seeking to pass through this house to treat those two workers, those two front-line emergency service workers, in different ways.

In further questioning, we also heard that an SES volunteer may or may not, depending upon which of the answers we got, be covered by the transitional provisions. A Volunteer Marine Rescue volunteer, who comes under the SES and reports to the Chief Officer of the State Emergency Service, may not be covered.

Despite the protestations of the minister in the other place about the time frames on the bill to be passed, it is my true belief that the committee stage has been important. Unfortunately, we have more questions now unanswered than we have answered. I commend the bill. I look forward to its implementation, notwithstanding the intervention of the minister from the other place. I hope that the operation for volunteers, who were promised one thing and will be delivered something else, is far less disappointing.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament tonight boarding house prefects from Prince Alfred College, who are guests of not only the member for Flinders but also the member for Narungga and the member for MacKillop. Welcome to Parliament House.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SCREENING) BILL

Third Reading

Debate resumed.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (20:22): I rise to speak in support of the Statutes Amendment (Screening) Bill; however, in doing so, I want to comment briefly on some of the issues it raises for volunteers, in particular in relation to clause 9. The bill aims to ensure that South Australians working with children or supervising people working with children or with access to data relating to children, including those volunteering, are required to undertake a new DHS working with children check. It also introduces the NDIS Worker Screening Check national system, pending the passage of the commonwealth legislation.

Volunteering is essential to building strong and resilient communities. We know that it encourages economic participation, mitigates isolation and loneliness and that it can increase social inclusion and community participation. Importantly, volunteering provides benefits to the recipients of the volunteer services, who are often children and the more vulnerable members of our community. Screening, of course, is important to ensure proper protection of these members of our community.

Today, people from many different workplaces and walks of life are required to undergo these screenings—teachers, police, childcare workers, nurses, and so on—as part of their employment. However, there are thousands of volunteers in our community who spend many hours delivering volunteer services who require a screening check and whose only contact with community members where a screening check is required is in relation to their volunteer roles. Across the state, we have sporting organisations, volunteer coaches, umpires, referees, parent committees, governing councils and parents who participate in weekend sporting activities.

So concerns have been raised in the community and by colleagues on this side of the chamber that go to the heart of volunteering. In the lead-up to the last state election, there was a commitment, a promise, by the Liberal Party that, if elected, it would provide free screening checks for people who volunteer in the community, and now we have before us a bill that goes some way to renegeing on that promise through a provision that will require volunteers who have more than seven days of paid work to pay back the cost of their free screening. I know that many in my community would not be in a financial position to do so should this occur.

Of even greater concern is the lack of notice provided before an expiation notice of \$315 is issued to the volunteer who fails to pay the fee within 28 days of commencing work with children, other than as a volunteer. We have already heard the example, provided by the member for Hurtle Vale, of someone who gets work as Santa's helper at one of the shopping centres in the lead-up to Christmas. It may be their only form of paid employment in the three years, but they still have to pay for their screening.

It is a concern that today in committee the Attorney-General could not guarantee that a person will receive a warning, a reminder from the department, that they are required to pay the department their screening fee because they have exceeded seven days of paid employment. If this is to be the case—that no reminder or account is sent to the volunteer notifying them—there will, without doubt, be volunteers who end up with the \$315-plus expiation notice. It could also result in the community losing some of our valued volunteers.

For all the good the screening bill delivers, it is disappointing that some of the salt of the earth people, some of our much-needed and valued volunteers, will, if changes are not made, suffer personally, financially and emotionally by unintentionally breaking the law. Some of the more senior members of our community are not able to use computers to track any of the work they may have done. They may be using notebooks or scribbling it down on a bit of paper which, in the time frame, they would lose.

So being sent an expiation for \$315, without being sent an account or a reminder that they have exceeded the seven days, is problematic, and I think it would be worthwhile the government considering how the issue of notifying volunteers could be addressed. I commend the bill.

Mr BOYER (Wright) (20:27): I must say that I think the intentions of the bill are somewhat puzzling. I think there is a belief among those opposite that people will somehow try to move heaven and earth to score themselves a free screening check, which I think is fanciful, to say the least, when we consider the people many of us would know in our roles as members of parliament. Some of us volunteer in organisations as well. To think that the people who volunteer in those organisations would really go out of their way to try to score themselves a free screening check, and somehow avoid having to repay the cost to the government, is nothing short of ridiculous.

What really alarms me is the lengths to which this government will go to actually recoup or claw back that money. Of course, the way this will work—and we uncovered this during the committee stage under questioning—is that somebody, somewhere, actually has to be the person who investigates a claim on the hotline, or whatever it might be, 'dob in a volunteer cheat'. Somebody will have to investigate the claim that somebody has crossed that seven-day, magical threshold and failed to repay the cost of the free check to the government. Cue dramatic music at that point—unbelievable, shock horror!

What will be the cost to the government of having someone sitting somewhere in, I presume, the Public Service, spending their time investigating an allegation of screening theft, clearance fraud, or whatever we might call it? What is the cost of that compared to the meagre amount that this

government is going to recover by asking someone who has crossed that seven-day threshold of paid work to repay the cost of the screen that they received in the first place?

Aside from the very little economic sense that it makes to do this, what message does this actually send to current and prospective volunteers in our community? To use this bill and to use volunteers as a vehicle to make a budget saving is nothing short of reprehensible, particularly when the commitment before the 2018 state election from the then Liberal opposition was crystal clear. It was crystal clear that volunteers would not pay for their screening check. There were no ifs, there were no buts, there was no fine print or no asterisk at the bottom.

In my second reading contribution, I readily admitted, as someone who knocked on a lot of doors during that campaign, that there were people in our community whose vote was decided by this commitment. I spoke to them and I remember some of the people, and I have met them since. They said to me that, as volunteers, they did not think they should pay for their screening and that the state government should do more to encourage and incentivise people to be volunteers, and I have no doubt that they went to the ballot boxes on 17 March 2018 and cast their vote for a Marshall Liberal government on that basis.

What we see now is a failure by this government to meet the commitment they made to those people. I have no doubt that they are going to feel very let down, particularly when the seven-day rule, as we learnt when we asked questions during the committee stage on this, is a completely arbitrary rule. We asked whether or not the threshold of seven days of paid work might have been decided upon because the government thought that the volunteer had somehow reached a magical point where their capacity to repay the cost of the screen might have come to fruition—but, no, it has nothing to do with that.

My recollection of the answer we were given is that the seven-day time frame actually aligns with other time frames in that bill and other bills. So it is not about the volunteer who, as we have heard, might be doing a few hours as Santa during Christmas. It is not as though they suddenly have a pocketful of cash and we think, 'Right, you can easily pay back the cost of the screen, Santa. Come on down.' It has nothing to do with that. 'The seven days fits really nicely and snugly with other thresholds and other time frames in the bill so we will choose that.'

The great offence taken by the minister in the other place at the audacity of the opposition to ask questions about this bill was really something to behold. The imposing of arbitrary time lines upon us for when the bill should be passed could not at all be explained here under questioning, even when the member for Reynell tried in vain to ask what the ramifications might be if this bill was passed at 5.30 tomorrow instead of 5.30 today. No explanation was given.

All in all, holistically, this only goes to further disincentivise other people from volunteering. That will be the net effect of this bill. People who might be prevaricating or thinking about being a volunteer and who, if they are like everybody else in our community, have a very busy life and might be wondering whether or not they can fit in volunteering at the Country Fire Service, the State Emergency Service, or at Surf Life Saving South Australia, when it comes down to it will think, 'Well, this new government says that if I work seven days of paid work I'm going to have to repay the cost of my screen.' I think that speaks volumes about the value this government places on volunteers. It is very disappointing that a bill with such noble intentions is now being used to save a bit of money.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (20:33): I rise to make a very brief third reading contribution. As others have so rightly spoken about, every single aspect of South Australian community life in every corner of South Australia is enriched by volunteers: their generosity of spirit absolutely makes South Australia a stronger, kinder and more connected place. Their efforts often inspire and pave the way for others to follow similarly in providing community service. Certainly, I and all members on this side of the house commend every single one of those volunteers for making a very personal decision to give their time, their energy, their heart and their passion in the service of others.

Yesterday, when I was thinking about this bill coming on today, I reflected on the three preceding days and what I had done on Friday, Saturday and Sunday. I reflected on the fact that every single event that I attended was made possible, was made stronger and was made better by the generosity of spirit of volunteers in our community.

Just last Friday, with the Speaker I attended the Italian Community Volunteer Awards, where we recognised and rightly awarded dozens of volunteers. These are people who have given their time and their energy to so many different causes and to so many different people in our community. We recognised and awarded people from Italian pensioners' associations, Radio Italiana, aged care, community organisations and multiple others.

On Friday night, I had the pleasure of attending the Athletics SA awards together with the member for Colton, who I must say spoke very well. It was a pleasure to see him standing in for the Minister for Recreation and Sport and hear him speak so well and from the heart about his experience in sport. It really was a lovely speech. As I said, I was pleasantly surprised not only that he spoke so well but that he stood in for the Minister for Recreation and Sport. I hope that I see him at many other functions in that capacity in the future.

As the member would know, many people were recognised that night for decades of service as coaches, as starters and as officials. So many people were recognised for running athletics clubs right across our state. It really was a very inspiring event to attend, and again I say to the member for Colton well done on what he contributed to that evening.

On Saturday morning, I unfortunately had to miss my usual parkrun at Christies Beach, which again is staffed by volunteers in our community. I had to miss that parkrun because I had the opportunity to support the Edge Church in their Run to RED and did my kind of walk, kind of run (mostly walking) with them. Again, that entire event was attended by thousands of people in our community and was entirely run by volunteers. It was a spectacular event that raised lots of funds, again through the efforts of volunteers, which will go back into our community.

On Saturday afternoon, I had the pleasure of attending the Port Noarlunga and Christies Beach Southern Football League match. I had the opportunity to be part of a commentary team that broadcast through Tribe FM 91.1. The other members of that commentary team, who are there week in, week out, as well as on their Friday night siren-to-siren show, are also volunteers who give hours, weeks, months, years and decades of service to the Southern Football League. Of course, we were commentating a game that would not have been possible without the service of volunteers at both the Port Noarlunga and Christies Beach football clubs.

That night, I attended a local surf lifesaving club where volunteers were recognised for their generosity throughout the surf lifesaving season. Some people were recognised for reaching the milestone of having contributed thousands of patrol hours, keeping our beautiful beaches on the Mid Coast safe for our local southern community and also for people who visit our beautiful Mid Coast.

Others were recognised for long-term service supporting our young people's pathway into surf lifesaving and, in turn, supporting their volunteering efforts. Surf lifesaving is a wonderful institution that has been a very strong part of my life. It not only enables competition but also focuses on providing a vital community service to other people in our community. Others were rightly recognised for running the club bar, for serving food, for doing all the things that make that club run week after week during the summer season and beyond.

On Sunday, together with thousands of South Australians, including the member for Bragg and many people on this side of the house, I attended the Mother's Day Classic. Multiple volunteers who are members of the Women in Super organisation and who are members of cancer support organisations were there, making sure that that incredible event, that has grown so much over the past couple of decades, was again a huge success. Without the support of those volunteers running that event, the funds would not have been raised and awareness about the terrible circumstances that people find themselves in due to this terrible illness would not have been raised. All those things were made possible through the service of volunteers.

Those events are literally just a few stories of volunteers that I encountered over the course of just a few days. I certainly could go on, and I know every single member in this house could speak at length about the volunteers that they encounter day in and day out in our community. As were many people in this house, as were many members of this house, I was really pleased when I heard the news about the implementation of free screenings for volunteers, given all that contact I have with volunteers, as do so many others. I was intrigued about that particular initiative, but then I found that this measure had a number of problems when it was presented in this bill.

First of all, it does not necessarily deliver free screenings for volunteers at all. It lacks clarity, as we found through questions this afternoon, about the line between the service of volunteers who are providing services like those I have just spoken about—those providing voluntary service without expectation of monetary reward—and those who are doing paid work. Certainly, through the questioning this afternoon it was very clear that there is a very worrying lack of clarity about where that line lies.

We also found out, again through questions today, that the nexus between the NDIS commission—and its role in safeguarding people, screening people and overseeing that screening—and the central screening unit contemplated in this bill is really unclear, which again, given the incredible change that is upon us as a result of the NDIS, is really very worrying.

We also found through looking at the bill and through questions today that, absolutely shockingly, these generous volunteers so many people and I have spoken about and all of us encounter in the course of what we get to do with and for our communities, could be subject to \$5000 penalties under new section 33A(4) and that, even more worryingly, there is no communication plan about why and when you might be liable for those penalties. There is no clear communication plan, leaving those generous volunteers, whom we should absolutely be rewarding for their service, vulnerable to exorbitant penalties rather than the rewards they so richly deserve for what they do with and for our community.

We should be celebrating our volunteers, not penalising them. Our volunteers deserve so much better than what is in this bill, and our volunteers certainly deserve so much better than an attempt that was made by a member in the other place to actually stymie our ability to interrogate some of those concerns that have rightly been raised today and when we commenced debating this bill a couple of weeks ago.

It was alarming to think that a minister would send a message to somehow curtail those absolutely appropriate questions that we all have about the operation of this bill, how it actually could deliver what it purports to deliver and how those generous volunteers would be protected from those exorbitant penalties that we explored in our questions today and a couple of weeks ago.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (20:45): I indicate again my appreciation that the opposition have confirmed their support of the bill. It is taken effectively some three years to culminate legislation to conclude what has been the passage of the 2016 bill in relation to children and then, more recently in 2018, the Disability Inclusion Act, traversing a population of children and vulnerable people and the protections afforded them as a result of the screening procedure.

It is disappointing to note some of the commentary, but I will conclude by saying a number of things. We spent 16 years under the previous government, during which they gave no relief to the volunteers about whom I have just heard repeated glowing speeches—no relief whatsoever. They charged them full tote odds throughout the time we have had screening, which has been for a decade or so, and yet, coming into the parliament in the course of this debate, somehow they see these people as having deserved much better.

We are not going to resolve the clear and different view that the opposition have relative to the government's position as to both the appropriateness and applicability of the provisions that are to apply in the event of a volunteer obtaining work relating to children and, after a threshold of seven days, having the obligation to pay the fee. Clearly, we are not going to agree on that. The opposition have indicated that they see this as some kind of carnivorous clawback that is unfair and inappropriate for the purpose of volunteers. We see responsible government as having to deal with what we would hope to be only very few people who might try to exploit this circumstance.

The commentary that has been made in the final conclusion of this bill, and the repeated claims that the minister imposed on this house an obligation to curtail debate and restrict questioning, I think is blatantly unfair and inaccurate. I maintain that the minister, together with the Minister for Child Protection, and personnel in the Attorney-General's office have worked diligently, certainly in the 14 months or so of the new government, to try to bring this matter to a successful conclusion so that we can get on and implement the new obligations.

I do not know, but I suspect that those same people were also working during the time of the previous government. They were meeting challenges as to the applicability of the new screening provisions. That was evident from when the change of government occurred, when we found that they were nowhere near being able to complete this exercise by the end of last year, and efforts were then made to bring it to fruition by June this year.

I will specifically address the matters that have been raised. One was the assertion by the member for Lee that somehow or other somebody like Shannon McCoolle might be able to get access to data that would be totally inappropriate. I do not know where the member for Lee was during the debates on this matter or where he was during the development of much legislation subsequent to the finding of Mr McCoolle's conduct while he was in the employ of the department under the previous government.

The reality is that we on this side of the house do not take responsibility for Mr McCoolle. That was a shabby exercise. It was totally unsatisfactory supervision of the protection of children under a previous regime, and we take no responsibility for him. Nor do I take responsibility for the former premier in the way he made press statements upon the arrest of Mr McCoolle and the subsequent announcement of a royal commission. The whole exercise was a shabby and, I think, tawdry passage in the history of the previous government.

There is nothing that has been outlined in the course of the committee that suggests that someone like Mr McCoolle would be able to get access to data under the regime of the operation of the assessment unit and accessibility to data for the purposes of a worker having real-time information about their history, together with the rights of an employer to, obviously, make the inquiry and be kept informed as to whether their employee had become a prohibited person for the purposes of the act.

In my view, that is nothing short of a disgraceful attack on those people who are already working in this unit, already doing this work and already protecting that data for the purposes of the registry and the accessibility arrangements for it. It is a shameful attack on them, without one scintilla of evidence that a breach has occurred. I remind members that if circumstances are brought to their attention where there may be some breach then, for goodness sake, report it. Do not come in here and try to raise the threshold that there is in some way a risk to a service that diligent public servants are currently undertaking with not one shred of evidence to suggest the contrary.

Another matter that was raised in the third reading was the suggestion that the police had not been consulted, that we are not sure about the police data in respect of confidence of their capacity to support the obligations that they will have, already have and will continue to have under this legislation. Again, there is not one scintilla of evidence to suggest that, not one complaint presented to us and no approach by the Commissioner of Police to say, 'Hang on a minute. We can't manage to comply with the obligations that we are currently doing,' etc.

As members may be aware—which should have been known to members of the opposition, particularly those in government—late last year new IT infrastructure was in place for the reportability and transferability of data in relation to prosecutions and convictions within the Courts Administration Authority and obviously assisting in the compilation of material. Again, please do not come into the house and try to use the committee process as some kind of arena to throw allegations around without presenting any evidence to support that.

I thank the member for Cheltenham for his contribution. Although he is puzzled, it seems, by the differing definitions in relation to employment, work and the matters that are relevant to this legislation, they do differ from other legislation and that is for good reason. He will learn in the course of time that there are circumstances that apply in which those definitions will change. Whether it is in the Fair Work Act, as he suggested, the Fair Work Commission, under WorkCover or ReturnToWork obligations in the industrial law, there are lots of different circumstances where this is raised.

He also seemed to be puzzled and concerned about the definition of those who are in services such as the CFS and MFS to the exclusion of others. Again, this is a policy decision determined by the government that a high number of them are not in the high-risk area and that group has been accorded the longest period of time to transition—a three-year transition—because they present the minimum risk.

That does not mean we are ignoring other people completely. They have a transition, but we have identified a particular cohort that is larger in number and that will assist in the transition. That should not be seen as some reflection of inconsistency, of exclusion of other groups that might have a smaller amount in them.

The question was raised about a marine rescue squad—I cannot remember the full title of it now—that basically provides services when they are trying to find or rescue, hopefully alive but sometimes not—

Mr Cowdrey: Sea Rescue Squadron.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Sea Rescue Squadron, which assists the SES from time to time. Are these people included? We would expect so, if they are under contract, but we do not know that for sure. I make this point: it is a transition clause to try to ensure that we have an orderly transfer of what are tens of thousands of people who will be requiring checks or upgrades.

In relation to the committee itself, it is disappointing that when the member for Hurtle Vale came into the house and presented her argument on aspects of this bill, and we do not agree with it all but she presented her argument, and asked genuine questions about concerns of constituents—I think there were other members, too, the member for Reynell, with particular concerns in relation to the disability area and how things were going to apply, and it is reasonable that that inquiry is made—what is rude to the committee is when it appears that other members who come in to make a contribution about the matter are clearly not, for whatever reason, listening to the questions being asked by their colleagues.

They come in and either repeat them or dress them up in speeches that make it almost impossible to understand. The member for West Torrens is an expert at that. After his contributions I am struggling, at times, to even understand what he is asking. My adviser was certainly looking very puzzled. I make this point: if a valuable contribution is made to committee work for the purposes of eliciting the practical application of a proposed piece of legislation, please have the courtesy, wherever you may be seated, of listening carefully to your colleagues' contributions. Coming in with some repetition or repetitive argument is clearly unhelpful in progressing the case.

I can sit here day in and day out—I have done it for 17 years, and I am happy to be here to answer questions on these matters—but it is disrespectful to other colleagues in the opposition who have presented or asked reasonable questions (and the member for Torrens is one) about the administration when the Three Stooges come in and give us this contribution that is completely unproductive and unhelpful. I ask them to address the circumstances and seriousness of this legislation.

Finally, again, it seems that for whatever reason the opposition has seen some mischief in the Minister for Human Services' indication to all members, right across the parliament and not just to the opposition, of the circumstances in which this would place the capacity for the implementation of law if we did not conclude the debate today to deal with executive council approval, etc., and undertake what I see is being begged for by this parliament, that is, a comprehensive communication strategy to go out to the community before we get to 30 June. The capacity to affect that has been made very clear.

That is not my assessment. That is the assessment of the advisers who have been working on this for three years. They made this clear: if you pass this bill in June and you have a few days left, then clearly people have no clue to be able to prepare for this. We are talking about tens of thousands of people who would need to be alerted to the change of the rules and what their obligations would be.

We can have our differences of opinion on these things but, please, members who want to come in here and just grandstand about this matter, this serious matter, listen carefully to what your colleagues have already contributed. There have been helpful contributions, and I think they have outlined that, but some have been both obstructive and unhelpful. With that, I commend the bill to the house and look forward to its now swift passage.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (20:59): I rise to exercise my right under standing order 116 to clarify a matter that the Deputy Premier has unfortunately misunderstood about a

contribution I made previously. It has just been asserted to this place by the Deputy Premier that asserting that someone potentially of the ilk of a Shannon McCoole may have access to the database the bill seeks to establish is somehow a disgraceful attack on the public servants who are currently administering the database.

As I was at pains to explain, I made those comments because the response we received from the Deputy Premier was that we have no protocols around the operation of this database to be established. We have no regulations that set out those protocols, and so as far as we know, according to the bill it is open to anyone. It is not a disgraceful attack. It is a reasonable comment about a reasonable assertion made on the back of the responses that the Deputy Premier has made.

Bill read a third time and passed.

SUPPLY BILL 2019

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2019.)

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (21:01): I rise today to place on record some remarks as a member of this house on the Supply Bill that is currently before us. I stood in this place only 12 months ago to reflect on the election that was and the opportunities and pitfalls that the next four years presented, not only to us as an opposition but to everyday South Australians.

I remarked upon my humility and gratitude first and foremost to the electors of Hurtle Vale for electing me as their local community representative in this place, as well as my appointment as the shadow minister for human services. This is a role that will forever change the way I work in parliament, through the people and organisations I meet with who are working hard to provide for the vulnerable.

The struggles and roadblocks that South Australians are forced to endure every day are inspiring. The stories of hope and perseverance in the face of unbelievable obstacles, and sometimes the bureaucracy that we in this place often put in place ourselves, are all inspiring to me when it could easily become a very overwhelming task.

I briefly take the opportunity to echo those sentiments from 12 months ago. Serving in this role has been one of the greatest honours I have had the privilege to receive. I look forward to continuing to work for the people of Hurtle Vale, and indeed for every South Australian, in particular those who are vulnerable, for the next three years and beyond.

I have to firstly say that I am extremely concerned about the availability of affordable housing in South Australia. The Marshall government has stated that, at this point, over 20,000 South Australians remain on the waiting list for state government housing. Federal Labor recently announced a plan to provide long-term affordable housing for low and middle income Australians, including in South Australia, and I hope that this has some really positive impact on our budgets moving forward.

It is disappointing that the minister in the other place in question time last week revealed that neither she nor her department has lifted a finger to model this policy or this policy announcement, or undertaken any kind of preliminary work or preparation. I would have thought it was incumbent upon ministers to begin the modelling in preparation early for federal policy announcements from either party. While our waiting lists continue to balloon out of control, Michelle Lensink in the other place revealed how out of touch and politically inflexible she is, in fact, on important issues of social policy, including housing.

I am proud of my engagement with the housing sector over these past 12 months, including community housing providers together with emergency housing providers and support organisations. I look forward to working closely with them in formulating sound housing policy tailored to those who need it most ahead of the next election.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Acting Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms COOK: I would also like to touch briefly on youth, an important component of the portfolio of human services. It has been a little disappointing to note that youth has currently been somewhat of an afterthought in the Marshall Liberal government. I have a very strong personal history in supporting, and a desire to support, youth in South Australia to achieve the best they can.

I was pleased to recently attend the launch of the Youthful Cities report by the Commissioner for Children and Young People. It really does make for some interesting reading, and I have supplied copies within our party room. I hope that the government has been interested as well, although there was nobody from the government there at the launch.

I was not surprised but really interested to learn that 25 per cent of people who use the City of Adelaide are under 24 years and that this is the largest user group of the inner city. So one in four users of the CBD is under 24. It is really important to continue to renew our public spaces to maintain the vibrancy but also to invest in the programs and services so that they are attractive and available to young South Australians.

There is often a joke that for young people it is not just always about skate parks. However, they can be a good start, as we have seen with the announcement of the skate park. I would like to show my appreciation for that because I know that many young people will connect and gather at the city skate park again, once it comes to fruition. Often, an area like the skate park is a good place for other service providers to visit and support young people.

It is particularly important to put inclusivity and accessibility at the forefront of our minds with programs that are rolled out through the opportunities the government provides. I am obviously very focused on the role that youth play in our society and on providing a safe and harmonious environment for our young people to thrive in. The decisions need to be made with youth at their heart. I look forward to continuing to make youth a priority of mine as shadow minister, and I thank those youth-orientated organisations and individuals who have engaged with me in the past 12 months.

This focus obviously also extends to youth who are particularly vulnerable. Young people are disproportionately affected by crime and disproportionately subject to being victimised, so my focus extends to youth justice. I was very pleased to join the shadow minister for child protection last year to tour the Adelaide Youth Training Centre facility, which was upgraded by the previous Labor government into new facilities, which I have to say are really impressive. It was also good to see, actually, that they were not full—that there are programs that are working and keeping young people out of the training centre.

I thank the staff for their time and their generosity in answering questions. I also thank some of the young people who are currently living at the training centre and in programs because they also were very generous with their time and in sharing their stories. I am determined to ensure that young South Australians are given the tools to thrive in our community. I will be checking in with the minister through estimates, obviously, and also through the Training Centre Visitor's annual report later this year.

Concessions are a priority within Human Services, and in my role I have been checking through the plans and some of the proposals that have been made throughout the department in relation to this. I was very disappointed to discover that a \$130,000 exploratory contract was delivered to review and pursue the privatisation of the delivery of energy concessions payments. I think that the quick movement of the Liberal government to privatise this is not welcome and will potentially cause harm as it goes out of government hands, with South Australians already doing it really tough when it comes to electricity.

The government's role is to try to make life easier for South Australians, and I know that most people coming into this place support and believe that, but outsourcing that role within a sector such as energy, which is already experiencing inflated prices, is something we should not feel confident about.

I would like to lend my voice to an issue that is extremely important, that is, disability and the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS), which is an incredibly socially progressive

achievement, up there alongside other great achievements like Medicare. Of course, a Labor government was the initiator of the NDIS, this significant policy agenda, and recognition goes to the prime minister at the time, Julia Gillard, for being able to deliver that achievement in what was an extremely politically febrile environment.

The NDIS seeks to put choice and control back into the hands of Australians living with disability, their friends, family and carers, with individualised plans and supports to meet specific requirements. For some, this has been brilliant, a real game-changer, but for others it has just been the start of an enduring nightmare. It was a scheme with the best intentions, but it has been sadly languishing under the hands-off approach of the Abbott, Turnbull and Morrison trio of government leadership.

In my time as shadow minister, I have really been mortified by the sluggish rollout of NDIS throughout South Australia and also its inability to be agile. The minister in the other place has stated that she is not the minister for the NDIS, but I point out that actually she is the minister for NDIS transition; that is very much within her oversight. We have seen delay after delay concerning the full rollout of the NDIS. We have seen uncertainty around the expected end point of rollout, and really we are no closer to an answer. I believe that that there have now been five federal ministers overseeing the NDIS in the six years of the Abbott/Turnbull/Morrison government, and South Australians are struggling to make head or tail of what is going on.

We are flooded by vulnerable South Australians reporting issues, living with stress and anxiety because their plans have been refused, delayed, underfunded, their submissions went in eight months ago with no response, 12 months for a review—it goes on and on. The complaints are fed through to the NDIA to a specific group for MPs to contact and achieve outcomes for these people in the community. What organisation, what process, has to have its own office for members of parliament, I ask you, although Cheryl and the team look after us very well and ensure that, as much as possible, we have a positive outcome for people with NDIS issues. I know that people on both sides of parliament are really grateful for that procedure that is in place and that department to provide the help they get.

Nothing highlighted the disdain for the NDIS more than the \$1.6 billion that is ostensibly a cut from the full scheme and parked in what is now estimated to be a surplus in the budget that we will see in more than a year from now. What we want to know, particularly from the minister in the other place, is how much advocacy is happening in order to find out how much of our money—our state's stakeholders' money from the NDIS—is sitting within that \$1.6 billion? I would like to see that opened up, I would like to see more advocacy around that and I would like to see it used to help people get the services they need.

We are seeing a reliable pattern here regarding the cuts by the Liberal federal and state governments. This has happened before these current regimes are in place. They may be job cuts, reducing the availability and speed of service delivery; program cuts; infrastructure cuts; cuts in funding for housing, schools, hospitals; or cuts in basic government services that people rely on in their everyday lives. Each and every one of those cuts hurt in some way or another. We found many of them hidden amongst last year's budget. I worry for what we are going to find this year. We saw cuts to Service SA, which we are opposing now, and 10,000 signatures have been collected on petitions outside Service SA centres. Labor has stood and always will stand with people against cuts like this to service delivery.

The past few weeks have really highlighted the cuts and the loss of transport support, via the subsidised taxi vouchers, that we are facing in the future. This week, we saw the Queensland government announce a fully funded extension for 12 months. I call on the Minister for Transport in this place to look at that commitment and, within that, to advocate and lobby the federal government around an improvement to the transport payment that has taken the place of the previous allowances. What will the next budget show us in the state from the point of view of disability and transport?

The cuts damage not just the social fabric of our diverse and complex South Australian community; they damage our economy. Here is an example: the taxi vouchers that are used by people with a disability to go out socially with friends, to see a movie, to go out to dinner or to attend

a football game. They use the vouchers to go to work, to go to school and to navigate between frequent and time-consuming medical appointments.

All these outings, their social life and, of course, their commute to work are crucial for both social and economic health. As I said, I believe that we are now the only state without a plan for those vouchers beyond the end of this year. By jeopardising this, we compromise the capacity of people living with a disability not only to better themselves and improve their positions but also to engage in recreational activities and invest their money into the economy.

It hurts the economic contribution that South Australians living with a disability can make through their participation in the local economy and their productivity in contributing to economic growth—all this in the midst of the Marshall government's consultation phase of their disability inclusion plan. If a person living with a disability cannot work, they just cannot be productive and they cannot reach optimal fulfilment. If they cannot participate at a level they want to, there is no way they can reach a level of self-actualisation in our community.

It is shameful that in the midst of continued NDIS pain these taxi vouchers cannot be guaranteed beyond this year. It is a very simple thing to do. It is something that means so much to the people we represent. It occurs in tandem with changes to bus routes, amidst the \$46 million worth of cuts and also the recently announced proposal to encourage hopping on and off different transport routes or different forms of transport in order to improve the journey. While that might work for somebody who is fit, ambulant and able, I have had a great deal of feedback from people who have mobility issues or vision impairment and from parents with prams and parents of people with disability. They are saying that hopping on and off is just not an option; please reconsider.

People will take longer to get to work because of the cuts to public transport. People will be less productive. They will have less time to go out and socialise. They spend less time at work and more time waiting in line. They have less time to spend with their friends and families. Cuts to education hurt productivity through the loss of skills. Cuts to health care hurt productivity because sick people cannot work, and we have seen this with SHINE and many other services. This applies to cuts in all forms, and it is something that Liberal governments have always had trouble understanding at both a state and federal level for people who are most vulnerable in our community. They see any government spending as a cost that must be borne by the community. They see any cut that they make to government spending as a plus for the economy. It is actually not. It is just a misguided philosophy from the viewpoint of social harm and also from an economic one.

An economist will tell you that when you take money out of an economy, an economy suffers. This is most obvious when you talk about reducing the number of South Australian jobs through cuts to the Public Service. With these people cut out of the Public Service—and I know there were about 600 from Human Services alone and I am sure there are many more in other groups—these people will be unemployed. They will not have work. They will not contribute to the economy. The valuable work these people do in delivering services to the community that people rely on cannot be underestimated.

What will happen once these jobs are gone? Without a job, how do these individuals put a roof over their head? How do they independently manage to invest in their own home? How do they manage to support others to support themselves? It is not smart, methodical or purposeful public policy. When we talk about this theory around investing in the top end of town and watching the dollars shower down on people, watching the vulnerable people in our community suffer and struggle, the money does not rain down on them. This trickle-down economics just does not work. It never gets to the people who need it.

I urge the government, as they spend this money we are approving through this Supply Bill, to consider people who are most vulnerable and consider some of the small things that can be done to ensure that we invest in the future of people who need that support, people such as those I have mentioned who require the taxi vouchers to get around. It is a small investment that can make a massive difference. With that contribution, I support the bill.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (21:21): In rising to speak on this Supply Bill and in reflecting on this Liberal government's cruel 2018-19 budget of cuts, closures and privatisations, I hark back to what I said in my budget reply speech last year. I am deeply disappointed and worried about the

impact this government is having on South Australians in every corner of our state, particularly on those who most need kindness, compassion and support.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

Ms HILDYARD: Pardon? What was that? What did you say, Tim? What was your latest insult?

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! The member for Reynell will direct all her comments through the Chair.

Ms HILDYARD: You might like to keep him in check.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order, member for Chaffey! The member for Chaffey will sit there in silence. If we could restart the clock as well, please, Mr Clerk. The member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I am deeply disappointed and very worried about the impact that this government is having on South Australians in every corner of our state, particularly on those who most need our kindness, compassion and support and those who most need their government to step in and ensure equality of opportunity through what and whom they prioritise in their spending.

This government handed down a heartless budget last year, a budget that was bereft of compassion, care and any sort of commitment to fairness, equality and inclusion; a budget that alongside its cuts also did not deliver a surplus; a budget that is a clear demonstration of what and whom they do not value, of what and whom they disregard.

We on this side of the house are committed to fairness, equality of opportunity and inclusion, to ensuring that those who most need our support get that support and to ensuring that all South Australians have access to decent jobs, quality services when they need them, good public education and health services and facilities, and quality public transport and infrastructure. We on this side of the house understand that our state and our nation face growing inequality, a growing gap between those who do not work or those who rely on insecure work, on their hard-earned penalty rates to make ends meet, to pay the rent and those with an abundance.

The federal colleagues of those opposite continuously demonstrate their lack of regard for those who need a fair go. They show this lack of regard through their repeated votes in the federal parliament against restoring penalty rates, their lack of commitment to equal pay and to decent pay increases, and their repeated opposition to the banking royal commission. Their budget showed that those opposite are lockstep with their federal colleagues in their relentless focus on ensuring those with so much are able to get even more, and showed their utter lack of understanding about what will make a difference in the lives of those who do not enjoy such privilege. Well, Mr Acting Speaker, we have been speaking up for those people and we will continue to do so.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Acting Deputy Speaker.

Ms HILDYARD: Excuse me? I don't think—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure will not interject. It is completely unparliamentary. Member for Reynell.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. We have been speaking up for those people and we will continue to do so. We will keep empowering them to grow their voice against that which does not serve them, against that which so blatantly disregards some. We will keep speaking up against the cuts and closures inherent in their last budget, and we will speak even louder about any deepening of those cuts, any further closures—anything that does not serve the people of South Australia nor advance their interests in this coming budget because I and all of Labor value all South Australians, and we will fight for them against any cuts that negatively impact their lives.

In this last budget, those opposite clearly and comprehensively demonstrated their lack of care for people in so many different ways through so many different cruel measures, and it is just some of those measures that I will highlight to the house tonight. I know that the Minister for Transport

and Infrastructure seems to relish attempting to brush off, to laugh off and to play down any criticism of his cuts. When he does so, he is attempting to belittle and unfairly disregard the voice of those who most deeply feel those cuts and whose lives are impacted by them, by his actions, on a day-to-day basis.

I speak with many people about their reliance on public transport. It might be surprising to the minister, and to the Treasurer, that people in the electorate of Reynell in the southern suburbs need public transport—sometimes because they cannot afford parking in the city, sometimes because they do not have a car and sometimes because they are not able to drive one. They use public transport to get to work, school, TAFE, university, medical appointments and to visit friends, and these cuts are hurting them.

Just a couple of months ago, I chatted with a lovely man named Elias who was waiting to catch the bus on South Road at Morphett Vale to get to his regular appointment at Flinders Medical Centre. He was alarmed to hear that the route he relies on is listed as one that will be cut. I speak with parents who are worried that when their kids finish their part-time jobs at Colonnades or when they finish at Marion and catch the train back to Colonnades there is no longer a connecting bus to the surrounding suburbs. I speak with people with limited mobility, who find it hard enough to get around on public transport as it is and who are utterly bewildered by how they will manage to do their shopping and to get to their appointments.

These people are getting active against these cruel cuts, and so are thousands of others: those who rely on public transport and those who actually care about others who do. Should this coming budget continue with his program of cuts, the voice of these people will rightly grow, and I commend every person who is speaking up against this disregard for those who need decent public transport.

I also deeply worry for those whose anxiety about any further cuts is growing. We will speak up for them because they matter, because their inability to go about the day-to-day business of their lives matters, because their journey matters. We will also speak up about this minister's increasingly disturbing record on public transport and transport infrastructure, about the removal of train carriages, changing plans for the Springbank Road/Daws Road/Goodwood Road intersection and about collapsing infrastructure.

I note that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure brushed off in question time today people's concerns about the collapse at Darlington. People are scared. It is actually frightening to be crawling along on a road surrounded by hundreds of other cars when you know that a structure has collapsed just a few metres away. I look forward to hearing more about this in the coming days, and I am intrigued about how this budget will deal with the many, many problems that the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure is creating.

Those opposite do not seem to be willing to fight for anyone to help them make ends meet and access good services, facilities and support when they most need it. They have prioritised some of the wealthiest people in our community to the detriment of Housing SA tenants and to the detriment of South Australians across our community who deserve and want a fair go. The fact that their last budget, in addition to its cuts, included a rent increase for people in Housing SA homes is astounding. Access to housing, a risk of homelessness and issues with Housing SA are some of the most prevalent issues that people come into my office to talk with me about.

To target people who are living in Housing SA homes, eking out a living, is a disgrace. As I stated in my budget reply speech, I assure the many community members and friends residing in Housing SA homes in our southern community that we will fight this awful, unfair increase, that we respect you for what you do to meet the cost of living, to put food on your table and to pay your rent. I assure those committee members and friends that we will absolutely continue that fight and it will intensify should this heartless, visionless government again use another forthcoming visionless budget to reach into your pockets.

The statistics that we know about domestic violence in our community are utterly unacceptable. Together, just two weeks ago, many members of this house paid our respects and remembered those South Australian women who had been violently and tragically killed at the hands of a partner or former partner. It was so sad. It was also a reminder of what we still must do to address

the gender inequality that persists in our community and is at the core of disrespect and violence towards women. It was a reminder of how tired so many women are of not feeling or being safe when we walk to our car, when we walk through a park, or for so many women, tragically, when they are at home.

It was a reminder to all of us here in this place that simply saying we will do whatever we can, whatever is within our power to prevent and end violence against women, is not enough. We must do whatever we can to prevent and end domestic violence and indeed all violence against women. Our former Labor government progressed a number of measures and I know this government has undertaken measures also, a number of which we have supported, a number of which we had also explored.

But there is something that was glaringly omitted from this government's last budget in relation to domestic violence measures. There was not one dollar allocated to prevention—not one dollar. This is not okay and I trust and I hope that this will be absolutely remedied in this forthcoming budget. I am not hopeful about this given the recent voting down of the bill by those opposite to include provisions in our Equal Opportunity Act that give those who have been discriminated against as a result of their experience of domestic violence a measure that was actually cost free to those who have to bear this unequal access to the processes of the Equal Opportunity Commission.

I am also not filled with hope given the reduction in funding to the commission and this government's lack of funding for staffing for their new crisis accommodation beds. Nor am I at all filled with hope given their appalling record on gender equality, evidenced in part by the fact that four—just four—out of 25 of the members of this house on that side are women. They have as many Davids in their caucus as they do women members of the House of Assembly. Four out of 25 are women.

Members interjecting:

Ms HILDYARD: Four out of 25.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will desist from interjecting. The member for Reynell will continue.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, you will contain yourself as well. Member for Reynell, please continue.

Ms HILDYARD: I have said many, many times in this place that sport is a powerful tool for change, for bringing people together, for including people and for giving them a sense of belonging as part of the community families created and engendered in clubs in every corner of South Australia. It has the power to include all and to support many to do their best and to belong.

We are all aware of the exponential growth of girls and women participating in sport, including in sporting codes that have traditionally been dominated, in terms of participation, by men. These girls and women deserve our support and they deserve decent and appropriate facilities that enable their participation, that say to them that they are welcome and are an equal part of their sport, their club and their code.

We want to end the days of girls and women getting changed in cars, in bars or behind a towel on an oval, as young Lilly Brown articulated was her experience at one of our many recent actions against this government's appalling lack of commitment to achieving equality for girls and women in sport and indeed for equality for girls and women anywhere. Backing women and girls in sport means we do not let this happen. It means we provide them with the facilities they need.

Achieving equality in sport and anywhere else means addressing inequality. It means specifically targeting those who have been disadvantaged by putting specific measures in place for them. It means that, if you are allocating grants to clubs for facilities, you make sure that you consider and target those growing numbers of women and girls playing sport and you back them in. As I have also said, when we see girls and women play sport, when we see them play at the highest level, we see them differently.

It is transformative in terms of how the roles of girls and women are perceived, and it gives us the opportunity to challenge many other issues that our community confronts about gender inequality, including violence against women. This government has utterly failed South Australian girls and women through its cut to the \$24 million former Labor government program for female facilities, through its cut to the SA Women in Sport Taskforce and its discontinuance of the female participation grants. They have shown their complete lack of regard for the achievement of equality. They want to take our quest for equality in this state backwards. Shame on them.

South Australian girls and women deserve so much better, as do all sporting codes. They now have a program that is worth far less money for facilities, but the program is only for football, cricket and netball. This government should hang its head in shame. It is clear that this government does not want to support girls and women in sport and does not support grassroots clubs, given it has reduced funding overall and it is clear that it will provide minimal support for only some codes.

This government has also clawed back \$10 million from the synthetic surfaces program and \$20 million in grants overall. Apparently, it is currently reviewing its Recreation and Sport Grants Program. As I understand it, this review is being internally conducted. Can we expect more cuts to sport and recreation? If you truly want to review your grants program, you need to have some level of independence.

Apparently, this government is also reviewing their Multicultural Grants Program and the functions of SAMEAC, reviews that I fervently hope do not make cuts in this area. Our cultural diversity is our greatest strength and our multicultural communities and all that they bring to our state must be celebrated and enabled to flourish wherever they can. Labor cares about our community. Through their last budget, this government demonstrated that they do not. We have a vision for our state: they do not. We will fight for our community against these past cuts and against any other cuts, closures or privatisations that come our way.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: I ask that the members for Chaffey and Adelaide cease their interjections or other attempts to interrupt the member for Reynell.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am not hearing the interjections from up here, but I remind all members that interjections are out of order.

Members interjecting:

Ms HILDYARD: You cannot help yourself. It is constant. It is not okay.

Members interjecting:

Ms HILDYARD: His name-calling is constant. I do not call people names, Stephan.

Members interjecting:

Ms HILDYARD: I never do, but this person does constantly.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Lee, that is enough from you, too. The member for Reynell, you have four minutes to go.

Ms HILDYARD: I am finished.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (21:40): There are a couple of things: first, the Deputy Premier is out of her place and interjecting.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is true.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before you begin, member for West Torrens, I might remind everybody again that interjections are out of order and unparliamentary.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: They're getting tired.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And emotional.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, you are at fault here as well. The member for West Torrens has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Supply is always an interesting debate. I remember in previous parliaments members opposite bemoaning supply debates and wanting to know exactly why it is that the government is procuring money without any line of sight as to exactly how that money will be spent. These concepts were often argued by members opposite—not the member for Adelaide because the capacity there to understand these issues might be wanting.

The Hon. R. Sanderson: I studied accounting. What year level did you get to in maths?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide will cease interjecting.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I know it is late in the evening, but we do not need to get ratty just because we are sitting after dinner. Member for West Torrens, you have the call.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: Stop being ratty.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, there will be no further interjections.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: That was two syllables, Tim; did you get that?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is some testy, emotional and heightened sense of anger from members opposite. I know it is unprecedented for this government to sit beyond 6pm—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: At least this year.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —at least this year, so I apologise to members opposite for having to work for a living. I want to talk about supply, especially in the portfolios that I have been asked to shadow on behalf of the opposition to the government.

Transport is always a very difficult portfolio to have coverage of because you are expending vast amounts of money on transport and infrastructure. The member for Lee knew what it was like for four years, and I was transport and infrastructure minister for 14 months. There is a very large responsibility in delivering these services to the public. Often, ministers in those portfolios are under heavy scrutiny, and rightly so. They are under heavy scrutiny because the portfolios that ministers have coverage of in these areas spend vast amounts of money. It is probably the third highest spending portfolio on average; sometimes, it is the highest, depending on what is happening that year. However, by and large, it is one of the biggest spending portfolios in government.

I think there have been a number of issues where this parliament has procured money on behalf of the government and where the minister charged with expending those moneys has been found wanting. What I thought I would do in my 17 minutes is detail where I think the minister could improve because I care about him and I want to teach the next generation of young aspirants and leaders to learn from others more experienced.

I would like the minister to reflect on some of the statements he has made. For example, one of the early errors a relatively young and inexperienced minister made was to say that you could 'take it to the bank', or it was 'a rock solid promise' that a certain tram extension would be finished on a certain date. Of course, that was not true. We were then told before the election that members opposite, through the power of their personalities, could make a tram turn right where we had failed. Of course, a relatively young and inexperienced minister fell flat on his face yet again.

We keep on going through these infrastructure spends where the minister has made statements that simply do not stack up. In the first budget released by the government the minister is attempting to sell \$46 million worth of cuts to public transport. Of that \$46 million, \$3 million has been delivered thus far, and it has caused a great deal of angst amongst a lot of the travelling public.

I think the minister's ability to go out and sell these changes has been called into question for a couple of reasons. I think it has probably been an Achilles heel of the government that they

made no mention of this rationalisation of transport services before the election. However, after the election, South Australians find themselves having been subjected to cuts of a dramatic nature around transport. The government trots out the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure to defend those cuts.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Long may he remain the transport spokesperson.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: He has nearly been there longer than you were.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Nearly; yes, that is true. I was only a minister for nine years; I am sure he will overtake me. The minister then is attempting to sell these \$46 million worth of cuts and I think thus far has done a pretty poor job of it, given what we have seen in terms of the reaction back. We found out today that the minister refused to rule out a privatisation of our train and tram network. I do not remember reading anywhere before the election that the government told the people of South Australia and the travelling public of South Australia that they would see their train and tram services privatised. You have to again call into question the judgement of the minister on this issue. The minister was given an opportunity to deny this and he has not, which makes me think—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Tom, judge us on what we do.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So the government is now ruling it out?

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Judge us on what we do. I reckon I heard that a hundred times from the former government.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I hope so.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: Maybe 200.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Maybe 200 times, yes. I will judge the government on what it does and I will divert back again to the minister's carriage of this portfolio. Earlier today, I asked him some questions in question time about the two T-junctions the minister was championing for four weeks, saying that this was the right solution, that he had done his homework and that this was the best outcome for the people of Boothby and for that intersection, only to come out publicly and say he was wrong. He claims new evidence has come to light but has not provided what that new evidence is, and he has now adopted Labor's plan of one intersection.

I congratulate him on that, but what I am concerned about are the statements this minister made leading up to it, assuring South Australians that he had done his homework and that he was assured that the numbers do not lie. These are direct quotes from the minister. Indeed, these are statements made to the parliament. In here, the Crown told the parliament, 'No, Labor was wrong: the two T-junctions had better outcomes than one four-way intersection,' because the minister had done his homework. That was wrong. The minister had not done his homework and had it wrong.

What focused the attention of the minister and the government was the upcoming election on 18 May, this Saturday, and the very real prospect of a revolt within two seats held by the Liberal Party: a state seat and a commonwealth seat. So the minister backflipped, and the justification for that backflip was that more information had come to light, despite the minister having assured this house and us that he had done his homework.

It builds a pattern of behaviour by the minister where he says, with the Darlington embankment collapses, that he did not attend those Darlington embankment collapses but instead went to a fundraiser for the Liberal Party in Mount Gambier because he is not an engineer, yet he tells us the reason he was in the South-East was that he was inspecting roads.

The idea that he cannot inspect the Darlington project because he is not qualified to give advice on the works but is qualified to give advice on blackspots is contradictory, and the media pulled him up on it. But again the government keeps on putting out these contradictory lines by a relatively inexperienced minister, who in 14 months already is being called 'embattled' in the media, and one of the most senior journalists in the media pack has openly questioned whether or not the Premier will remove him from this portfolio altogether.

That in itself might give concern to some members, but such senior members of the press and a week from hell have not even bothered the government. It makes you wonder: what is the internal decision-making process that is going on here? Privatising trams and trains, no problem; backflipping on the Goodwood interchange because we got it wrong—well, why did you get it wrong in the first place if you had done your homework? Promising to turn a tram right when you know it cannot be done; making a public statement that the tram extension will be completed on this date, saying it was set in stone, and then later being embarrassed—these are constant reminders to the public of: 'Do we have a minister who is out of his depth in one of the most important portfolios?'

Yet, here we are with the government asking us again to procure more money for this minister without a budget. There is no budget alongside this Supply Bill. This is simply that the government needs more money and it is passing a Supply Bill. Members opposite used to complain regularly about supply bills without a corresponding budget or a budget line to match the spending to. So we are confronted with this. We are confronted with what could potentially be a minister who is tragically out of his depth, and we are procuring billions of dollars for this minister to perhaps then again bungle.

With the Darlington situation, the minister is overseeing a road that cannot cope with rain. I think it is fair to say that most South Australians are horrified with what has occurred: \$620 million from our Treasury being spent on a road where, the moment it rained, the embankments at not one but two locations collapsed. On the day the first embankment collapsed, the minister's department assured South Australians and the assembled media that it was an isolated incident that only applied to that one area that had collapsed. A day later, a second area collapsed.

The department in the media attempted to tell the public that they had always meant that entire section, and of course we saw the exchange between one of the most experienced political veterans in journalism, Mike Smithson, and the minister, which I thought was humiliating for the government and the minister because that exchange, I think, showed every South Australian the immaturity of the minister and the level that he was out of his depth.

Then we find out that he drives to the South-East to inspect roads, despite his own statement that he is not qualified to make these inspections, and then attends a \$250 a head Liberal Party fundraiser. How do I know? Because Liberals from the South-East called me and told me that he was there. That is how I know. Apparently, the member for Schubert says, 'Look, I just attended a function organised by the local Liberal MP in the area.' No, it was a fundraiser to raise funds for the Liberal Party and the guest was the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. It was a planned event.

Then we hear the following day that he had not yet attended the site, that he would not agree to a public inquiry by the Public Works Committee and that there was no independent audit being conducted as yet. We had to wait until Saturday, after the two embankments collapsed. Mind you, Mr Deputy Speaker, these embankments are alongside the north-south corridor, which cars are currently using as we speak, and embankments are subsiding metres from those cars. Because we dared to ask the question of whether the integrity of this road is okay—I did not say that it was not safe; I asked the question—the minister says we are scaremongering. That is our job, to ask these questions of the government: is this road safe, can it be used by the motoring public?

We had the minister not attend the site, not give us briefings, and we still have not heard from the chief executive of the department. He has made no public statements, as far as I am aware, about what has occurred. We have also heard two contradictory statements by the minister: one, that no taxpayers' money will be used to remediate this site, to fix it. Then we hear, in the same interview by the minister, that all repairs will be done within the budget of \$620 million for the Darlington project. That means we are using taxpayers' funds to repair this. No budget or contingency should be used to repair this road. No budgeted money should be used for any independent audit; that should also be at the cost of the consortium.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Yes, but this consortium is using taxpayers' money.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, they should not be for this. They should be using their own resources to conduct the audits. But now we have had confirmed that they are using taxpayers' money. They are using the budgeted allocation of \$620 million to conduct an audit into their own shoddy work. How is that fair to the taxpayer? It is another thing the minister has just let out through

an interjection and laughing about it. We were assured that no taxpayers' money would be used to remedy this site or to audit this site, and now we are being told they are.

I think that this minister is out of his depth and that senior members of the press gallery in this state are right. How long will the Premier put up with this? How long will the Premier put up with a junior minister getting it relatively wrong almost every single time? He got it wrong on the tram. He got wrong on Springbank Road and Daws Road intersections. He has got it wrong on Darlington. He got it wrong and showed poor judgement by attending a Liberal Party fundraiser rather than being here to answer questions of the media. He got it wrong when the consortium, every time the media attempted to film the collapsing embankments, were pushed away. He got it wrong when he did not visit the site immediately. Every single time this minister is tested he gets it wrong.

There is an old saying that anyone can put up with adversity but if you want to test someone give them power. Looking at the authority given to the minister, I think he fails that test. Now we are being asked to procure more money, to be given to the minister, in his portfolio, and we do not know how he is going to spend it. The Darlington project is just scratching the surface. Regency to Pym has not started construction yet. The minister thinks construction is compulsorily acquiring homes.

This minister has been charged by the Premier to conduct a great deal for the state, yet everything he has touched has somehow ended in controversy. You have to start asking yourself some other questions about the competency of the front bench when you look at the quality of the backbench.

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The mining minister interjecting has had one bill with resources to pass in this parliament and could not do it, despite that very same bill passing this parliament 15 months ago unopposed. That takes a unique talent. That takes a unique quality. I cannot think of anyone who is able to stuff that up any further.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Point of order.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order, member for West Torrens. Could you take a seat, please.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The member is now reflecting on a bill that is currently before the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, will you come back to the Supply Bill for the remaining 50 seconds.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will, sir. I think the quality of the backbench watching the quality of the front bench must make many members on the backbench pause for a moment and think, "Why are we putting up with this type of incompetence?" Why are they having to go out and sell and mop up the mess of junior ministers who are getting it wrong constantly, with members on the backbench being blamed by their constituents for ministers who are arrogant, out of touch and show poor judgement at nearly every opportunity?

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (22:00): At the last state election, we saw a very clear mantra being espoused by the then leader of the opposition and now Premier of the state, the member for Dunstan. The whole underpinning ethos of the election campaign of this government was supposedly a commitment to more jobs, lower costs and better services. I take this opportunity within the house to scrutinise whether or not the government has indeed met its own test of providing those three keys things.

More jobs is clear. Right now, according to the Bureau of Statistics, in the state of South Australia we have more people unemployed than was the case at the last state election. It is a damning indictment of this government that we now have more people in this state without the means to support themselves and their families through having a job. We know that in this state the unemployment rate, as distinct from the number of employed people, is higher today than it was over 12 months ago around the election of the Marshall Liberal government—a higher unemployment rate.

We know that underneath that there are some other statistics, and one I would like to draw the house's attention to is youth unemployment. We have seen youth unemployment in this state hover around, but more recently we have seen it go up quite dramatically. Right now, the youth unemployment rate in the state of South Australia is substantially higher than it was around the election of the Marshall Liberal government. There are more unemployed people and there is a higher unemployment rate and a higher youth unemployment rate.

Right now, we have the government running around trumpeting a tone of success, a tone of triumphalism regarding the way they have conducted themselves thus far. When you actually look at the raw statistics, as independently measured by the Australian Bureau of Statistics, this government have failed on the core question of providing more jobs. What underpins that most concerningly is that there are some policy decisions that have been made by this government, including by the Premier himself, that have contributed to this problem.

We on this side of the house do not accept that governments do not have responsibility when it comes to providing jobs in our economy. We do not accept that governments should just take their hands off the wheel and seek to let the market determine whether or not job creation activity occurs within the labour market here in South Australia. The state government have decided, quite deliberately, to abolish agencies within the government that had a strong track record of delivering real jobs in South Australia.

The investment attraction agency comes to mind, an agency that delivered real jobs to this state's economy, particularly in the private sector, for the betterment of all concerned. Then there are over a dozen other job creation activities which the previous state government had in place and which this government have abolished. It is little wonder that we have seen the scourge of unemployment come back to the forefront under the life of this government.

It is worthwhile reflecting on what this means in human terms. Often in this place we talk about statistics, we talk about numbers, we talk about facts, but there is actually a genuine, human element to this. There is nothing more tragic than a working woman or man seeking to put themselves out on the labour market to earn an income for themselves and their families and not being able to get a job. There is nothing more tragic than an employed person losing the dignity that work provides after a lack of action in the economy that provides jobs. That is what is occurring under this government's watch.

We have not really seen a response to these concerning numbers from this government thus far. Instead we have seen a doubling down on what they believe is a brilliant strategy. We have not seen a serious effort at economic reform. We have seen not a serious effort to provide stimulus into the economy but a winding back of infrastructure. We have seen promises of infrastructure out in the never-never, in 10 years' time and the like, but nothing immediate. We think that is highly problematic and does not bode well, particularly for young people in this state.

At the same time, we are seeing a state government committing itself to a DAMA. They had a whole range of secret details that were kept away from the eyes of South Australians, including putting downward pressure on wages in the economy through a 10 per cent reduction in the TSMIT. That is an inexplicable policy to have. If the objective is to fill gaps in the labour market, I find it hard to understand how people who believe in the power of markets rationalise that you fix that problem by reducing the cost or by reducing the wages. You do not solve shortages in the labour market by paying people less. It is an absurd proposition.

It is also important to understand what the TSMIT is there for. The TSMIT is a minimum migrant wage to reflect the fact that temporary migrants to this country—people who are not permanent residents, people who are not citizens—do not get access to basic services that are provided by the government. Chief amongst those is Medicare. If you are a temporary migrant to this country, you do not get access to Medicare, and therefore it is necessary that you earn a decent wage to ensure you can provide for and cover the cost of health insurance.

If you reduce the amount a migrant worker earns by 10 per cent, where is the 10 per cent reduction to the cost, where is the 10 per cent reduction to super, where is the 10 per cent reduction to the cost—

The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The member for Adelaide is making an insightful contribution, Mr Speaker.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: She's yelling out words at random: tax, super.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: That's right. A 10 per cent reduction in the amount that a migrant worker earns does not reflect a 10 per cent reduction in the relevant health costs that are incurred by that employee. It is a silly policy. It is not thought through, which is probably why the Premier was not across it when we were asking him about it in question time, and it is probably why the government is seeking to keep it a secret until it is exposed at an Economic and Finance Committee with the shadow treasurer. These are concerning policies when we start to contemplate the idea of more jobs in our economy.

Then we look at lower costs. Concerningly, what we have seen in recent weeks is the Treasurer of this state trying to lay down the political foundations for what would be an appalling decision to dramatically increase costs for South Australian taxpayers by increasing fees and charges at a rate that is potentially far higher than the rate of inflation. Let's just think that through. We have a state government making a deliberate policy decision to reduce the wages of people coming to our country to work at the same time as increasing fees and charges to South Australian taxpayers.

On what planet are people operating when they think it is a good idea to improve people's standard of living by reducing wages on one hand and increasing their costs on the other? It simply does not make sense, apart from the fact that it is patently unfair. If you go to an election promising lower costs, you had better deliver lower costs, and we have not seen any decisions from this government thus far that demonstrate a serious willingness to reduce costs but rather to increase them.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The member for Colton pipes up at an opportune time, because he needs to ask himself how he is going to justify to his constituents higher fees and charges that may yet amount to a scale that exceeds any reductions that some people have—not all people, but some people—in their emergency services levy.

Then there is the question of better services. This is the big one because this government had an unequivocal commitment to better services. Let's just start looking down the line to which ministers thus far have actually delivered higher or better services. Let's start with the two key elements of responsibility within the state government: health and education.

In regard to health, where have we seen better services? What we have seen are policies such as these. Firstly, they have brought in the corporate liquidators to run the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. If you want to deliver better services, let me give you a hot tip: corporate liquidators are not necessarily the go-to consultants that you want to engage to deliver better services. Yet, that is exactly what this government has done.

We have seen a closure of beds already take place within the system, and we know that KordaMentha, under their own plans, have put together a proposition to have further bed closures within CALHN. You will not deliver a better service in our health system at a time of increasing demand by closing beds. Surely members opposite understand that rising demand will not be addressed by closing beds in our public hospital network. It is an absurd proposition, and it is hardly surprising that we are seeing ambulance ramping at levels that are worse now than they were at any other point in the past. Ramping has got worse in the last 12 months, not better. That hardly looks like better services.

Furthermore, we have started to see in SALHN recently, particularly at Flinders Medical Centre, as a result of the government procurement decision around what can sometimes be referred to in the health system as hospital services—things like cleaning and food—some appalling service delivery when it comes to food, raising very real questions about whether or not this government is serious about delivering better services in our health system.

Then there is the flu. It is clear that we have an extraordinary flu season on our hands as a nation. This will represent a major challenge. Twelve months ago, last winter, we had the government trying to explain its worsening ramping situation on the flu. Fast-forward 12 months and we are now approaching a winter with a flu season that by some accounts is up to 10 times worse than last year's—10 times as many cases, an extraordinarily daunting proposition.

The question then becomes: what is the government doing to mitigate this substantial risk? They had a plan. They came out and announced that they want to bring forward our flu shots. They want to bring forward our flu vaccinations. 'Let's make sure that we get the South Australian community immunised against flu sooner and with a high degree of uptake.'

What we saw immediately following that announcement was a complete botching of a rollout by this state government in regard to the flu. Of course, that has culminated in report after report of not just any members of our community but particularly vulnerable members of our community, the elderly in particular, not getting access to their flu shot, all at a time when we understand over 100,000 flu shots are sitting somewhere in a warehouse.

What is the Premier's response thus far? What is the health minister's response thus far? 'Send out the bureaucrats. It has nothing to do with us. We're not going to respond to these questions. We're not going to respond to these media inquiries.' That begs the question: who is running the show? At what point in time do the government start accepting responsibility for their own actions?

Where is there a minister, where is there a premier saying, 'What's the action plan? What are the deliberate decisions that we are taking as elected representatives and people in charge of the show to actually start delivering these flu shots?' Instead we have complete silence, a sending out of health officials to face the scrutiny of the media. It is a desperate sign of weakness on behalf of this government. What we need right now in our health system is action. We need deliberate decisions being taken by ministers and the Premier to make sure that literally everything is being done to ensure that the upcoming flu season does not contribute to a greater burden on our public health system.

Then there is education. The movement of year 7s into high school was an unfunded and ill thought-through promise at the last election. How do we know that? We know that because recently we have seen broken promises being rolled out. There is the changing of school zones. People making lifelong decisions about where they are going to live, what houses they are going to buy and the size of their mortgages are being completely upended because the government decided to break a promise because they did not think through an election policy. It is an appalling proposition.

Meanwhile, money that was allocated to schools on the basis of need is being wound back and not being expended on the things that principals and teachers say those public schools need. Instead, that money is being rolled out on their policy for putting year 7s into high school. There are no additional funds and there is no thought-through mechanism about how to roll that policy out. The people who are paying the price are kids in schools, who need to rely upon additional funds the most, and parents who make lifelong decisions about which school they are going to send their children to. It is an absolute farce.

Today, of course, we have seen a botched rollout of online NAPLAN tests, with reports of students running out of classrooms in tears because they have not been able to get access to their NAPLAN test online. This is hardly consistent with the idea of better services.

Then, when we move down the line of ministers, let's go to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Better services? What a joke! You cannot think of a more atypical idea for providing better services than closing down Service SA centres, yet that is exactly what they are doing. They are closing down not just low-use Service SA centres but some of the most highly used Service SA centres in the state. The Enfield Service SA centre in the member for Adelaide's electorate, the Prospect Service SA centre, the Mitcham Service SA centre and the Modbury Service SA centre are all being closed down, and they are highly used.

The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The Minister for Child Protection says, 'It's still there.' Well, not because of you. The reason those Service SA centres are still there is that we are there, applying the pressure.

Of course, if the Minister for Child Protection, the member for Adelaide, wanted to announce a backflip, I would congratulate her because she would be showing the sort of leadership that this state needs and is not getting from her Premier. You cannot be committed to better services and close down Service SA centres.

To make matters worse, the minister has for months been promising an imminent release of details about how these services are going to be replicated by some other provider—an imminent plan that we have been hearing about for months—and to date we have heard nothing. We have heard reports about potentially using Australia Post, but there is going to be a fee associated with that, which might actually supersede the savings we are seeking to make. We know that there is mass confusion amongst the landlords of these Service SA centres, who are trying to work out what is happening next. This is a farce of a policy. These Service SA centres are having higher levels of patronage, not less, yet they are closing them down.

Then we have public transport. I know that the shadow minister for transport and infrastructure has already covered this subject, but this is now a situation where policy is well and truly on the run. The government's proposition at the election was that they were going to set up a public transport authority to have a long-term strategic focus on how they were going to deliver better public transport services. Yet, before that body is even formed, they have decided to cut \$46 million out of public transport. Before that body is even fully constituted, they have decided that they are going to start completely changing the network. Why? Because we now understand that their intention may well be to privatise the train and tram network. Better services through privatisation? I do not think so.

We have seen this movie before. The last time those opposite were in charge, they privatised the bus network and we saw a debacle: hundreds of bus drivers losing their jobs, routes being cut and fares going up. I suspect that is exactly what people who use trains and trams to be able to move their families around, to be able to get to school and to be able to arrive at work on time are now facing as a result of this government's on-the-run policy when it comes to public transport. It is a farce.

Then there are buses. We heard the government talk about cutting ghost buses but it turned out through FOI efforts on the opposition's behalf that they are not ghost buses at all. Some bus services have been cut with over 20 patrons who used to consistently rely on those services—20 people, real people, people who relied upon that service to be able to get to work, often early in the morning and late at night. Do you know who those workers are? Those people who are working early morning and late at night are often low-paid workers getting to jobs to service high-income earners like those people in this chamber, and they are the ones they are going after. The calculated decision from this government is to cut services, mainly to the vulnerable, because they are largely voiceless.

Early on as Leader of the Opposition, I said to them from the get-go, 'If they've got ideas, we'll work with them on it,' and there have been examples of that. But we said, 'If it hurts working people, if it hurts families or if it hurts small business, we are going to give them one hell of a fight,' and that is exactly what we will continue to do.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (22:20): I rise to speak on the Supply Bill. Last year, I was proud to be appointed by the member for Croydon as shadow minister for police, corrections and emergency services, and I see myself—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: Don't forget health.

Mr ODENWALDER: No, I am talking about me. Pay attention.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone: No, you said 'member for Croydon'.

Mr ODENWALDER: Pay attention. I will speak more slowly—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth, I am paying attention. Please continue.

Mr ODENWALDER: —for the minister for agriculture.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister for agriculture and the member for Lee are called to order. Member for Elizabeth, continue.

Mr ODENWALDER: Thank you, sir. I need protection from the member for Lee.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Leader!

Mr ODENWALDER: As such, I see myself as part of a continuing tradition on this side of politics of being strong on law and order where it needs to be strong and of protecting our community where it needs to be protected. What we saw in the lead-up to the last election was a concerted attempt by the then opposition to hijack this agenda, to try to focus on law and order in a way that they knew the Labor Party had done for the last 16 years. It was a core strength of ours and I am proud to be a part of that tradition. It was a core strength of ours throughout the whole of the Rann era, then with the former member for Enfield as the attorney-general and through the member for Cheltenham as the premier, and we saw a concerted effort on the part of those opposite to hijack that agenda to make it their own.

We heard a lot in the lead-up to the election. We heard a lot of promises. We heard a lot about terrorism, for example. They brought in a fairly good terrorism bill which was based on the work we were doing following the Lindt cafe siege, and at the time we supported that work. They talked a lot about domestic violence. Again, that was a commendable effort by the Attorney-General in a lot of ways, but measure that effort against the cuts that are being mooted for the court system—the \$7 million and climbing that the Chief Justice has to find within his court system.

If you talk to any prosecutor and any prosecution service across South Australia, particularly in regional areas, they will tell you that their workload has increased exponentially as a result of these very good law changes made by our previous government and the Liberal government in terms of domestic violence. They are good changes, but they need the support of the courts, and we have seen cuts to the courts. The Chief Justice is at a loss to find where to make those savings. It remains to be seen if there will be more cuts in the budgets to come but the Chief Justice is already struggling and, as a result, domestic violence victims are suffering and will continue to suffer.

We also heard a lot of talk by the then shadow minister for police, now Minister for Transport, about the war on drugs. There was a lot of talk in the lead-up to the election about the war on drugs including, it has to be said, a bizarre plan to give police powers they already have to enter schools to search for drugs.

We heard a lot of talk about drugs in and around prisons. We did see some action against some of these things. As I have said before in this place, the opposition and I have supported every sensible law and order measure that this government has introduced. In fact, as I have said before in this place, the only law and order measure that we have not supported has been the misguided attempt to put dope smokers in gaol for two years. We were never going to support that. The public were never going to support that. It was a crazy idea by the Attorney-General. Other than that, we have supported every sensible measure that the government has brought into this place.

But we have brought in measures of our own, measures that have been met with inexplicable opposition from those opposite, measures like ensuring that child sex offenders never get out—unrepentant child sex offenders who cannot or will not control their despicable behaviour, never allowed back in the community. We were struggling to get that through this house. We brought in measures to give police the capacity to search vehicles for drugs when they stopped at a roadside drug test. Again, it was rejected by the government.

Allowing police to search people coming and going from known drug houses again was rejected by the government. Doubling the punishment for endangering life by incredibly stupid acts like throwing rocks off bridges onto moving traffic again was inexplicably opposed by this government. Removing from our roads and from our kids' sight revolting and offensive messages and slogans on campervans again was rejected by this government. Measures to allow greater capacity to punish drug possession around prisons and to remove automatic parole for serious drug offenders—these two measures, again, only six months ago were opposed by this government.

I note that in the last month or so the Minister for Correctional Services made noises about those two measures finally being accepted by this government, which raises the question of why they were not accepted six months ago. What has changed? Why not vote yes then instead of no? I think we even divided on it. The minister is on record as voting against it. These are measures that could have been enacted six months ago when the Correctional Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018 went through this house, and the minister is only talking publicly about them now.

On top of all this failure, we have seen cuts. We have seen cuts to law and order—\$38 million of savings that SAPOL need to find over the next four years. We have seen cuts to crime prevention grants. As I have said, we have seen cuts to the courts. The Chief Justice has said that \$7 million was the initial target, but this is climbing exponentially. No-one seems to know the figure of where these savings will end for the court system, which again is putting at jeopardy things like the country courts, which particularly Aboriginal people are so dependent on for their access to justice. It also affects domestic violence victims across South Australia.

We are seeing vastly increased rates of reporting and also the creation of new offences, which is putting extra pressure on prosecution services. That pressure is not being met by the court system currently, let alone after finding more than \$7 million worth of cuts. We have seen cuts to Crime Stoppers and cuts to road safety and road maintenance. We have seen cuts to road safety on its own and also as a result of the decision to close the Motor Accident Commission.

Of course, on top of all this we have seen the wholesale privatisation of a complex maximum security prison. Not only that, it is a privatisation of the prison to a company so discredited in other jurisdictions that the Queensland government has, only in recent months, cancelled their contracts and essentially bought the prison management back from that company. I am referring to the Southern Queensland Correctional Centre. All of these cuts add up to making the community less safe, which is precisely what the government were not saying in their election promises.

I will speak a little bit about Crime Stoppers. I have spoken about this before, as has the member for King in some interesting contributions to this place. I will just go over a little bit of the history again. This is an organisation that now remains the only Crime Stoppers organisation in South Australia not to be centrally funded by a state government. Indeed, for its most recent campaign it has been forced to go to the public in a GoFundMe campaign in order to raise money to raise awareness about particular rural crimes and the reporting of crimes.

It has been shown time and time again that whenever Crime Stoppers in any state focuses on a particular issue in their promotional material, there is an exponential increase in the number of reports to police, the number of arrests, the number of reports and eventual prosecutions in the particular area where they are focusing.

Now they are forced to go to the public for a GoFundMe campaign in order to fund a rural campaign into rural property crime. They had a very successful campaign last year around ice, with many more reports than usual for ice production. Over the past few decades, in fact, Crime Stoppers have helped to solve almost 30,000 crimes. Crime Stoppers themselves are confused and appalled at this decision. I will quote what Crime Stoppers had to say in relation to the government's inexplicable refusal to fund them:

The lack of budget allocation comes despite a public commitment by the previous government and a number of subsequent briefings with the Minister for Police and his advisers, who have acknowledged the efforts of the highly effective crime-fighting program but do not follow up accolades with action....That lack of support now forces Crime Stoppers SA to consider cost-cutting measures and other ways to fund its campaigns and operations—which also includes costs associated with hosting the 1800 333 000 hotline, website, and its Rewards Program.

Crime Stoppers have been unquestionably successful. I will go through some of their results. More than \$220,000 in rewards have been paid to members of the community. More than 32,000 have been solved; 21,141 persons have been apprehended; about \$9.4 million worth of property has been recovered as a direct result of Crime Stoppers campaigns; nearly 2,000 charges have been laid for drug dealing, firearms, robberies, serious assaults and child pornography offences; 79 firearms have been seized, including ammunition and a range of illegal accessories; and 12 clandestine labs have been shut down and 1.3 million kilograms of amphetamines seized, which equates to 16,920 street deals, I am advised.

For a government claiming to be prosecuting a war on drugs, they do not seem to be doing a very good job. It is bizarre that they would cut funding for a program which self-evidently does so much towards detecting drugs in our community. In the Attorney-General's portfolio last year we also saw many cuts, not just the cuts to the courts but also cuts which were in many ways trifling cuts, which seemed unnecessary and cruel considering their impact. They included cuts to crime prevention grants which will save \$3.9 million over four years.

These were grants which provided communities across the metropolitan area and across regional areas, local councils and community groups with grants to provide crime prevention initiatives within their own communities. Whether that is CCTV or better lighting at a train station or a road safety initiative that keeps people safe, all of these things cost \$3.9 million over four years and have been inexplicably and cruelly cut.

The safe city grants were trifling cuts as well in many ways in terms of costs but their value to the community was huge. What the safe city grants did was to make sure that the CCTVs were set up within the City of Adelaide across places like Hindley Street, Hutt Street, Victoria Square and Pulteney Street to make sure that the CCTV cameras are not only renewed and replaced but the software which runs them, which has a shelf life of about five years as I understand it, is constantly replaced and renewed. Again, it is an inexplicable cut to a very successful and useful program to the police.

Finally, the cut to the managed taxi ranks was in that same suite of small cuts which make such a big difference to the safety of people in the community. The managed taxi ranks have an added dimension because people from the Lord Mayor down have informed me that these were extremely valuable services. They were provided on Friday and Saturday nights so that many people, including young people, women in particular, knew where to go to feel safe, how to get a taxi in a safe environment and, not even to get a taxi, just to attend a safe environment when they didn't feel safe at times in the city. In fact, Adelaide city council made some effort to pick up the shortfall in the very short term when that funding was pulled. But, again, that was another small, inexplicable cut that had such a big impact.

On top of all this, the police commissioner needs to find \$38 million worth of savings over the next four years, with \$7 million this year rising to \$11 million in 2021-22 for efficiencies in so-called back-office activities at SAPOL. Again, I ask the Minister for Police, the Premier and the Treasurer: in a period of rising crime in certain areas—certainly very static crime—and rising reports of domestic violence against a backdrop of cuts to the courts: where will the police commissioner find these savings?

I am sure he is not happy about having to find the savings, and I predict that there will be considerable bunfights over the next four years as the commissioner tries to find them; but we all await what the next budget will bring. The Treasurer and the Minister for Police have assured us many times that front-line police services will not be directly impacted, but that simply cannot be the case. If you attack back-office activities in SAPOL, it will have a direct impact on front-line activities.

Finally, I refer to the Motor Accident Commission, which has again become topical this week, and the inexplicable decision to close the Motor Accident Commission—a very successful organisation. There is not a great deal of savings, it has to be said. The Treasurer has committed to provide the funding of \$11 million over the next year to road safety initiatives. He has made noises about committing to the funding well into the future, but that is not what the budget papers, as far as I read them, reflect.

It is not just the promotional and research activities of the Motor Accident Commission that are at risk. As the member for Lee has pointed out, there are also numerous smaller grants or areas of funding that come through the Motor Accident Commission to various organisations, particularly sports clubs and sports organisations, to fund sporting activities. As part of that, it promotes road safety initiatives and road safety messages to what, it has to be said, is largely a young male audience that needs to hear these messages.

The Tour Down Under and Adelaide United Football Club receive about \$50,000 a year, I am advised, from the Motor Accident Commission, and the Motorcycle Riders Association's Toy Run and the RAA, through their Street Smart Primary program, run funding directly through the Motor

Accident Commission. Also, the MFS run a road awareness program for kids. I noticed that the Minister for Emergency Services was at a session of that this week extolling its virtues, meanwhile cutting its funding by closing the Motor Accident Commission.

All these things add up to a whole series of what are sometimes small cuts and sometimes large cuts, but all inexplicable and inexcusable cuts that add up to a decrease in community safety, putting our community at further risk in order to save a few dollars. Like most South Australians, I fear what is in the next budget. We have heard a lot about public transport today. My dad was a bus driver for the STA back in the 1990s. He was a victim of the Treasurer's last foray into the privatisation of public transport services in the state and, like most South Australians, I fear the next step.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: On a point of order, Mr Deputy Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (22:40): I rise to support the second reading of the Supply Bill 2019, which, approved by the parliament, will supply the government with sufficient funds to carry on the business of government in the lead-up to the budget being passed. It is not unusual that there is no detail, no budget breakdown, on how these dollars will be spent.

Since the March election, residents have been speaking to me about issues that negatively impact on them, issues that were not flagged as part of the Marshall Liberal government's plans in the lead-up to the state election. There continues to be a feeling of trepidation about the government's plans. 'What's next?' they are asking. It is easy to understand why they are asking what is next when you look at what is going on under this Liberal government.

You only have to look at the job creation support and other programs cut by the government, including the economic investment fund, the northern and southern connections, the very popular Fund My Neighbourhood program, the Small Business Development Fund, the South Australian Early Commercialisation Fund, the renewable technology industry development program, the Automotive Supplier Diversification Program, the Advanced Food Manufacturing program, the SA Premium Food and Wine Credentials Grant Program, the Future Jobs Fund, the career services program and the Retrenched Workers Program. The list goes on and on.

There have been cuts of more than 800 workers in SA Health, the closure of TAFE campuses, the closure of the two SHINE South Australia clinics and the Service SA centres at Modbury, Prospect and Mitcham. I have already spoken in this place about the impact this will have, particularly in the north-eastern suburbs and in relation to the more senior members of our community who do not actually have access to computers to proceed with the work required to complete their forms. But it does not end there.

There is the privatisation of SA Pathology, the Adelaide Remand Centre, the Modbury Hospital patient transfers, and there are rent increases in Housing SA homes. From the budget, we learnt that \$46 million was to be cut from bus and train services, and we are already seeing the impact of this on cuts to our bus routes and services. I have had many residents raise issues about this. Then there is the uncertainty about ongoing funding for so many of our wonderful hardworking community organisations. It is no wonder that residents are asking, 'What's next?'

The member for Ramsay spoke in this place about the impact of \$11 million being cut from the tourism budget, pointing out that international visitors are down 3.2 per cent, international visitor spending is down 3.5 per cent and international visitor nights are down 9 per cent. In government, Labor delivered the biggest ever investment in public transport, upgraded every major hospital and developed a state-of-the-art health and biomedical precinct, with the iconic SAHMRI and the world-class new Royal Adelaide Hospital as its centre.

We delivered record investment in infrastructure for the revitalisation of our CBD, with the redevelopment of the Riverbank Precinct, the Adelaide Convention Centre, the Festival Plaza and, of course, the iconic Adelaide Oval, with the nearby footbridge over the Torrens. Under our government, there was investment in major infrastructure projects, including the extension of the O-Bahn into the Adelaide CBD, with improved travel times and reliability for thousands of public transport users, reducing traffic congestion and delays for motorists on the inner ring route.

For all the criticism that we had from the Liberal opposition over the years for investing in this infrastructure, I have heard nothing but praise from commuters about the upgrade of the O-Bahn and the investment in the park-and-rides and parking facilities under our watch. Klemzig residents and commuters in my electorate of Torrens were looking forward to the additional car parks Labor had planned and budgeted for at the Klemzig O-Bahn Interchange. Unfortunately, following the election, the Liberal government made a decision to take that away and, to date, we see no evidence of it being reinstated.

Klemzig residents are particularly keen for these works to progress because their streets are congested throughout the working day with the cars of O-Bahn commuters who park not only on OG Road but in the side streets of Klemzig. I often speak to residents who have their driveways blocked by these cars or find it difficult to enter or exit the driveway of their home because of this congestion. Labor's investment to increase the number of these car parks would have seen that congestion on the roads removed, along with an increased use of the O-Bahn, which is good for commuters all-round and beneficial for the environment, too, so I will continue to speak out until the Klemzig park-and-ride facilities are delivered.

I have spoken in this place on numerous occasions about the Strathmont swimming pool at Oakden. This was closed by the Marshall Liberal government on 31 January this year. There was no mention of this happening during the election campaign. This pool was used extensively by 1,500 children and adults for swimming lessons and water therapy, including children with autism spectrum disorder and intellectual and physical disabilities; new migrants from landlocked states, often challenged by a fear of water; young babies; and senior members of our community.

We need additional swimming pools, not a reduction. Labor committed to a new swimming pool in the lead-up to the election. The Liberals were silent and then, when elected, closed the Strathmont swimming pool. This was indeed a budget measure, as clearly stated in a document accessed under FOI that states the Strathmont swimming pool is 'a budget pressure for DHS' and that 'there will be recurrent savings if the pool is closed'.

Many in our community are feeling despondent about these cuts, closures and privatisations that the government has already announced or actioned. While most were not flagged by the Marshall Liberal opposition in the lead-up to the March 2018 election, there were a number of promises made that are yet to come to fruition. I have been listening to speeches by government members opposite, joyfully saying that projects in their areas are being funded—and there are some smiles over there.

There are two important projects in my electorate that were promised in the lead-up to the state election. The Liberal candidate for Torrens made promises that, if a Liberal government was elected, they would deliver these promises. Unfortunately, that eventuated and those opposite are now in government. While I often hear ministers saying they are delivering on election promises, what has not eventuated, what they have been silent on, is the delivery of these two projects in Torrens.

The first was \$500,000 towards the construction of female change facilities at the Gaza Sports and Community Club in Klemzig. Recent years have seen great progress with women and girls playing football at the club. The Gaza women's football team players list is rapidly growing, with the vision of adding another women's football team. It is a club that is encouraging and has seen a number of its players go on to play for the SANFL.

Having female change rooms and other facilities at our sporting clubs sends a very important message to women and girls that they are welcome in sport and that their club's culture is one that will facilitate this participation. As I said previously, the Liberal candidate for Torrens met with Gaza's committee and made a commitment that a Liberal government would match Labor's commitment for women's change facilities at the Gaza Sports and Community Club, and I have a statutory declaration from committee members to this effect.

Along with Gaza club players and members, I am still waiting for the Minister for Sport to respond to my question asked in question time: when will the commitment made by the Liberal candidate to the Gaza football club be honoured? Addressing inequality for girls and women in sport is important. The government cut the girls and women in sport facilities program. Only last Saturday

I was at MetroStars Soccer Club where there was a double-header and Metro United women played the second game. The club had to bring in a transportable facility so that the women could change. That is outrageous.

Another commitment by the Liberal candidate was to fix Fosters Road, including putting in lights at the North East Road and Fosters Road junction. I understand now that this promise will not be kept. In the lead-up to the election the Liberal Party put jobs as a priority—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! The member for Torrens, a moment, please. The interjections between the two frontbenchers will cease. You have been heard in silence up until now. Member for Torrens, continue.

Ms WORTLEY: Another commitment by the Liberal candidate was to fix Fosters Road, including putting lights at the North East Road and Fosters Road junction. I understand now that this promise will not be kept. It is interesting that now we are coming up to a federal election, they have adopted the same policy of using signs saying they are going to fix something. The state Liberal Party did not keep their promise then, so I cannot imagine that federally those promises are going to be kept. Putting signs up along the road saying that these things will happen is just for show.

In the lead-up to the election the Liberal Party also put jobs as a priority. The ABS now reveals that there are more unemployed in South Australia than at the time of the state election in March 2018, that the unemployment rate is higher today than it was 12 months ago, and the youth unemployment rate is higher than what it was at the election. We are only just into the second year of the Marshall Liberal government and we have cuts, closures, privatisation, job losses and broken promises. It is no wonder that residents are asking, 'What's next?'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Giles.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (22:51): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. I also rise, as we all have, in support of the Supply Bill. I would just like to say before I start that I am sure you are more than pleased with the rain that has recently fallen on Eyre Peninsula. Let's hope that it continues for the rest of the season and for the rest of the state. We could do with more, though, in the Far North as there are still some quite desperate circumstances up there.

The incoming Liberal government gave the impression that it was going to be absolutely fantastic news for regional South Australia. That would have to go beyond the #RegionsMatter repeated again and again. I suspect that a lot of people in regional South Australia have been somewhat underwhelmed by the initiatives of those opposite. You would think that after 16 years in opposition you would have been chomping at the bit to come in here with a well thought-through reform agenda to implement those things that you held us to account for, often more on the basis of perception than anything else but you held us to account. In your first budget, there was hardly any indication that the regions matter or matter in a way that was fundamentally different from when we were in power.

There has been a whole series of cutbacks when it comes to regional South Australia. A lot has been said over the years about our road network in country South Australia. Clearly, there is a lot of work to be done and there has always been a lot of work to be done. It has never been helped by the federal government when it comes to its spend in South Australia and its constant dudding of South Australia regarding our fair share of road funding. There were big commitments made about improving roads in regional South Australia, and what did we get with the first budget? We got a \$26 million cut to regional road funding. There is nothing that is going to set the world alight out there in regional South Australia.

We have fantasy projects like GlobeLink. Why not concentrate on something really decent like getting the duplication of the road between Port Wakefield and Port Augusta underway? The Freight Council has described this road as a death corridor. The number of people who have died and been seriously injured on that road over recent years is something I believe both sides of the house would not accept. We need to start making a solid commitment.

I notice that the member for Grey came out today or yesterday with \$60 million, but that is not a \$60 million project; that is an incredibly tiny start. Depending on which figures you use, it is

anywhere between \$1.2 billion and \$2 billion. It is national Highway 1 and it is the federal government that should be coming to the party in a serious fashion, given the usual formula is 80 per cent federal and 20 per cent state, but we should be doing more as a state to really push that important project. It is a project that should take a precedence over what I have described as the fantasy project of GlobeLink, which I bet will never happen.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: Let us hope there is going to be a change of government at a federal level and we will be in like Flynn, getting the federal government to come to the party. One of the simple things that you promised when elected was, for some of those roads where we reduced speed limits to 100 km/h, to pop those back up to 110 km/h. Well, it still has not happened. This is not complicated stuff. I can stand up here as someone with a foot in both camps when it comes to this one, and not just because of a recent speeding fine.

I did see some recommendations from the bureaucracy about being far more extensive when it came to cutting road speeds on country roads in South Australia. That did not happen, but some roads of late were cut. I did not think there was any justification for some of those in my electorate when it came to the accident history and the nature of those particular roads.

The SPEAKER: Member for Giles, there is a point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I am very apologetic to my colleague but, Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr HUGHES: I think I was just on a roll then; unfortunately, I will almost have to start from the beginning again to get that roll going. I was talking about road speeds. It is a very simple and a very straightforward task. Have you delivered on that one year into your term? No, you have not. You have not delivered on something as simple as that, so God help us when it comes to the more complicated stuff.

You thought, 'Country cabinet is a really bad idea and we are not going to do that.' You said all sorts of strange things about country cabinets—

Ms STINSON: I draw your attention to the state of the house, sir.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr HUGHES: I was about to wax lyrical about country cabinets and the lack of support by those opposite for country cabinets.

Members interjecting:

Mr HUGHES: I know how much, at 11 o'clock at night, you want to listen to me. I am sure there is a vast audience out there listening to this stream now, at 11 o'clock at night.

One of the fundamental things about country cabinets was that act of getting all the ministers, senior bureaucrats and others out into country communities but out into country communities in totally uncontrolled forums. Anybody could turn up; anybody could ask questions. There were no gatekeepers there, no having to go through a whole layer of people to get in to see a minister.

In fact, they were incredibly well attended. I attended a number of them myself. There were 6,200 people who attended these forums. The member for Stuart is not here, but he will testify to the fact that in Port Augusta there was a big turnout to that country cabinet meeting. In Whyalla there was a good turnout, and there were good turnouts in other communities as well.

They were something that was accepted. It is interesting that the two Independents, both from regional South Australia, have spoken recently on the value of country cabinets. But no, not good enough for the current government. They prefer to have gatekeepers in place so there is control, so there is real control about who gets to see visiting ministers.

One of the most miserly things that was done—and I will cut across a few portfolios here—was in regional South Australia and communities like mine of Whyalla, but also in Port Augusta, Port

Pirie, Port Lincoln, Murray Bridge, Mount Gambier and in some of the smaller communities, is that there is a significant number of Housing SA properties. For instance, in a place like Whyalla it would be close to one-quarter of the housing properties.

The most miserly thing that was done was the attack on some of the most vulnerable people in our state who lived in the single-bed bedsitters—Housing SA properties in regional communities and also in the metropolitan area—with the rent increases for those particular individuals. That was not going to generate much in the way of income; these were one-bedroom bedsitters. These were not the three-bedroom houses on the traditional quarter-acre block Housing SA properties.

Now these people are going to be paying the same percentage of their income when it comes to renting a Housing SA property. I went out and checked the make-up of the people in those one-bedroom properties. I know that in my community they were nearly all frail, elderly people. It epitomises the approach in a number of ways that that particular section of our population, those people who are low-income earners, who depend upon the pension and who have a one-bedroom bedsitter, were to be hit by this increase in rent. It was just one of those things that sums up those opposite in a number of respects.

There were a number of cuts to TAFE facilities. Roxby Downs was cut—and there was an interesting conversation in Roxby Downs about that cut—as was the TAFE facility at Coober Pedy. Coober Pedy is the opal capital of the world. I say that we should have done more when we were in power. At times, there were opal-cutting classes that attracted people from all around the place. I believe that we could have done more. There is now no TAFE facility in the whole of the far north of South Australia. The nearest TAFE facility is in now in Port Augusta, so no TAFE facility in Roxby Downs and no TAFE facility in Coober Pedy.

One of the most disturbing losses was the Plan for Accelerating Exploration program. I think it was one of the most valuable programs that the previous government introduced way back in 2004. Through the good times and the bad times in the mining industry, we continued to fund that particular program, and it was incredibly successful. The South Australian Chamber of Mines and Energy have stated that over the life of that program it generated an additional \$2.4 billion in mining revenue to the state. That was an incredibly significant return on the investment undertaken.

From memory, I read somewhere that for each dollar invested there was an \$18 to \$20 return. So it is incredibly short-sighted that that program was cut, and it is incredibly short-sighted when it comes to backing regional South Australia's economic opportunity. I have mentioned before, I will mention again and I will keep mentioning until this program is reinstated, that the Carrapateena deposit would not have been discovered without PACE. The PACE program contributed 50 per cent to that particular drilling campaign, and that drilling campaign led to a \$900-odd million investment in the Carrapateena mine, and now we have OZ Minerals flagging that there is going to be an additional \$1 billion investment in Carrapateena, which is incredibly good news for the state.

For regional South Australia, for the state as a whole, that represents 500 long-lived jobs as a result of that mine, that is, the direct jobs not counting the indirect employment. When you add the additional billion dollars that they are talking about, out of outsourced minerals, how many additional jobs that is going to represent in the long-term, they were not in a position to say, but you can bet it is going to be a significant increase in employment. That will benefit Port Pirie, that will benefit Port Augusta, that will benefit Whyalla, and will benefit places further afield, where people do drive-in drive-out or fly-in fly-out from the airport, the runway that has been set up at Carrapateena. I would implore those opposite to lobby the Minister for Energy and Mining and to get behind the reintroduction of this incredibly valuable program.

I am proud of the Labor government's history when it comes to the support of the mining industry in this state. Nearly all the feedback that I used to get from the mining industry—and I have the biggest mines in my electorate—was always very positive about the former state government. However, at the end of the day that sort of investment in the PACE program means jobs for regional communities. It is one of the things that has been cut, and I think it is a disgrace.

There is a range of other things that are going to have a negative impact on country South Australia. The next budget I am sure will put enormous pressure on the court system. Whyalla and Port Pirie are being lined up to lose their courts, and that will have a whole range of consequences

for our communities and the social justice system. It is going to put additional stress on our police. It is probably going to lead to the loss of lawyers in Whyalla and Port Augusta, if you do not have courts in your community. That has a cascading series of impacts in a whole range of other areas. So, once again, it is going to be harder for people in country communities to access some of the services they need.

One of the good things about the previous state government was that it totally ruled out the privatisation of SA Pathology. The potential privatisation of SA Pathology once again disproportionately impacts upon regional communities because SA Pathology has an extensive integrated network in regional South Australia and a network that is integrated with what it does in the metropolitan area. It carries out a whole range of services that the private sector will not carry out. They are very important public services for public health.

At present, we have SA Pathology in Whyalla, Port Pirie, Port Augusta, Victor Harbor, Mount Gambier, Wallaroo, Berri and Port Lincoln. The privatisation of that particular service will see the loss of specialist jobs in regional South Australia. In the community of Whyalla, there are approximately 20 people employed at SA Pathology, and I think the number is similar in Mount Gambier. In Port Pirie, around 10 people are employed at SA Pathology. This will have an impact employment-wise and, once again, an impact in terms of the services available in country South Australia.

SA Pathology, and pathology in general, is involved in about 70 per cent of medical treatment decisions. Sometimes, time is of the essence. We know what the private sector does: it cuts corners. It is all about the bottom line. Work will be sent interstate, work that was formerly being done in the regions will come to Adelaide or possibly go interstate. That all adds time and complexity, which ultimately has an impact on patient outcomes.

I have mentioned the duplication of the road between Port Augusta and Port Wakefield. I think it is something that has to be done. It is part of our national infrastructure and it does need urgent attention.

In relation to SA Pathology, I could talk a bit more about health services in country South Australia. I am not going to have a go at those opposite when it comes to health services because it is a mix, and some of the issues we face in the delivery of primary health care services are predominantly federal issues, with the incentives that are available and the way that Medicare operates in general.

When it comes to wellbeing associated with health, as a nation we are one of the highest ranking countries in the world. The latest index puts us at around No. 7 in the world, which is interesting because we have dropped two positions in the last two years. In country South Australia, we have some real issues in relation to timely access to primary health services, especially in relation to GPs. There have been a couple of initiatives by the current government in this space that I think are worthwhile, but they are just touching the periphery because it is a deep systemic issue.

It is going to have to change, and it requires changes at a federal level, especially in relation to Medicare provider numbers. At the moment, we have an inverse relationship between where the medical professions are and where the greatest need is. The greatest need is out in the country and in some of our poorest suburbs in the metropolitan area. Part of the explanation in the country relates to access in a timely fashion, availability and distance, but that is only part of the story because we know that socio-economic factors are incredibly important in health outcomes.

The general picture, and it is not true in all cases, is that the further away you get from the core of the major metropolitan areas the lower the income, and that has a direct impact on health outcomes. It is not just a case of access and remoteness, even though that is one of the factors at play.

We do need to get GPs out into country South Australia, and that is going to require not just initiatives on the part of the state government but also serious lobbying of the federal government to change the mix of incentives, how we allocate Medicare provider numbers and a move away from the overabundance of doctors in some of the more salubrious suburbs in our metropolitan areas, whether that be in Adelaide or the other states. I was going to talk about energy, but it looks like I have run out of time.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (23:15): Every new government needs to carve out an identity for itself. Will it be a reforming government, a progressive government, a government with a bold agenda, big dreams? This government has clearly decided it wants to be known as a cuts government. Cuts, closures and privatisations; that is what defines this Marshall Liberal government.

It is a far cry from the slogan it adopted prior to the election, a slogan many South Australians now probably strain to recall, so remote are its ideas from what is actually being delivered. To remind the house, this slogan was 'More jobs, lower costs, better services'. Let us look at that in relation to the child protection portfolio, a portfolio that was the focus of this government when it was in opposition before the election, a portfolio that, just a few months in, has slid right off the agenda. It is barely spoken of now, and the minister is barely heard from.

More jobs: what we have seen in child protection is fewer jobs in key areas. We have seen jobs slashed. Let us take the financial counselling service. This program employed 59 full-time equivalents, and more than \$4.4 million was invested in delivering this service each year. Over many years that skilled team of financial counsellors played a pivotal role in early intervention and prevention as well as family reunification and capacity building and in the very important task of assisting young people to develop the skills to transition out of care and into independent living. That is a vital role, because no-one wants to see the cycle of disadvantage spin another revolution and carve into the fortunes of another generation.

Slashing this service has some pretty severe consequences. Not only does the sacking of 59, or even more, child protection financial counsellors breach the Liberals' much repeated slogan of creating more jobs but it also breaches recommendations 158 and 159 of the child protection system's royal commission, better known to most as the Nyland royal commission.

Those recommendations state, firstly, that the Children's Protection Act 1993 be amended to require the minister to provide or arrange assistance to care leavers aged between 18 and 25 years. Assistance should specifically include the provision of information about services and resources, financial and other support to obtain housing, education, training and employment, and access to legal advice and health care.

Secondly, commissioner Nyland recommended an expansion—an expansion—of financial counselling services to manage access to post care financial support from the agency provided in accordance with the previous recommendation. Nowhere does it say that the existing service should be dismantled or defunded, or that the jobs of those 59 financial counsellors should be slashed. In fact, it indicates that the royal commissioner valued financial counselling services and wanted to see them expanded.

I can see why a cuts government would target this service. It has shaved almost \$14 million off the child protection budget by doing it, but the real cost will be paid by families and young people who can ill afford to be sacrificed for this government's cuts agenda. In fact, the costs of intergenerational disadvantage far, far outweigh the almost \$14 million the government might hope to save with this measure.

Ripping out this \$4.4 million a year service—that is \$13½ million over just three years—is being replaced with what? If only we knew. If only the minister knew. As usual, questions about this area were met with the vagueness and confusion that we have come to expect from the Minister for Child Protection. The minister gave not one, not two, but three different accounts of how the financial wellbeing service would be replaced, and that was all in one estimates hearing.

The first account was that \$1 million had already been allocated to Relationships Australia for post-care services. However, in the list of post-care services to be provided, financial counselling was not one that the minister listed. The second account was that \$1 million would be allocated for a range of different initiatives by NGOs and an app, though the chief executive later corrected that and confirmed that those initiatives listed by the minister were actually part of the previous government's response to the Nyland royal commission and were already funded, and indeed many were already implemented, including the app.

The third account was that a tender for the \$1 million new service would go out within the next nine months. That was stated in September/October, though this minister has in that period been very quiet about this tender. In fact, there has been no such tender for any such financial

counselling service released at all. In any case, the deputy chief executive pointed out that such a tendered service would not be like for like, indicating that it would not be a dedicated financial counselling service at all.

It is all very confusing, and there has been no clarity in the public sphere since and, I understand, quite a lot of confusion in the NGO sector about how these financial wellbeing services will be replaced, if at all. Just weeks out from the financial wellbeing service being disintegrated, on 30 June, it leaves some really big questions. Where are these 59 staff going? Where will families and young people get financial counselling after 30 June? And, of course, how does this constitute more jobs, as promised by the Liberal government?

These jobs, these financial counsellors, are needed now more than ever. In fact, they are needed more than when this government came to power. The number of children in state care is growing under this government, and not just the number but the annual rate of increase. That is despite the now minister's assertions that this government would decrease the number of children coming into care.

Since this government took office, since this minister took the portfolio, there has been a 9.1 per cent increase in the number of children in care in 12 months. That is a significant jump compared with the previous financial year's figures. In the previous financial year, the rate of increase was 6.1 per cent. I note that in estimates the minister stated that she had would arrest the rate of increase and limit it to around 3 per cent.

I say 'around' because, as usual, the minister was pretty vague about that, too. She also inaccurately relied on some figures when making her assertions about her own self-imposed KPIs. Based on the varying statements that she gave, she could have meant anywhere between 2.5 per cent and 3.3 per cent, so I have been pretty generous in my interpretation. Despite that generosity, she has obviously failed to reach that self-set target. Instead, the rate of increase has been three times her stated goal. Shame!

With so many more children and families now coming into contact with the child protection agency under this government, now more than ever support for families and those additional children coming into state care is needed, and that includes financial counselling services. We have seen a rise in the number of children in state care, yet we have seen cuts left, right and centre to support families, carers, relatives and children, and the staff who support them all.

Back to that Liberal slogan, 'More jobs, lower costs, better services'. Lower costs for whom? Certainly not kinship carers. Under this minister, kinship carers only narrowly escaped footing the bill for the Christmas lunch last year. The cuts have been so brutal in the Department for Child Protection that they have even extended to the point where staff were concerned that Christmas lunches for kinship carers might be cancelled this year.

We know that because concerned people told us about it, despite the minister's vehement denials. We know that the minister's denials were false and misleading because FOI documents revealed the chatter and concern of staff, particularly in regional DCP offices, that they would have to cancel the lunches because the money had not been found for a cheap Chrissie lunch for regional kinship carers who do so much for so little.

I am glad the money has been found—after it was raised by Labor publicly; nevertheless, it has been found. It is a sign of how miserly this government is, the level of penny pinching that it will sink to and that it prioritises bottom lines over respecting kinship carers. In fact, the minister persists with the penny pinching, unable even to reveal the costs of these lunches, even as a per head allocation, and blanking that information out in the FOI documents. That speaks to someone who knows that she has made a poor decision and is petrified of scrutiny.

Lower costs: this government is happy to pass costs for a basic lunch on to kinship carers, and that is just one of many charges being passed on to foster and kinship carers. As the member for Wright pointed out in January, foster and kinship carers are increasingly reporting that their applications for the facilities they need to support children in their care or to take on additional children are being rejected. These carers have been told that the department has been instructed to shave

back the budget and disallow requests for fit-for-purpose vehicles, household appliances or accommodation in all but the most extreme circumstances.

If we look at the most recent Report on Government Services, we can see that caring for a child in residential care costs state taxpayers an average of some \$540,000. That is 10 times more than the cost of providing foster care for a single child. It does not make sense to knock back applications for a few hundred or a few thousand dollars and risk children going into much more expensive forms of care that arguably produce much worse outcomes for young people.

Then we have the claim of better services. There are certainly not better services when it comes to financial counselling and providing for the children most in need of the state's care and protection. Last year's budget saw \$3.9 million axed—money that was slated for new residential care facilities. I understand that the minister, and indeed some in this sector, had concerns about particular housing configurations, but the decision was made to axe this funding altogether—not to reconfigure it, not to come up with a different design but to axe it entirely.

The explanation given was that this housing was not needed because of an expected drop in the number of children in care, and in particular in residential care. That has simply not transpired. As I stated earlier, there has been a 9.1 per cent rise in the number of children in care under this minister's watch. In residential care we have seen a rise of 7.3 per cent in the number of children in this form of care in the first 12 months under this government and this minister.

You have to wonder if axing \$3.9 million for additional residential care was such a smart idea. You have to wonder if the minister really understood the portfolio. You have to wonder if the minister had some rather lofty ideas about her own capacities. That \$3.9 million was not just bricks and mortar. Once again, it was people: much-needed staff in child protection, front-line workers. There were 12 full-time staff associated with this budget measure, that is, 12 full-time staff who were axed under this budget measure.

It is hard to justify that decision in light of the acceleration of children coming into care under this government. There is less housing, there are fewer staff and there are worse services. This promise of more jobs, lower costs and better services is a joke and, when it comes to child protection, it is not a very funny one.

Mr GEE (Taylor) (23:29): I rise today to support the Supply Bill. It is essential that we ensure that the state government can continue to operate while they prepare what we expect will be a high taxing budget. Where to start? It is difficult to see the vision of this government. I have heard the Premier say, 'We're a government for all South Australians.' I have heard various ministers say the same thing. We will have a look at that. On this side of the house, we believe in investing in quality education, quality health care and in our community. We take our responsibility for our environment very seriously.

On the government side of the house, the evidence shows that they support ongoing cuts, closures and privatisations and have failed to support South Australians when it comes to the River Murray—the River Murray that is so important to all South Australians; I just cannot figure how this government could be so out of touch with the rest of us—and I must now add breaking election promises to that list. It is this difference in values that saw the state Liberal government cut funding to critical health services in the most disadvantaged areas of Adelaide, including Davoren Park in my electorate.

The government's cuts, closures and privatisation are hitting vulnerable people across the state, but are these cuts affecting all South Australians the same? Yes and no. In my electorate, young people and women are affected by the closure of the SHINE SA clinic at Davoren Park, and it is the same for those people living south of the city following the closure of the Noarlunga centre, another example of this state government's funding cuts. When meeting with councillors and mayors from the Adelaide Plains, City of Playford and Salisbury councils, even local government is saying that the Liberals are out of touch with the community in relation to this issue.

This government argues that only a small amount of funding was cut and that SHINE should be receiving more via Medicare, but the loss of \$547,000 of funding has led to these closures as the state government possibly does not realise or just does not care that SHINE SA is already maximising the funding it can receive from Medicare. Doctors have advised that there will likely be more

unplanned pregnancies, an increase in the rate of sexually transmitted diseases, longer waiting times in local hospitals, more cost-of-living pressures for those who can least afford them and that the cuts will affect the mental health of those who need this service.

Despite all this, the state government went ahead and cut funding. I am proud of everyone across South Australia who fought hard to oppose this cut—community organisations, residents, local councils and the Australian Medical Association. Over 400 doctors wrote letters, signed petitions and rallied against this short-sighted cut. Members of the house may not be aware that SHINE SA Davoren Park serviced not only people from northern Adelaide but also clients from across regional South Australia. It is not easy to visit a doctor's surgery in a small town to get advice for an unplanned pregnancy, when young people are questioning their sexuality or for advice regarding contraception and protection from sexually transmitted diseases.

There is no anonymity at these doctors' rooms. In small towns, everyone knows each other. SHINE was seeing 9,000 people annually between the two clinics that are being closed. These women and young people are most likely to now attend the Lyell McEwin and Flinders Medical Centre. What will the cost of this be compared to the small \$547,000 funding cut? As we are coming up to budget time, I call upon the members for Frome, King, Narungga and Schubert, and the Premier's suicide prevention advocate from the other place to join Labor and call upon the Treasurer to reverse the funding cuts to SHINE SA.

Another area where the state Liberal Party is out of touch with community expectations is in relation to bus and other public transport cuts. Public transport should be accessible for all, not just those travelling at peak times. The community want to see more services and cheaper fares for those who sometimes cannot afford it. The state government said it is listening to the community. The Premier is not listening to the residents that I spoke to on buses and at interchanges and bus stops across my electorate and in the city.

We are already seeing overcrowding across the rail network, and we have seen carriages removed from the Belair, Grange and Outer Harbor lines. The community are upset that they are losing their services and getting angry with the Liberal government over the millions of dollars worth of cuts still to come. Who is affected by this? The first cuts mostly affected cleaners and nurses and other shiftworkers, along with students travelling to or from university or TAFE. Will the next round of cuts have a greater impact on seniors and families with children, and people with a disability travelling during the day or on weekends? We do not know.

The government recently had a bit of a thought bubble. They think it is a good idea to force commuters to use a mix of buses, trains and trams or multiple buses to get from A to B. This will just lead to fewer people using public transport and make it more expensive for those who still do. Nobody I have spoken to thinks that this makes any sense at all.

On this side, we believe that everyone has to have access to shelter or accommodation, but this is becoming increasingly difficult as housing becomes less affordable in South Australia. A study by Anglicare released recently found that 98 per cent of rental properties are unaffordable for minimum wage workers. Further, there is a huge shortage of secure, affordable rentals. I know from families coming into my electorate office and speaking with me at the local shops that they are struggling with their rent, their utility bills and even to put food on the kitchen table. We are dealing with some locals who are sleeping in their cars. What is the government doing about this? This Liberal government is just hopeless.

At the same time that we have people who cannot get somewhere to live, the government has huge tracts of land that remain vacant in my electorate, as the Playford Alive urban renewal project seems to have just stopped. These vacant blocks should be used to provide affordable housing to young families, seniors and people who need access to the housing market, either to purchase a home or to be housed in a Housing Authority property.

Shame on this government for increasing Housing SA rents. I call upon them to act now to increase the supply of affordable housing in the state and reduce rents for those who cannot afford to pay. The state government also seems to have cut the funding to last year's Playford Alive fun day. It may not be important to the government, but it is a great event that the local community feels has been taken away by this Liberal government.

Our team values education and its importance in ensuring our children and grandchildren can succeed whether they choose university, TAFE or a trade to start their career. The possibilities are endless if they receive a quality education from the age of three. There is some positive news in education because of Labor's investment in schools. The shadow education minister and I visited the Swallowcliffe Primary School to see the impact of the school's redevelopment. The difference is clear to see, with students in modern classrooms that meet their needs and facilities for teachers to deliver world-class education.

When it comes to schools being able to grow, this government has its foot on the brake and is going backwards. One example is the Elizabeth North Primary School. Promised funding for a badly needed upgrade, now under the Marshall Liberal government it will have to wait up to six years to receive quality facilities for their growing number of students. While this government uses the funds for its year 7 transition to high school, parents want to see funding invested in their kids' education now.

It is pleasing that there is some positive economic news in South Australia, but it is thanks to the work of the former Labor government and the private sector. Recently, I attended a business breakfast at Dublin Clean Grain, which was organised by the Adelaide Plains Council and supported by Regional Development Australia for the Barossa, Gawler Light and Adelaide Plains groups. The meeting was the third that the council has held so far. The first was in Mallala, then Two Wells and now in Dublin to engage with local businesses and consider the development of an Adelaide Plains business council. The local member for Narungga, Fraser Ellis, was one of the speakers at the meeting, along with a social media expert and representative from the council, outlining the economic benefits of the region's current expansion.

It was good to catch up with APC's CEO, mayor and other local councils and to hear from several farmers about their life on the land, successes and challenges, plus the need for significant rain. It has been good to see some rain falling in the rural areas, but plenty more is needed. But the main issue raised with me on that day was in relation to the mining bill. On this issue, the government is completely out of touch with farmers. The Dublin meeting voted to further develop the case for a business council—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: A point of order, Mr Speaker: it is not often from my vantage point that I can see the seat of Chaffey, yet now I can, and I am wondering if it is appropriate that I am able to do so, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, thank you, member for Lee. Yes, I ask the minister if he is going to get up and walk around, he can sit on another chair. Let's lift the standard for the remaining 20 minutes.

Mr GEE: I appreciate the support from the member for Lee in pointing that out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Let's give the member for Taylor the respect he deserves.

Mr GEE: The Dublin meeting voted to further develop the case for a business council for the region and subsequently the council has agreed to set up an independent business council. I believe this will bring positive benefits to this region. The Adelaide Plains Council area has seen huge growth through four new residential developments, plus new jobs at Dublin Clean Grain, Perfection and other local businesses, including new retail jobs.

I want to speak about other new opportunities in the north. The former Labor government negotiated the establishment of the Sonnen operation on the former Holden site at Elizabeth South. I recall the then premier Jay Weatherill welcoming the announcement. He called it a coup and said Sonnen would be 'leading the jobs of the future'. It now seems to me that the Liberals have embraced Labor's renewable vision, and this is when South Australians could really benefit.

Sonnen is leading the way in home battery systems in South Australia and is providing an exciting opportunity for the north, along with VeroGuard and La Casa Del Formaggio, developments located in Edinburgh Parks which were also assisted by the former Labor government. Sonnen is already employing many local staff, including contractors, and that number will continue to grow.

I visited Sonnen earlier this year when the operation was still gearing up, but they will be in full production soon. They are currently going through a quality assurance process with possible local suppliers and they are trying to maximise the opportunities for local South Australian businesses. It was good to see the former Holden site being used and more pleasing still to meet with ex-Holden workers who are now at the forefront of the renewable energy industry in South Australia.

I mentioned VeroGuard earlier. Again, it is good to see the ongoing construction of their new facility in Edinburgh Parks. This will create more local jobs for those currently looking for work and opportunities for our kids and grandkids in the future—another Labor project. There are also developments occurring at the RAAF Edinburgh, as it develops into one of three superbases across Australia. I encourage members and their families to visit the base for the air show later this year.

Another area that will hopefully experience an economic turnaround is the Port Pirie area. I had the opportunity during March this year to visit Port Pirie with Labor leader Peter Malinauskas. We visited the Port Pirie smelter, met with residents at the Ellen Centre, and the Mayor and CEO of the Port Pirie Regional Council. I know all members of this house are aware of the Nyrstar smelter at Port Pirie, but many members would not have been able to visit it to see how important and complex this plant is. It was good to be joined at the smelter by the member for Frome, Geoff Brock, a former smelter worker and regular visitor to the site.

The Port Pirie smelter is the largest lead smelter in the world and will hopefully have a bright future. I thank Mark Zaborowski, vice president of the Australian operations, and his team at the smelter, for their briefing and tour of the facility. It was valuable to hear about the challenges and opportunities for the local community from Leon Stephens, Port Pirie Regional Council Mayor, and CEO Peter Ackland. The area has a positive future ahead, but they are currently struggling with high unemployment and a shortage of doctors and carers.

It was also good to hear the recent announcement by Pirie Meats, which is expected to create up to 350 direct and indirect jobs. The new Watertown abattoir will become South Australia's only multispecies dedicated service processing centre for domestic and export products. This announcement, which comes at a critical time, will hopefully boost confidence in the local community. Unfortunately #RegionsMatter has not had an impact in that local area at all.

My local community can sympathise with the Port Pirie community, as the Adelaide Plains in my electorate is another area that does not seem to matter to this government. I hope that the local state and federal governments, along with the private sector, will assist Port Pirie to realise its full potential. Closer to home—

Mr Pederick: Just talk about Nyrstar, comrade.

Mr GEE: I appreciate the member for Hammond's support. Closer to home, residents have given up on this government. In Virginia, there is a need for a street upgrade to cope with the expected growth, yet there is no support from this government for the Virginia Main Street upgrade. Support for local growers is almost non-existent and, following campaigns, petitions, public meetings and meetings with the minister, we still have no funding for the Curtis Road and Heaslip Road intersection.

One of the worst social issues we must face in northern Adelaide and across the state is crystal methamphetamine (or ice). It is destroying lives. Unfortunately, this is not news to anybody in this place, but it is shocking to see the damage ice is causing in our communities. I recently attended a public forum run by the Australian Anti Ice Campaign (AAIC) and supported by the Northern Carers Network. Around 100 local residents, AAIC volunteers (who are mostly ex-users of the drug) and community leaders attended. The forum heard from the CEO of AAIC, Andrea Simmons, who informed attendees about the drug, and her experience of taking the drug once, and then the downward spiral from being a successful businesswoman to living in a unit with blacked-out windows, believing the government was watching her and doing whatever she had to do to survive.

Local families and AAIC volunteers shared their confronting experiences. Imagine a mum facing her son who comes home high and trashes her home, or while under the influence you drive the wrong way on the Northern Expressway, or you now have lifelong medical effects from using ice. It is unthinkable that ice is affecting every community. As elected officials, we need to do all we can

to fight the spread of ice and other drugs in our community through greater budget funding for prevention, education and rehabilitation. We need to acknowledge the work of family members, often grandparents, who provide support in these very difficult circumstances. The message is clear: it is not safe to take ice, not even once.

In recent years, we have seen penalty rates reduced, the government wanting to axe labour hire protections, and safety at work is under threat. The attack on workers' rights must stop. In fact, I believe that this Saturday's election will take care of penalty rates. I have always believed that workers have a right to a safe workplace and to return home safely each night. I am sure everyone in this place feels the same way. Every worker also has the right to receive fair and equal remuneration for their work. Unfortunately, these basic principles are not always true—whether it is workers building our city, or doctors and nurses caring for our families.

In regard to labour hire, we are aware that the laws introduced by the Weatherill government to protect workers will not be enforced as was intended. We are just awaiting a decision from the other place. The protection of wages and conditions for labour hire workers is essential. Labour hire was very rare in 1990, but by 1995 several thousand labour hire companies were operating around Australia and affecting millions of workers. Labour hire has only ever delivered insecurity for workers and their families. I think I will leave it there and bring the rest up in my grievance.

Bill read a second time.

Supply Grievances

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (23:50): I move:

That the house note grievances.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (23:50): I will not be lead speaker for the opposition. I welcome the opportunity to discuss a number of local, state and national issues in my grievance on this debate tonight; the first is in relation to the Mental Health Commission. The Mental Health Commission has been an important part of our health system since it was created a couple years ago by the previous government. Unfortunately, what we have seen in recent weeks is that the government have hired interstate consultants who have given them a recommendation to abolish the Mental Health Commission.

The Mental Health Commission have been advising on mental health policy for our state. They have been consulting across the state, and the commissioner, Chris Burns, has been doing an excellent job. The recommendation to abolish the commission has not been supported by any stakeholders, and it has not been supported by any clinical groups; they were not talked to as part of the review.

This is a retrograde step for mental health care in this state. It is something that we will be fighting. The government made a big mistake in the way they have gone about this review in not talking to consumers and in not talking to clinicians. There is a lot of anger about this, so we will continue to fight to keep the Mental Health Commission and to keep it providing leadership for this very important area of public policy in this state.

In recent weeks, we have seen the devastating impact of flu, and it has been a horrid start to the flu season in this state. We have seen over 12,000 cases and 17 deaths in this state and, unfortunately, we have seen a very bungled response by the state government. We had doctors and nurses who could not access vaccines to protect themselves. We had Flinders Medical Centre running out of vaccines; at the same time, vaccinations had not even started at other hospitals.

At the same time, politicians were able to access vaccines, as were health departments, and GPs were having their vaccines rationed. We have seen that the result has been a huge number of cases of flu but, unfortunately, we do not have any winter demand management plan put in place by the state government to deal with it. We are calling on them to put that plan in place now, make sure those winter beds are available now and learn the lessons of their bungled rollout of the flu vaccine so that this issue does not happen again.

I want to raise a local issue in terms of green waste in the Onkaparinga city council. The City of Onkaparinga has been the only city council in Adelaide that has not had a fortnightly green waste

collection. This is an issue that I and other members of parliament from the south have been raising continually. We have been fighting for this, and we have had petitions, letters and campaigns on this for many years. The previous council did not support it, and I am very glad that the new council, led by new mayor, Erin Thompson, has now supported fortnightly green waste collection and that it is going to start at the beginning of next year.

It is going to be excellent for reducing our waste to landfill. It is going to be an excellent additional service for people in Onkaparinga. It is going to help in terms of reducing kitchen waste because people will be able to put it in the green waste. It turns it did not cost very much money: about 0.2 per cent of the council's budget, despite the previous council saying that it was going to cost millions of dollars. So, congratulations Onkaparinga council. Thank you for listening to the community and thank you to the community for raising their concerns and supporting our campaigns to get this to happen.

Over the past weeks, some serious issues have been happening in our hospitals in terms of catering. At the Lyell McEwin, we had the case of Patricia Smith, who ingested glass in her meal. Luckily, she was able to spit it out, but it was a very significant safety risk that happened at the Lyell McEwin in terms of catering services there.

At the same time, we have had a new contract, signed by the state government, come into operation at the Flinders Medical Centre that has delivered some absolutely ghastly meals for patients at that hospital. At the same time, the government is booking in savings of \$4½ million a year—a \$4½ million cut to catering and cleaning services at hospitals, including the Lyell McEwin and the Flinders Medical Centre. We are particularly worried that this is going to lead to further downgrades in services for patients at those hospitals when patients in public hospitals deserve to get safe, nutritious and appropriate food. Clearly, that has not been happening at these hospitals.

A local issue is the Old Noarlunga bridge. People will remember that a few years ago we had devastating floods that hit Old Noarlunga and took out the old swing bridge that was there. This was heartbreaking to many people in the community. It also broke the connection between Old Noarlunga and the Onkaparinga River Recreation Park and National Park, which are great places to go for a walk, to take the dog or go for a cycle.

The community has been very passionate about this and I congratulate them on advocating to replace the swing bridge. The previous government allocated the funding for it, and I am glad that that is being continued and is now under construction. I am very excited that we are going to have the opening of that with a big community day on 2 June. I encourage as many community members as possible to get along to Old Noarlunga for the opening of the bridge. Hopefully, it will be completed by then and we can all enjoy that new swing bridge, which will provide access to the recreation park once again.

People in the south know all about the Springbank Road/Daws Road/Goodwood Road intersection, otherwise known as the Peter Van The Party Man intersection. Peter Van The Party Man has been an icon of the south for a long time and we have come to enjoy it while stuck in traffic there. This is a dogleg intersection. The previous government, under the then minister for transport, the member for Lee, finally said, 'We are going to fix this issue once and for all and put in a proper intersection and do the requisite property acquisitions to do that.'

Unfortunately, we heard the new government, under the current minister, say, 'We don't want to do that. We are going to keep the dogleg. We are going to keep this crazy proposition.' He said it was the best solution. Well, the community disagreed. Everybody who knew that area disagreed, led by our excellent candidate for Boothby, Nadia Clancy, who has been doing great work in the community and has been advocating particularly strongly on this issue. Because of her leadership and her campaigning on this issue, we have won this fight. We have convinced the government to back down from their crazy plan to continue the dogleg there and Labor's plan of fixing that intersection once and for all will finally come to pass.

There is a similar issue where we have campaigning, amazing well led by the Labor Party, in the southern suburbs. Amanda Rishworth is a force of nature in terms of campaigning on issues. She has been campaigning very hard for a long time to fix the Witton Bluff issue for the coastal path gap between Port Noarlunga and Christies Beach. This is a missing link in our coastal path trail,

which has been sitting there as a problem for many decades. Amanda has been campaigning hard on this, working with me and the member for Reynell.

There is a lot of community support for fixing this, and I am delighted that Amanda has a commitment from the federal Labor Party that, if elected on Saturday, we will see funding going in to fix that coastal path and get the Witton Bluff trail delivered once and for all. That is going to be great news for residents in the area. It is going to be great news for businesses and getting more tourists into the area. We have a beautiful coastline in the south and I am delighted that Amanda has worked so hard in delivering this project for our area.

Unfortunately, we have seen a significant issue in terms of the loss of maternity services recently announced at Flinders Private Hospital. People in the south have relied on Flinders Private for private hospital maternity services. It is the only private hospital in the southern suburbs and we want to make sure that those services continue. Sadly, I believe I need to seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 23:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 15 May 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

643 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018 how many total public sector FTE positions were funded in the Lifetime Support Authority branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

Whilst the Lifetime Support Authority (LSA) are a distinct statutory authority, they are administratively aligned to the Department of Treasury and Finance (DTF).

As at 31 December 2018 59.4 FTE positions were funded in the Lifetime Support Authority.

Class	Number	FTE
SAES2 (Equiv)	1	1
SAES1 (Equiv)	3	3
MAS3		
ASO8	5	5
ASO7	2	2
ASO6	8	7.7
ASO5	3	2.7
ASO4	4	3.6
ASO3	1	1
ASO2	14	12.7
ASO1		
AHP4	6	5.3
AHP3	7	5.6
AHP2	9	8
AHP1	2	1.8

HOSPITAL BEDS

692 Mr PICTON (Kurna) (3 April 2019). What is the average number of overnight hospital beds broken down by category, including a statewide total, and broken down across each major metro hospital and country hospital total for 2016-17, 2017-18 and the 2018-19 year to date?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

There is no single centralised data set of average overnight hospital beds for South Australian hospitals.

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

708 Mr PICTON (Kurna) (3 April 2019). What was the average waiting list for forensic mental health patients waiting for an appropriate bed on each day from 1 July 2018 until February 2019?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised that:

Data is not collected on a daily basis.

HEALTH SERVICES

709 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (3 April 2019). Between 2017-18 and 2018-19 what SA Health public and preventative health roles have been abolished?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Prevention and Population Health Branch

There were six positions abolished since 2017-18.

Public Health Services

There were two positions in Public Health Services whose FTE allocation was reduced by 0.5 FTE each in 2018-19.

FOSTER CARERS

712 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (1 May 2019). How many foster carers have exited the child protection system in South Australia since 1 April 2018?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The number of foster carers within the child protection system in South Australia has increased since 1 April 2018.

FOSTER CARERS

713 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (1 May 2019). What has been the overall rate of attrition for foster carers in the child protection system in South Australia since 1 April 2018?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The number of foster carers within the child protection system in South Australia has increased since 1 April 2018.

FOSTER CARERS

714 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (1 May 2019). How many foster carers have exited the child protection system in rural and regional areas in South Australia since 1 April 2018?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The number of foster carers within the child protection system in rural and remote areas in South Australia has increased since 1 April 2018.

FOSTER CARERS

715 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (1 May 2019). What has been the overall rate of attrition for foster carers in the child protection system in rural and regional areas in South Australian since 1 April 2018?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The number of foster carers within the child protection system in rural and remote areas in South Australia has increased since 1 April 2018.

ALTERNATIVE CARE ARRANGEMENTS

716 Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (1 May 2019). How many children in rural and regional communities have been placed in alternative care arrangements outside of their local community since 1 April 2018?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised that:

Every effort is made to place children and young people within their family.

One hundred and twenty five children and young people who entered care from rural and regional South Australia between 1 April 2018 and 1 April 2019 were placed in out of home care outside of their local community.

The major reason that a child or young person is placed outside of their local community is so that they can be placed with relative and kinship carers.

SHANGHAI BUSINESS AND INVESTMENT HUB

721 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). What activities thus far has the Shanghai Business and Investment Hub undertaken to promote export activity? Which of these activities could have only occurred as a result of this hub being established?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

The Shanghai Business and Investment Hub has undertaken many activities in Shanghai to promote export since its establishment.

This includes but is not limited to:

- Further developed and refreshed a database of key trade contacts in market across China.
- Developed a stakeholder engagement plan.
- Introduced and promoted South Australian exporters to target buyers in market.
- Provided real time advice on China's geopolitical and trade market activity and movements in China to give confidence in, and support, South Australian exporters' China market entry strategies.
- Enhanced business activity of South Australian exporters through on the ground cooperation and co-ordination.
- Recruited buyers and influencers for the inbound food and wine missions led by DTTI in South Australia in April 2019; and
- Actively participated and promoted South Australia's capability in key sectors through local industry events.
- The establishment of the Shanghai Business and Investment Hub has significantly brought more confidence to key Chinese partners, potential investors and stakeholders on their engagement with South Australia. On the ground key account management is highly valued by clients.
- The Country Director, China is actively engaging with state government departments that are working closely with the Department for Trade, Tourism and Investment to pursue promotional, investment and other opportunities across the state's priority portfolios, the South Australian Department for Energy and Mining and Department for Environment and Water being two such examples. The China office is connecting these Departments with key investors and partners in the market and supporting ongoing management of, and advice to, the in-market stakeholders.
- The Shanghai office has also been assisting the upcoming Port Adelaide Football Club match on 2 June in Shanghai at Adelaide Arena at Jiangwan Stadium. The 2019 match will be contested by Port Adelaide and St Kilda. Some 11,000 fans are expected to attend, and more than four million viewers will tune in to watch the broadcast which will make it the most viewed AFL game in history.
- A South Australia club event will be held inviting visiting Port Adelaide Football Club business delegates, existing club members. The SA club event will also support the Barossa Grape and Wine Association (BGWA) launching their Barossa Super 100 program, promoting premium wines at A\$100 and above from South Australia.
- The Shanghai office is also supporting StudyAdelaide and TAFE SA with their market visits to China, with the objective to work with the International Education sector to increase the export value of international education.
- Last but not the least is the support and assistance provided to South Australian companies planning to participate in the second China International Import Expo (CIIE) at Shanghai in November, 2019. There were over 23 South Australian companies representing South Australia at this important trade event last year. We are expecting there will be more South Australian companies participating in this year's CIIE.

INVESTMENT ATTRACTION SOUTH AUSTRALIA

724 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (1 May 2019). In dollar terms and broken down into calendar years, how much foreign direct investment did IASA successfully attract to South Australia since its inception?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

Since its inception, the previous Investment Attraction South Australia secured a total of 28 foreign investment projects.

Calendar Year	# Foreign Direct Investment Projects	Foreign Investment
2016	10	\$939,480,000
2017	12	\$1,043,090,000
2018	6	\$137,900,000
Total	28	\$2,120,470,000

Approximately 2,400 actual jobs were created from these 28 foreign investment projects.

Foreign direct investment includes investment from companies whose ultimate parent is headquartered either overseas or interstate.

NATIONAL WINE TOURISM CAMPAIGN

730 **The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (1 May 2019). Is any money from the minister's portfolio budget contributing towards the state government's \$750,000 contribution towards the national wine tourism campaign? If so, how much and how long is the contribution commitment for?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The \$750,000 state government contribution is from the PIRSA budget and is for financial year 2018-19.