

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 5 June 2019

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

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

### *Bills*

#### **CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ASSAULTS ON EMERGENCY WORKERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

##### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (10:31):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and to make related amendments to the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007, the Sentencing Act 2017 and the Summary Offences Act 1953. Read a first time.

##### *Second Reading*

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

In October last year, following various court decisions on assaults on police in this state and also following updated legislation recently enacted in Victoria, the Police Association of South Australia announced their intention to publicly campaign for the introduction of new legislation. Broadly, it would remove the police assault provisions from the Summary Offences Act so that offenders were always charged under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act for assaults on police, and it would look at adequate penalties and sentencing guidelines to properly punish offenders and deter others from assaulting and harming police and emergency workers.

I immediately commenced discussions with the Police Association and other relevant groups on behalf of the opposition about what specific action we might take in this state to give police and emergency workers the protections they need. It became very clear that change is needed, in terms of both punishment for offenders who assault and injure these workers and deterrence, so that the courts, the public and potential criminals get the message loud and clear that assaulting and harming police and emergency workers in their line of duty is a very serious offence and will not be tolerated anymore.

These discussions continued on what legislative framework would give these workers the protections they need while still retaining the judicial discretion that is at the heart of our system. In February this year, the Police Association wrote to me and, I am advised, to the Attorney-General outlining what they thought were sensible amendments to the law, and we recommenced discussions with the association on that basis.

I also consulted with other unions, agencies and volunteer organisations as well as talking to individual front-line cops and emergency workers. As a result of these discussions, the Leader of the Opposition and I released a draft bill for public comment. While the government sat on its hands and was almost entirely silent on this issue, we were out on the front foot letting the public and emergency workers know our intentions and asking for their input on how the legislation might be improved and strengthened. We went out with a proposal that we thought got the balance right, and after a period of consultation and discussion we arrived at the proposal before the house today.

This bill makes several significant changes to the law and, when seen cumulatively, should send a very clear message to the affected workers, the courts and the community that this parliament will no longer tolerate the level of violence against emergency workers that we have seen in recent years. The first change is that it entirely removes section 6—Assault police, hinder police and resist police—from the Summary Offences Act and places these offences entirely in the criminal code.

The changes to the simple assault provisions are self-explanatory: they make the offence more serious and place higher penalties on offenders. However, after discussions with the Police Association of South Australia, I decided to include 'resist and hinder' in the proposed changes after concerns that police officers were often injured, sometimes quite seriously, in the course of an arrest and that there was no adequate remedy when the elements of an assault could not be established. Following on from that, the bill creates specific offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to deal with assaults against police and emergency services workers and carries tougher penalties. I will go through the penalties shortly.

There has been a lot of public and private discussion about which workers should or should not be included in the definition of 'prescribed worker' for the purposes of these offences, and I would expect those discussions will be ongoing. They will be placed in the regulations after the passage of the bill. The rule of thumb in framing the regulations around these workers should, I think, be the general principle that these workers go into situations willingly, knowing that they may well be dangerous, in order to protect people, property and/or the general community, or administer emergency medical treatment.

Workers other than police who may be included in the regulations include ambulance officers and paramedics; members of the Metropolitan Fire Service, Country Fire Service or State Emergency Service, whether they work in a voluntary or paid capacity; and certain classes of nurses, other medical staff, corrections officers and youth training officers. Obviously, the discussions about who will be included in the regulations will be ongoing, and any mention I have made of specific occupations is absolutely not exhaustive or exclusive.

The offences are as follows. The first and most serious is causing harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of their official duties, intending to cause harm. This carries a maximum penalty of 15 years. At present, the corresponding aggravated offence in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act carries a maximum penalty of 13 years, so that is an increase of two years for that particular offence.

The next offence is causing harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties through a reckless act, which carries a maximum penalty of 10 years; assaulting a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of official duties, which carries a maximum penalty of five years, that is, for simple assault; and hindering or resisting a police officer acting in the course of their official duties. The maximum penalty for this is two years, as is currently the case; however, if harm is caused to that police officer, it carries a maximum penalty of 10 years, bringing it in line with the recklessly causing harm provision mentioned previously.

It should also be noted that the provisions in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act around serious harm, where the maximum penalty is 25 years, remain unchanged. However, increased penalties alone are not enough, particularly for offences in which harm is caused to the worker. Importantly, this bill makes amendments to the Sentencing Act, which, seen together, further underline the seriousness of these offences in the eyes of the opposition.

The first important change is that it puts any of those assaults or acts against police and prescribed workers that result in harm to that worker in the category of a 'designated offence' for the purposes of sentencing. This means that a sentence of imprisonment imposed by a court cannot be suspended if, during the five-year period immediately preceding the date on which the relevant offence was committed, a court has suspended a custodial sentence for this or another designated offence. In short, this ensures that anyone who has received a suspended sentence cannot have a custodial sentence suspended again.

I want to emphasise at this point that this proposal is not a mandatory minimum sentencing regime. As with other existing designated offences under section 96 of the Sentencing Act, the court retains the absolute discretion not to impose custodial sentences where it is not deemed appropriate. It simply means that anyone who has received a suspended sentence cannot have their sentence suspended again, assuming that the court has seen the offending as sufficiently serious to warrant a custodial sentence. This is why the next provision is so important; the two work in concert.

The bill further amends the Sentencing Act to make deterrence against these types of offences a 'secondary sentencing purpose'. This will ensure that a court, during sentencing, must

explicitly consider that the sentence imposed will serve to deter the defendant and others in the community from harming or assaulting emergency workers who are acting in the course of their official duties.

As I said, the government has been almost entirely silent throughout this debate. The Minister for Police has been completely silent, despite the fact that it is largely the workforce he is responsible for that will be affected by these changes. Indeed, it is members of his workforce who have been asking for these changes. For him not to have an opinion during a debate that has been going on for at least seven months is staggering.

We have all heard anecdotally about addresses where ambulances are reluctant to attend. I am advised that the increasing incidence of violence and aggression towards ambos resulted in the SA Ambulance Service instigating a high-risk address procedure, whereby addresses are red flagged as having previous episodes of violence or aggression and they will only respond with a SAPOL presence. Clearly, this situation is not ideal.

The advice I received from the ambos union was unequivocal: there is currently no deterrent in place that may make potential offenders think twice before attacking those who risk their safety in the protection of the community. You would have thought the health minister might have been concerned about this.

Finally, the Attorney-General was almost entirely silent up until very recently. She hurried to play catch-up and finally made some public statements last month about the nature of the government's response. I will not, of course, make any references to another bill that is before the house—I am very much looking forward to doing that—but her public comments reflect a government that is not listening and does not care.

The core of the Attorney's public statements was the proposal to clarify the status of the use of human biological material, such as urine, faeces and semen, in an assault on a prescribed worker. These comments came out of discussions with SAPOL, we understand; however, my advice is that the types of behaviour that the Attorney-General described already constitute an assault under the existing provisions and that harm resulting from these behaviours already constitutes harm.

Out of an abundance of caution, this bill clarifies those things and, by nature of the other provisions, substantially increases the penalties. Incidentally, it also makes this behaviour a designated offence for the purpose of sentencing when it results in harm. This week, we learned that assaults on police officers have increased by more than 8 per cent. It stands at a staggering 771 assaults over the 12 months to April this year. We on this side of the house say that enough is enough.

I want to be crystal clear that it is my intention—and, if this bill passes, it will be seen as the parliament's intention—that people who injure police officers, ambulance workers and other front-line emergency workers when they are simply trying to do their job protecting, serving, helping and treating members of the public will feel the full force of the law. Sentencing should be appropriate to punish these offenders and deter others who think they will get away with it with just a slap on the wrist. With the passage of this bill, those days are over.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

### **MOTOR VEHICLES (OFFENSIVE ADVERTISING) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2019.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:45):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes .....	23
Noes .....	17

Majority..... 6

## AYES

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

## NOES

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

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

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

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (10:52):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir, again on standing order 182:

A Member may move a motion initiating a subject for discussion only if notice of that motion has been openly given at a previous sitting of the House...

The exception is: 'With leave of the House, however, matters of a procedural nature,' which is an adjournment. The member has not sought leave.

**The SPEAKER:** I am reminded, member for West Torrens, of standing order 192: Order of the day, postponement:

Consideration of an order of the day on the Notice Paper for a future day may, on a motion duly seconded and without discussion, be postponed until some other future day.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I accept that, sir, but also standing order 182 requires leave.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my right, be quiet.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, I accept that, but standing order 182 requires leave.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hammond, be quiet. I am going to have to respectfully disagree with the member for West Torrens.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 23

Noes ..... 18  
Majority ..... 5

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

**ROAD TRAFFIC (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 July 2018.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:00):** I move:

That this order of the day be postponed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 22  
Noes ..... 18  
Majority ..... 4

AYES

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

NOES

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

## NOES

Picton, C.J.

Stinson, J.M.

Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried; order of the day postponed.

*Motions***ILLICIT DRUG USE**

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (11:05):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the state government's strong focus on preventing the uptake of illicit drug use, reducing the harmful effects of licit and illicit drugs and offering pathways out of harmful drug use;
- (b) supports the state government's position against pill testing at events;
- (c) notes that there is no pill testing regime that can test against the range of chemicals people might be ingesting;
- (d) recognises that there are a range of alternative strategies that can improve safety and reduce health harms at public events;
- (e) supports the safer music event guidelines to improve safety and reduce harms at events; and
- (f) expresses its appreciation to emergency services, including SA Ambulance Service and SA Police, for their efforts to improve safety and reduce harms at events resulting from the harmful effects of licit and illicit drug use.

Illicit drug use is a scourge on our society. Its effects can be devastating not only for those who use them but for their friends and families, as well as those who tragically become a victim, in some way or another, of an illicit drug user who is completely unknown to them. There is no doubt in my mind that each and every person who campaigns for one strategy or another to combat the effects of illicit drug use does so with the very best intentions and with the ultimate goal of bringing to an end the deaths that occur as a result of illicit drug use.

In an ideal world, there would be nobody who even considered using illicit drugs. However, as we all know, the world is not perfect. In recognising the unfortunate truth that there are people who use illicit drugs, the government provides a number of initiatives that seek to reduce the harmful effects of illicit drug use in our community and offer pathways for users out of their drug use. What the government will not do, however, is support a pill testing regime which will see the government sending the wrong message about illicit drug use.

This motion is important because it reinforces the point that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing has repeatedly made. To support and arrange for the testing of illicit drugs not only sends the message that the use of illicit drugs is safe, inducing a false sense of security for mostly young people, but also sends a message that the government is prepared to step in to make illegal activities safer for those who choose to partake in them. This would represent a fundamental shift in the role of government in Australia.

The role of government is not and should not be to make it easier or safer for people to break the law. Imagine a circumstance whereby, as part of a young person's driving education, they were taught methods of safe speeding. The first issue with this scenario is that it is completely incongruous with the well-established and I think correct practice that the government should not facilitate the breaking of its own laws. The second issue with this scenario is that speeding is inherently unsafe. To induce a misunderstanding that driving above the speed limit could be performed safely is dangerously reckless. As with illicit drug use, the consequences of such a misapprehension can be deadly.

In addition to the legal issues that pill testing could invoke, particularly in terms of any liability that we found to exist between a user and a tester, as well as the government, the reality is that, just as speeding is never safe, taking illicit drugs is never safe. There is no pill testing regime that is able to test against the range of contaminants or toxic compounds that people may or could consume. In fact, on-site drug testing is not particularly accurate and even proper laboratory testing, with specialist

training, could take many days and cannot test for potential high doses of substances such as ecstasy or methamphetamine that are often fatal on their own.

I have no reason to doubt those involved in pill testing in other jurisdictions who say that at no point during their testing process do they suggest to potential users that their pill is safe, but it is plain to see that an endorsement of pill testing is, at the very least, a passive message from government that it will not try that hard to prevent illicit drug use.

We often hear from advocates of pill testing that, after being made aware of some of the substances that make up their pill, young people, as the attendees of the types of music festivals where tragic deaths have occurred as the result of illicit drug use, often are more likely than not to consume the pill. This implies a sort of naivety on the part of the potential users and suggests that they were simply unaware of how dangerous illicit drug use is to themselves and others.

If we accept that naivety plays a key role here, then it should not be difficult to be concerned that a young person may naively believe that because the government is, in effect, facilitating their drug use it is therefore okay. If a person is so naive as to believe that illicit drug use is safe, despite the millions of dollars that are spent on awareness campaigns, they could surely be naive enough to believe that through endorsing pill testing the government is sending a message that taking illicit drugs is not as unsafe as it really is.

Conversely, where it might be said that naivety is not at play and that those who may consume illicit drugs have at least some knowledge that doing so is a risk to themselves and those around them, the question must be asked: what level of confirmation would they need to then decide not to consume their pill? If they have already made the decision to purchase a pill with the intention of consuming it, knowing that to do so could have a devastating effect, at what level of detail about their pill would they decide that it is too big a risk?

I hope not to be misunderstood. I am not arguing that those who consider using or, in fact, do use illicit drugs should simply be left to potentially destroy their lives and the lives of others. I encourage event organisers to follow the safer music event guidelines, developed through collaboration with Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia, South Australia Police and other stakeholders as a guide for event organisers to improve safety at their events.

Prior to the 2018 election, the Marshall Liberal government committed to a number of policies that seek to prevent and reduce harm from illicit drug use. I am pleased that the \$580,000 trial of the PsychMed Matrix recovery program is underway in the Riverland for two years and will be followed by an independent review that will inform the state government as it considers extending the Matrix program to other areas in regional South Australia that have been identified as being in need of such a program.

I am also very pleased that over the next three years the Marshall Liberal government is delivering a \$2.9 million drug and alcohol education package in South Australian schools. This is an important initiative that aims to ensure that young South Australians are aware of the risks associated with illicit drug use and the devastating impacts that can result if they ignore those risks.

These are the measures that the state government is implementing to combat illicit drug use. These measures are consistent with the principle that illicit drug use is dangerous and should therefore not be in any way facilitated by government. I thank our police and ambulance personnel, who work so hard to make sure that our community is safe and that the effects of illicit drug use are as minimal as possible. I am proud to be a member of a government that is resolute in its condemnation of illicit drug use and I hope all those opposite will concur. I commend this motion to the house.

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (11:13):** I rise to speak on the motion moved by the member for Newland in relation to illicit drug use in our community. Firstly, I will deal with paragraphs (b), (c), (d) and (e), then (f) and then I will come back for an extensive discussion of (a).

In relation to the first set of points that the member has raised in terms of pill testing, that is something we have not had a position of support on, both when we were in government and now in opposition. That is something on which we have obviously had advice from the police commissioner and that is why we did not bring that policy in when we were in government. I think one of the issues,

obviously, is not just whether it sends the wrong message, even if the pill did pass through the process of being tested, but also whether or not it could cause damage or kill somebody if it were ingested by the person. That is obviously a serious concern. I have not seen any way in which that risk is alleviated. Obviously, we will see what the impact of trials being undertaken interstate are, but currently it is not something that we are contemplating.

In relation to paragraph (f), we also share with the member for Newland our appreciation for those emergency services workers who deal with the impact of illicit drug use in our community, whether they be police officers, whether they be ambulance paramedics and officers or whether they be any other emergency services personnel. I extend that appreciation to social services and to the people who work in DASA and other drug and alcohol service providers as well, all of whom do an excellent job in helping those people who are suffering from addiction to illicit substances. Of course, we also need to consider alcohol in this equation.

Obviously, those services are under the pump. We know of the impact this has on police in dealing with issues that they are seeing in the community, but there are also massive issues that our health services confront. They are not easy to deal with. They are very difficult to deal with, so we thank those emergency workers and other health workers who do an excellent job in combating this issue.

I want to spend some time talking about paragraph (a) of the member for Newland's motion, where he is basically giving the government a big pat on the back and saying what a great job they have done on illicit drugs. Let's look at the facts. Let's look at what this government proposed when they came to office. I recall that the now Premier, the member for Dunstan, said before the election that he was going to have a 'war on drugs'. He promised that there was going to be a war on drugs if he was the Premier of South Australia.

**Mr Odenwalder:** General Vickie.

**Mr PICTON:** General Vickie would be, presumably, marshalling the troops. We have heard nothing basically since then. We have had no action in terms of illicit drug use from this government. What we have had are some pretty wishy-washy proposals. We have had the Attorney-General coming in here and trying to increase penalties for simple cannabis possession charges, including potentially making those criminal penalties, which was denounced by the community at large, and they have had to completely walk away from their commitment to do that.

We have had the member for Morialta say that he is going to send in the sniffer dogs to search schools. I do not think there is any evidence that any of that has happened, and all the evidence is that that is actually going to make no difference whatsoever to anything.

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**Mr PICTON:** Of course. The member for Elizabeth reminds me that the police have always had the power to do that. The police have always had the power to search if they wish to anyway. Of course, the police might have had some stronger demands on those services than the member for Morialta has had in mind. Of course, what they were proposing was only to cover public schools anyway. In private schools, apparently, there is no issue; nothing to see there. I do not think there is any issue that has been solved by the government's policies in that regard.

We also have the Minister for Health in the other place bringing in a bill to supposedly bring in youth treatment orders, although the bill he has brought in—I think it was about eight or nine months ago now—has been sitting around because it was shabbily drafted with no proper consultation and not properly thought through on how this would work. No proper funding has been allocated to it. No model of care has been developed for how these services would work. Basically, there has been no action in relation to that bill whatsoever.

We have this sprinkling of thought bubbles that the government had, with no actual action and no listening to the experts on what the issue is. At the same time, we know that the scourge of ice in our community is very serious. When we were in government we treated that very seriously. When we were in government we established the Ice Taskforce.

The now Leader of the Opposition (member for Croydon) was police minister and then health minister, and he was in charge of the Ice Taskforce. It spent a great deal of time consulting with



communities across the state, in the city and in regional areas. It talked to police, providers and families about what needed to be done. Out of that, we delivered some very meaningful projects that helped police and drug and alcohol services in the community. Importantly, it also helped families who were affected by the scourge of ice.

In terms of the programs that were outlined, we announced an extra \$3.6 million for outpatient counselling appointments; residential rehabilitation beds in the Riverland, Whyalla and Mount Gambier; \$1 million for SAPOL to conduct covert investigations to go after the people spreading ice in our community; and \$549,000 for two new police sniffer dogs, which commenced training at the beginning of last year. I believe that they are now in service. One of the great privileges of being a police minister is that you get to meet the sniffer dogs. They are fantastic, and they do a great job.

There was \$560,000 to double the number of state government-funded family drug support group sessions because we know that, if a family member is addicted to ice, the impact is not just on that one person; it affects the whole family. That is the role that the government should be playing—to step in to assist them. An amount of \$200,000 was also announced for a six-month Crime Stoppers campaign to stop the scourge of ice. Of course, we then followed that up with additional and ongoing funding for Crime Stoppers, which sadly this government has cut in its entirety.

There was \$287,000 to roll out mobile drug-testing kits for regional police officers. When I was police minister, I got to see these mobile drug-testing kits in operation, and they are fantastic devices. They will help police, particularly in regional communities, to undertake faster analysis of drugs that they obtain in the community and hence faster police work in terms of dealing with the people who are sadly selling and manufacturing those drugs.

We had the previous government taking action, consulting, putting in funding, helping the police to take on this issue, helping community providers with the rehabilitation that needs to happen to stop people after they have become addicted to ice and also helping the family members. It was a comprehensive package that was devised when we were in government. What have we had since then, in the 15 months since this government has been in place? Absolutely nothing. There have been thought bubbles about cannabis and chucking people in prison for having a joint, as well as sniffer dogs in public high schools, but no actual action on the big issue that the community is concerned about.

When the member for Newland says to this house that the state government 'acknowledges the state government's strong focus on preventing the uptake of illicit drug use; reducing the harmful effects of licit and illicit drugs; and offering pathways out of harmful drug use', show us where that is happening. Show us where there is any actual action being taken by this government in that regard, because we cannot find it.

We cannot see any evidence that the Premier is serious about his supposed war on drugs that he was so triumphant and almost Reaganesque about when he was leader of the opposition. It has basically fallen by the wayside and it has been replaced by these thought bubbles, when there are families out in the community who seriously want help for themselves to deal with not only the impact it has had on their families but also the people who are affected. This government needs to take this issue seriously and we want to see some actual serious action on this front.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (11:23):** I would like to commend the work of the member for Newland in introducing this motion:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the state government's strong focus on preventing the uptake of illicit drug use, reducing the harmful effects of licit and illicit drugs and offering pathways out of harmful drug use;
- (b) supports the state government's position against pill testing at events;
- (c) notes that there is no pill testing regime that can test against the range of chemicals people might be ingesting;
- (d) recognises that there are a range of alternative strategies that can improve safety and reduce health harms at public events;

- (e) supports the safer music event guidelines to improve safety and reduce harms at events; and
- (f) expresses its appreciation to emergency services, including SA Ambulance Service and SA Police, for their efforts to improve safety and reduce harms at events resulting from the harmful effects of licit and illicit drug use.

Again, I commend the member for Newland for his work on this. He has done an outstanding job. I know it is a big issue in his community, as it is in mine. We know that illicit drugs have a devastating effect on communities right across South Australia and that this flows on to families, friends and all people who are impacted by this very wide-reaching net when people are drawn into illicit drug addiction.

Our front-line SAPOL officers do a great job tackling illicit drug use in the community and the issues involving drugs across South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government and SAPOL are very committed to this battle against drugs, and I am proud that this state government has delivered some very strong action in its first 12 months or so. In fact, this was initiated in the first 100 days to give authorities the upper hand in the battle against drugs.

In my portfolio area, we know that criminals now find it harder to smuggle drugs into our prisons after new laws came into effect in March this year. We have given correctional officers the powers they need to disrupt the flow of drugs into South Australian prisons, and this was a very important part of the very strong stance that we took to the election and that we now have in government. We know that bikie gangs and criminal organisations use our prisons to recruit new members. They do this by trying to lure people into their nets and they then go out and reoffend and put the community at risk when they leave the prison system.

We are very conscious of cutting this off at the pass, and that is why we took some very firm action with new legislation that has made it more difficult for criminal organisations to get involved in the illegal drug trade. We took this very firm action to the election and then acted very swiftly when we came into government. However, the battle against illicit drugs is not one that can be fixed overnight, but the state government has a very strong focus on this battle in the short and long term to make sure that we do all we can to keep the community as safe as possible.

SAPOL conducts numerous operations throughout the year targeting illicit drugs in our community, and this includes stamping them out at recreational events, which is what the member for Newland has brought to the attention of the house. The notion of pill testing is fundamentally flawed because it essentially gives the green light to criminal organisations that are involved in the drug trade to continue pushing illicit drugs into the community. The concept of pill testing would normalise an illegal activity, and this is the wrong message to be sending to festival-goers and the wider community.

The prevalence of drug use at music festivals should not merely be considered as a lifestyle choice. SAPOL and the police commissioner himself have spoken about this. We always want to keep our young people as safe as possible whenever and wherever they go but, as the commissioner and SAPOL have rightly pointed out, testing a pill with the technology that is being discussed can only tell you what ingredients are potentially in there. Pill testing cannot tell you the levels or the impact it might have, and the pill then goes back to the person to make the choice.

If there are elements in the pill that could be damaging or, dare I say, fatal, without knowing the quantities and without knowing the details it is really hard to say. As the commissioner says, there is no way to safely test a pill. That is the flaw that is before us and that is why the member for Newland has moved this motion. It is something that we must be very aware of. To say that there is a safe amount of illegal drug that you can take really is dangerous, and this is something we are very conscious of and want to bring to the attention of this house.

There are alternative strategies to improve safety and reduce health harms at public events: targeted education campaigns and enforcement measures are capable of changing behaviour. We think that education and understanding the dangers around drugs are really important messages to put out to the community. For example, the most drastic rate of decline in smoking in Australia coincided with a targeted education campaign. That is how well these campaigns can work and the cultural change they can make. To have the mindset that taking illicit drugs is a norm I think is a very

wrong message to be sending. I know some of those on the opposite side of the chamber feel that that is acceptable, but I am not so sure that it is.

At public events, the presence of police officers, often as a deterrent to antisocial activity and illegal activity, is a very strong move. Again, I notice in this motion that the member for Newland talked about the safer music events guidelines to improve safety and reduce harm at events, and that is something that we are very focused on. When we talk about the user-pays model that we are moving forward, we know that some of these people running these events where there are potentially illicit drugs that will be used call on police to come and do that cover for them.

Police will always be there in their regular manner but, going forward, these event organisers will now have the ability to work with police to make sure that they have the right coverage that they need. They will be asked to pay for the extra services to have more police there. We do not want to take police, as happens now, away from the general public where they are doing their general duties and drag them towards these festivals and events because of the increased concern, just to help the event organisers. If they are putting on these events and need services over and above, they will be asked to pay for those services. It is something that we think is very important going forward.

Far too often, we have police officers at events, particularly rave festivals in recent years, and they have had to respond to incidents of distress caused by illicit drugs. Our emergency services personnel, including ambulance workers on the front line, know too well the devastating effects of illicit drugs and the negative outcomes they cause. I think all of the community is very much aware of this and that is why as a government we are making some very strong stands on this.

I know the member for Kaurua pointed out some of the things that the previous government did and that is fantastic. With a lot of our outputs we want to really now look at the outcomes and work out how we are getting the best outcomes to make sure that we are attacking this issue. We know it is out there in society and we need to be doing all we can, both in this city and in the regions. We need to make sure that we are addressing this right across our state.

SA Ambulance Service and SAPOL must be commended for their efforts. As I said, they do an outstanding job. They are normally on the front line and they need to deal with this. We know that in their capacity they improve safety at events and reduce harm caused by the distribution of illicit drugs. This drug use has a very antisocial outcome and these emergency services workers on the front line are truly to be commended.

The state government will continue to have a strong focus on preventing the distribution and use of drugs within South Australia and work in collaboration with SAPOL to stamp out this type of activity. Again, I want to take the opportunity to thank all the people at SAPOL. I know they work tirelessly, making sure that they do everything in their power to stamp out the use of illicit drugs. As a parent of young children, it is not something that you want to see.

I mention again the work that we are doing to keep bikie gangs and criminal organisations out of prisons, where we know a lot of the drug movement is perpetrated. The thought of people pushing drugs upon young people is one of the most abhorrent things we can think about. I stress again the point of making sure that we have that education, making sure we do not flower this up and say to people that taking illicit drugs is okay. It is not okay. It is not something that we want in our society. Again, I commend the member for Newland for the motion and for bringing it to the house.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Hammond, I welcome members of the Southern Volunteering team to parliament today, who are guests of the member for Hurtle Vale. The member for Hammond.

#### *Motions*

#### **ILLICIT DRUG USE**

Debate resumed.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:34):** I rise to support the motion moved by the member for Newland:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the state government's strong focus on preventing the uptake of illicit drug use, reducing the harmful effects of licit and illicit drugs and offering pathways out of harmful drug use;
- (b) supports the state government's position against pill testing at events;
- (c) notes that there is no pill testing regime that can test against the range of chemicals people might be ingesting;
- (d) recognises that there are a range of alternative strategies that can improve safety and reduce health harms at public events;
- (e) supports the safer music event guidelines to improve safety and reduce harms at events; and
- (f) expresses its appreciation to emergency services, including SA Ambulance Service and SA Police, for their efforts to improve safety and reduce harms at events resulting from the harmful effects of licit and illicit drug use.

We certainly made quite a range of election commitments in this field in the lead-up to the March 2018 state election. The then Marshall Liberal opposition at the time committed, when in government, to the following drug-related policy initiatives:

- a drug addiction rehabilitation program in the Riverland, the Matrix program;
- zero tolerance for drugs in prisons;
- limiting the number of drug diversions;
- keeping penalties in line with community expectations; and
- providing mandatory drug treatment for young people.

Our government, the Marshall Liberal government, is committed to improving health and wellbeing outcomes for all South Australians who are experiencing harm from illicit drugs. We will and we are facilitating new pathways into treatment, including through youth treatment orders and providing a legislative framework for young people with acute substance abuse problems with support for families who are struggling to have their children engage in treatment through voluntary mechanisms.

We have implemented a pilot of the Matrix drug treatment program in the Riverland. I want to talk about the Matrix program, which is an intensive outpatient addiction recovery program that provides group-based structured education and cognitive behaviour therapy for methamphetamine and IV heroin users across 20 weeks. The program requires weekly attendance in order to maintain focus and support. Groups are run by trained psychologists and co-facilitated by a recovered peer with lived experience. Delivered by PsychMed, this is one of a suite of alcohol and other drug treatment services commissioned by the Adelaide Primary Health Network.

Certainly in recent days we have seen it announced that the Murray Mallee General Practice Network has \$1.5 million in federal funding for drug and alcohol treatment services, some of which they will use to fund the Matrix program in Murray Bridge. It is anticipated that this program will start in Murray Bridge, in my electorate of Hammond, in August or September this year.

This program was first used in the United States. It has been used in the Riverland, and it is good to see that federal funding is being made available to bring the program into Murray Bridge. Right across the state the scourge of drugs does not pick and choose where you live, whether it is in urban Adelaide or our bigger towns and cities. It is a scourge right across the regions, and we need to do everything we can to save everyone, especially our youth.

In regard to pill testing, on 29 April 2018 the Australian Capital Territory government permitted Australia's first legal pill testing trial at the Groovin the Moo festival in Canberra. At that trial festival-goers were able to have their illegal drugs tested for chemicals by the independent consortium STA-SAFE. The trial did, as has been mentioned, raise a number of legal issues and uncertainty, including concerns over the legal consequences for patrons participating in the pill testing, as well as the legal liability of those facilitating and conducting the testing.

As the minister explained before, pill testing normalises the behaviour of people being able to take pills to events. They think, 'Oh, well, we will just get it tested.' From what I understand, we find that the evil people, the drug pushers, will blend materials. They can have terrible materials in there. Apart from the drugs themselves being totally harmful, the other additives that are put in these pills can cause quite a bit of harm.

I have raised this discussion at home. As the father of an 18 year old who goes out occasionally in Adelaide and around the place in the regions as well, I can say that it is not just music festivals where drugs are peddled. They are peddled on the streets, on the weekends, etc. I have a 15 year old as well, and I have given my boys a fairly stern talking to. They may not want to listen to their old man, but they do occasionally. I said, 'If you ever get involved, just hope the police catch you before I do.'

It is something that we have to be aware of. We cannot bury our head in the sand, but we do need to use legal outcomes to get the right outcomes. I have heard the arguments for pill testing, and I certainly do not believe they stack up. We need to use legal outcomes, and we can use them with educational and other programs to make sure that we keep kids and others safe.

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to working in an informed and focused way to address the wideranging community impacts that the misuse of alcohol and other drugs have on health, justice and child safety. It is important that we do recognise the progress that has been made in reducing the harm caused by substance abuse. Without that acknowledgement of our positive achievements, the community will not have hope that the problems we face will ever be resolved.

There is some data on the use of alcohol and other drugs that progress is being achieved in some areas. The data shows that fewer school-age children are drinking alcohol in South Australia, and the proportion of young Australians engaging in single-occasion risky drinking has decreased as well. The proportion of young South Australians with a reported use of cannabis has been decreasing since 2001.

However, we can never relax. I know a couple of families that have been torn apart by the use of methamphetamine or ice. It just leads to terrible results all around. An ice user believes they need to get more and more to feed their habit. From what I am told in relation to methamphetamine, nothing ever matches the first hit, so they keep chasing that hit, but it never happens.

I salute the way the families that I know have pulled in around their loved ones in some cases. However, in other cases, they just cut them free because they are on that path and hope they will be able to remedy it into the future. I commend the work that our government is doing. We must always be vigilant. We must get on board. We must always do what we can to help not just our young people but our citizens right across the state of South Australia.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:44):** I have asked many people in my electorate, young and old, for their thoughts on this idea of pill testing at events. I must tell you that I was surprised by some people's feedback. It has been really useful to hear people's thoughts on this issue and the reasons why they do or do not support pill testing. For those talking about their support for pill testing, I was surprised that there were more people supporting it than I expected, but the feedback was consistently along the lines that, since people are using drugs, we should introduce this to keep those using drugs safe.

The government's views on this are in line with my own after consulting my local community. The Marshall Liberal government does not support pill testing at events. We think that it sends the wrong message. Permitting on-site pill testing contradicts messages about the risks related to the use and possession of controlled substances. It also provides a false sense of security, as no pill testing regime can test against the range of chemicals that people might be ingesting.

Importantly, our government does have a strong focus on preventing the uptake of illicit drug use, reducing the harmful effect of drugs in our community and supporting the provision of appropriate intervention, treatment and rehabilitation services. There is a range of alternative strategies that can improve safety and reduce harm to health at public events, including the planning and management of events and close cooperation between event organisers and health, law enforcement and other agencies to minimise health and safety risks.

For example, the safer music event guidelines were developed by Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia, in collaboration with South Australia Police and other stakeholders, to improve safety and reduce harm at events. The guidelines recommend the provision of chill-out areas at events to provide well-ventilated, cool and quieter spaces for patrons to rest and recover, supervised by a staff member with first-aid training; the availability of free drinking water at multiple locations within events that are easy to access; dedicated, equipped and accessible first-aid locations; safe transport options to and from the event; and event organisers planning events early with emergency services, including the South Australian Ambulance Service and SA Police, to discuss any risks and implement strategies to reduce these risks.

On 29 April 2018, the Australian Capital Territory government permitted Australia's first legal pill testing trial at the Groovin the Moo festival in Canberra. Under the trial, festival-goers were able to have their illegal drugs tested for chemicals by an independent consortium. The trial raised a number of legal issues and uncertainty, including concerns over the legal consequences for patrons participating in the pill testing, as well as the legal liability of those facilitating and conducting the testing.

In the lead-up to the March 2018 state election, the Marshall Liberal government committed to the following drug-related policy initiatives: drug addiction rehabilitation in the Riverland, zero tolerance for drugs in prisons, limiting the number of drug diversions, keeping penalties in line with community expectations and providing mandatory drug treatment for young people. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to improving health and wellbeing outcomes for all South Australians who experience harm from illicit drugs. We will facilitate new pathways into treatment, including through youth treatment orders.

Providing a legislative framework for young people with acute substance abuse problems will support families who are struggling to have their children engage in treatment through voluntary mechanisms. When I was out doorknocking, my constituents gave me plenty of feedback about waiting lists that are too long when young people had made the decision to seek help and enter programs. This is something that I have been consistently following up with our health minister since being elected. It is incredibly important that, when someone makes the decision to seek help, they are able to get that help and not be on a waiting list that requires that vulnerable person to keep asking for help.

We have also committed to making amendments to the police drug diversion initiative to ensure that it is and remains an early intervention initiative. Individuals who are infrequently detected through this program will continue to access health assessment and intervention; however, adults who repeatedly access this system will no longer be diverted after their third infraction but will instead progress through the criminal justice system. Such an approach will preserve the intention of this initiative as an early intervention program.

Responses to illicit drugs in South Australia are informed by a number of strategic plans at the jurisdictional and national level, including the South Australian Alcohol and Other Drug Strategy 2017-2021, the National Drug Strategy 2017-2026, South Australia's Ice Action Plan 2017 and the National Ice Action Strategy 2015. It is good to see that there are some positive signs. The Marshall Liberal government is committed to working in an informed and focused way to address the wideranging community impact of the misuse of alcohol and other drugs on health, justice and child safety.

It is important that we recognise the progress that has been made in reducing the harm caused by substance abuse. Without acknowledgement of our positive achievements, the community will not have hope that the problems we face will ever be resolved. The data on alcohol and other drugs indicates that progress is being achieved in some areas. Fewer South Australian school-age children are drinking alcohol. The proportion of 12 to 17 year olds who had never consumed alcohol increased from 68 per cent in 2013 to 78 per cent in 2016. The proportion of young Australians engaging in single-occasion risky drinking has decreased.

The proportion of South Australians aged 14 years and older who reported use of cannabis over 12 months has been decreasing since 2001. Ecstasy use decreased from 2.8 per cent in 2013 to 1.6 per cent in 2016. There has been a decrease in the prevalence of methamphetamine use across Australia, from 2.1 per cent of the population reporting use in 2013 to 1.4 per cent in 2016.

Good mental health affects every aspect of our lives. It is widely accepted that there is no health without mental health. Increasingly, we understand that social and economic wellbeing is also inextricably linked to mental health. Good mental health not only enables individuals to enjoy meaningful and productive lives but also benefits the community and the economy. The benefits are felt across generations.

Keeping South Australians physically and mentally healthy is a very high priority for this government. Housing, education, employment and safety, along with the highest quality mental health and alcohol and drug treatments, are the supports of an effective mental health and alcohol and other drugs system. I will continue to advocate on each of these fronts to make sure they receive equal attention so that each of us can contribute to better lives.

It is excellent news that the federal Liberal government is working with us to tackle illicit drugs. The federal government is investing \$337 million over five years in a comprehensive drug strategy to address the supply of, demand for and harm caused by illicit drugs. This includes \$152 million for law enforcement agencies to reduce the supply of illicit drugs, including continuing to target outlaw motorcycle gangs, which are a key source of Australia's illicit drug supply.

Lastly, I want to note that research has established a relationship, albeit complex, between child sexual abuse and adverse mental health consequences for many victims. People often turn to drugs to cover up their personal pain and memories. According to research, negative mental health effects that have been consistently associated with child sexual abuse include post-traumatic symptoms, depression, substance abuse, helplessness, negative attributions, aggressive behaviours and conduct problems, eating disorders and anxiety.

More recently, child sexual abuse has also been linked to psychotic disorders, including schizophrenia and delusional disorder, as well as personality disorders. Child sexual abuse has many links to the use of drugs. That is another reason why I advocate to stop child sexual abuse in Australia. Thank you to the member for Newland for bringing this motion and topic to the house. We will continue to have a strong focus on tackling drugs in South Australia.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:54):** I rise very briefly to support the motion from the member for Newland. The point has been made, and I do not want to stay to discuss it at great length now, as there may be an opportunity to do so again in the future.

I want to emphasise that, insofar as there have been recent credible studies of the history of harm caused by the use of illicit drugs in various circumstances—we have had the emphasis on pill testing at music festivals—the evidence is that the harm and, tragically, in the worst of cases, the deaths that have been caused at these events have been caused not by impurities or so-called contaminants within the drugs but by the drugs themselves. In particular, the focus here is on MDMA, commonly known as ecstasy, and the chemical effects that drug has in causing related violence to the bodily functions, which then have caused, in the worst of circumstances, fatalities.

I do want to stress and put on the record that this is a concern to minimise and to prevent the take-up and use of the drugs themselves at events and in all circumstances. The notion that somehow it is impurities or other contaminants that are our enemy in all of this is not one that is founded on the evidence. I commend the member for Newland for bringing the motion and I commend the motion to the house.

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (11:56):** I would just briefly like to thank all those who have contributed to the debate on this motion, in particular the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, the member for Hammond, the member for King, the member for Heysen and also the member for Kaurana, who I was pleased indicated his support for the motion.

In brief, as the point has been made a number of times, pill testing very much sends the wrong message, in that it implies that an illegal activity can be performed safely and contributes to the normalisation of an activity we would like to see people do less of. Another important point is that the testing itself is limited, in that it has limitations in what it can detect in regard to contaminants and other toxic compounds, and it also has limitations in its ability to detect the quantity of the active ingredients.

The point the member for Heysen made was that the desired compounds are in and of themselves unsafe, which is one of the reasons why they are illegal, so to create the impression that this can be done safely through a pill testing regime is not going to have the effect of actually alleviating those risks that exist in conducting this activity in the first place.

I would also like to stress the point that we really need to thank our emergency services in relation to the impact that illegal drug use has on them, being right there at the front line. Police, ambulance and those who work in the emergency departments and so many other services really see the devastating impacts of these firsthand, some of which can be quite horrific, and I know that through my own personal experience of knowing people in SA Ambulance and some of the stories they have told.

Even the frequency of call-outs to these incidents is now right across the week, whereas in years gone by it tended to be more on Friday and Saturday nights. It now does not really matter what night of the week it is—there are call-outs to these kinds of incidents. We really cannot thank our emergency services enough in relation to the impact this issue has on them and for the work they do in essentially protecting the rest of us from the scourge of illicit drug use. I look forward to the support of this motion from all members of this place and commend it to the house.

Motion carried.

### **NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:59):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises National Volunteer Week 2019 from 20 to 26 May;
- (b) acknowledges the valuable contribution that volunteers make to the economic and social wellbeing of local communities; and
- (c) calls upon all South Australians to thank and show their appreciation to all volunteers in our community.

I will start by welcoming the Southern Volunteering team, who have come into parliament today as my guests. They do incredible work, some of which I will speak to in a moment. I thank them so much for everything they do every day to make our community better.

'Not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted counts.' That is a quote from Albert Einstein, and many of you would be familiar with it. There are lots of things that happen in our community that are hidden and unrecognised, and we cannot put a value on them, as hard as we try. However, it perfectly sums up the incredible hard work of South Australia's countless volunteers.

A tally of volunteers and their organisations in my electorate of Hurtle Vale resulted in a list literally as long as my arm, from Meals On Wheels, St John Cadets, Lions Club, Rotary, the Southern Men's Chat Group, CFS volunteers, Girl Guides, Scouts, Riding for the Disabled, local schools, community centres, aged care, retirement villages, sporting groups, car groups, church groups, social clubs, View clubs, Zonta—I could go on and on. There are also people helping out their neighbours, walking the dog, gardening, helping out people with children after school.

A whole range of formal and informal volunteering is going on in all our communities that we sometimes take for granted, so it is really great that we can come into this place and actually say, 'Hang on a minute. We don't take it for granted, particularly as members of parliament. We appreciate volunteers every day.' I wish I could thank every single volunteer involved in the groups I have mentioned, but I would be here longer than a day; I would be here all week, I believe.

South Australia's volunteers are represented by an outstanding peak body, Volunteering SA&NT. This is ably led by CEO, Evelyn O'Loughlin, who has had, I think, a quarter of a century of experience in both not-for-profit sector business as a leader and in her particular passion, where she has really made her mark, with volunteer groups through the peak body, Volunteering SA&NT. The board is chaired by Karen Buenger, who also leads a really great team.



The peak body does a great job of advocating for, leading and guiding our volunteers. They are, and they should be, the first stop for anybody wanting to know about the state of our state: a healthy state has a healthy volunteering culture. Here are just a few stats from the incredible team at Volunteering SA&NT: there are almost one million volunteers in South Australia, which is equivalent to 107,400 jobs, and it is worth \$5 billion annually.

It might surprise people to know that 15 to 17 year olds volunteer the most, followed by 35 to 44 year olds. I am sure some would think that is quite incredible but, knowing young people the way I do, it does not surprise me at all. The profile of today's volunteer is someone who is busy, who requires flexibility, and the modern youth volunteer—which, of course, encompasses all the Southern Volunteering people up there—is looking for high-tech ways to engage and get the job done.

In Volunteering SA&NT itself there is Volunteering Assist, where they match people up. There were 9,450 individuals who were assisted with volunteering inquiries in the last financial year, and there have been 6,350 positions actually advertised. There is an app called WeDo, initiated by the previous state government in October 2017 and downloaded 4,418 times since then.

It is the first volunteering app of its kind in the world, and makes it a lot easier to find volunteering positions and match what your skills are with the organisations looking for support—anywhere, anytime. With hundreds of positions advertised, there is one to suit everyone's time, commitment, skill and position. It connects volunteers and organisations and has proven to be a really great opportunity for that. The current government is supporting it as well.

I recently attended the National Volunteer Week parade and barbecue, together with our leader, Peter Malinauskas, and Corey Wingard, the member for Gibson and Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. We had a great time there, firstly doing the march up King William Street—some of you in the gallery were there—and then meeting many volunteers at the barbecue at the end. There were 1,200 registrations for that event, which is actually the most so far. It is estimated that there were at least 800 people who took part in that event, despite a bit of bad weather that was predicted, a few people pulling out and people not signing in. It is a credit to Volunteering SA&NT and it is a credit to volunteers.

Volunteers make an incredible economic contribution to South Australia. With so many various forms of volunteering, it is hard to quantify it, but volunteering is not about money and it really should not be measured by that. Volunteering is about giving, contributing and helping other individuals and the community at large. It is working with others to make a meaningful contribution to a better community.

People volunteer for a whole range of reasons: they want to gain experience and acquire new skills, some use it as a pathway to employment and some use it as a way of meeting new people and it breaks the loneliness. There is a whole range of reasons that people do that. However, most actually just want to give back to their community. They want to help a friend or promote a worthwhile cause or activity.

Volunteers do it because it makes them feel good. Volunteering makes you smile. I have volunteered since I was in primary school, and every time I volunteer I get something out of it. I meet somebody new and I learn something, and I am sure it is the same for all volunteers. That is the intrinsic value of volunteering, creating a vibrant, civil society that is dynamic, engaged and self-reliant. Volunteering brings a world of rewards that you might never have expected. Well-documented benefits of volunteering include positive impacts on affected communities and the advantages it brings to participating individuals.

Today, I would particularly like to celebrate Southern Volunteering (SA) Incorporated. It is a great organisation, established in 1984. At its heart, it is the volunteer resource centre for the south of Adelaide, the Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo Island. It has placed thousands of volunteers in positions. All this information I have been unpacking is preaching to the converted who are here today.

The Community Visitors Scheme has particularly caught my eye. It is an initiative that helps to establish and strengthen links between people living in aged-care facilities and their local community. It is coordinated by Southern Volunteering and is funded for 104 volunteers, I believe.

The scheme was developed as a way of enhancing the quality of life of residents in aged care by providing a one-to-one friendship and companionship on a regular basis.

The minimum commitment to undertake this, should anyone be interested, is that a community visitor volunteer should visit a resident for about 30 minutes per fortnight. However, I know, from talking to volunteers and staff in nursing homes, that there are not too many who visit just for 30 minutes a fortnight. People establish really solid friendships—and just try keeping them away.

The time commitment can depend on many factors, including the resident's health and their ability to sustain the company and the conversation. However, the volunteers who participate in the Community Visitors Scheme become very skilled, and they understand the person with whom they have made that friendship. They know when to walk away and how long to stay and volunteer with them.

Community visitor volunteers do a variety of things when they visit. Many simply chat in the person's room or they play games. They do a whole range of activities—I am sure that some do jigsaws—and go for walks around the aged-care facility. Also, some of the aged-care facilities now have cafes. Being able to spend some time sitting down over a cuppa really does emulate a natural friendship.

Volunteering is simply wonderful. It is a rewarding way to spend your time. I am so very proud to be the state opposition's spokesperson for volunteering. It is at the heart of what I believe makes a strong community. I am so glad to be able to use this motion to thank every single volunteer who helps our community and particularly every single person here today representing the Southern Volunteering Community Visitors Scheme and the Southern Volunteering board and staff. Thank you very much for making our state a wonderful place to live. I commend my motion to the house.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:10):** I, too, rise today in support of this motion moved by the member for Hurtle Vale, and thank her for doing so. The motion:

- (a) recognises National Volunteer Week 2019 from 20 to 26 May;
- (b) acknowledges the valuable contribution that volunteers make to the economic and social wellbeing of local communities; and
- (c) calls upon all South Australians to thank and show their appreciation to all volunteers in our community.

I would also like to acknowledge the volunteers we have here in the chamber today and thank them for the wonderful work they do right across our state. I was fortunate to speak on behalf of the Hon. Michelle Lensink from the other place at the launch of National Volunteer Week in 2019 last month in Victoria Square. There was the parade and the walk. The member for Hurtle Vale and the Leader of the Opposition joined me on this occasion, and it was wonderful to be there representing the government. Adelaide, of course, is the only city in Australia that blocks off its streets in the CBD for a parade like this and only Adelaide and South Australia could do such a thing. We truly value our volunteers and, in true traditional South Australian fashion, a parade is a great way to celebrate that.

The theme of National Volunteer Week in 2019 was 'Making a world of difference', and I must say that that is exactly what the volunteers in South Australia do. I would like to commend Volunteering SA and all the team behind the event for doing such an outstanding job. South Australia is fortunate to be home to so many volunteers who donate their precious time to the community to make it a better place, both within the city and in the regions.

We had almost one million people volunteer in South Australia last year. Together, they gave 1.7 million hours, which is the equivalent of 107,400 full-time jobs, which is worth about \$5 billion to our economy. As a government of whatever persuasion, there is only one thing you can say to that and that is thank you. Thank you for the service you give back to our community to make it a better place. It really is quite an amazing figure.

Volunteering is an integral way in which our communities operate, fostering community cohesion and supporting so many of the vital services that our communities rely on. I was lucky

enough to grow up in the regions and I know that was something that was instilled in me from my upbringing in the country communities that I was a part of. To come to the city and give back where I have in my adult life, and to see what the cities do as well, is truly amazing.

I am very proud to be part of a government that is making it easier for people to give back to their community, too. The Marshall Liberal government—and this is a really key point—has abolished volunteer screening fees. This is a really great policy that I am so proud of. I brought this up at National Volunteer Week and whenever I have gone around the community I have made the point that it is a way that we can say thank you and acknowledge the great work our volunteers do.

To remove those screening fees is just a little way to give back for some of those figures I was mentioning before. It will hopefully encourage the next generation of volunteers and keep the current ones going and involved in their community as well. It is a small thing, but it has been truly appreciated by volunteers, and I am very proud that our government initiated this for South Australians. The government has also committed to extending funding for the WeDo app, which connects volunteers to organisations that are advertising their volunteer positions. It is a great modern way to connect people to make sure that they can give back and see people who are in need of volunteers.

In my portfolio area of emergency services, I have been immensely proud of the success of the CFS's Project Renew. It has been \$5 million over two years, giving back to our volunteers. When I go out into the regions and visit our CFS brigades and see how their facilities have been left to run down, it is almost shameful in a way to see that they have not had this money reinvested into their facilities. To be able to go into communities and around the regions and say thank you to the volunteers who are putting their lives on the line, fighting fires and doing rescue operations in our local communities, and to give a little bit back is truly amazing.

The other week I was in Laura and Burra in the Mid North speaking to volunteers. It is amazing when you go there that these people do not want much. They are not saying, 'We need to rebuild this and rebuild that and have a new this and have a new that.' They are saying to us, 'Look, that little bit of money you are giving us means we can put new sheets of iron on top of our shed. The shed doesn't need air conditioning. We are not looking for anything like that. We can put some new sheets of iron on the shed to stop the leaks and we can refurb our kitchen because it has been left to deteriorate.'

They are so grateful, but again I stress the point that we are grateful to them for the work that they do. Likewise with the SES, and I know within the MFS and SAPOL as well, whilst they are paid organisations, the culture built within those organisations is invariably that they give back to a lot of other volunteer organisations.

We have also delivered \$420,000 in a commitment from the Marshall Liberal government to our surf lifesaving organisations. They do an outstanding job in our community saving lives on the beaches over the summer. When you go to any of the surf clubs it is such a great family atmosphere. I have a couple in my electorate at Brighton, Somerton Park and stretching down to Seacliff as well. It is great to see the family and culture being instilled in people.

Right from an early age, they learn how the volunteering culture works, and it goes right through to some senior figures in the clubs who are still there giving back. I think it is a wonderful culture. Again, to give back some funds to help them do the wonderful work they do is truly outstanding. Over the course of the next four years, every surf club will get \$5,000 to help with equipment and to make sure that they can keep doing the outstanding job they do. Their clubs, and the redevelopment of their clubs, have been a substantial project as well. Again, they create a social hub, a community hub, as do a lot of volunteering organisations.

We have already heard about what volunteers do over and above their immediate volunteering. A volunteering organisation does the task at hand, be it a surf lifesaving club, a CFS organisation, a sporting club, a Rotary club or a Lions club; I have many of those wonderful organisations in my community and I take a moment to thank them for what they do. I will not mention them all by name right now because there are too many to thank, but they do an outstanding job with the projects they do.

Over and above that, the real importance that is emerging more and more these days is the social inclusion they give. A lot of people across all ages are now getting online. You can now do so many things with your computer online, and people perhaps are not engaging socially as much as they once did, but volunteering organisations give people the opportunity to do that. That is a wonderful thing that volunteers and volunteer groups do over and above their immediate tasks. Of course, it is a pathway to employment and also people just generally like to help out in their community, so I thank very much for that.

I mention my portfolios in particular because police, emergency services, even Correctional Services and sport rec and racing are full of volunteers. These people give so many hours back to the community and do an absolutely outstanding job. The efforts of all volunteers are truly commendable and must be acknowledged. Over the course of the 2018-19 fire danger season, our CFS volunteers donated around 500,000 hours of their time to keep our state safe. It sometimes goes a little bit unnoticed in the cities. City folk do not notice that as much but, on the peri-urban edges of our city and, in particular into the regions, when you go out and meet the people who do this work, again to say thank you, you do notice how valued this work is.

I stress this point again. I was at a CFS group the other day whose facility is literally a tin shed across the road from a pub; unfortunately, this community is losing a few people and the pub is not open full-time anymore. When they first set up the shed, again with their graciousness and their gratefulness they said, 'We don't need a toilet in our facility. It is an extra cost and we don't need it. We can just go with a shed and, if we can park our truck in the shed, that's all we need,' and their shed was upgraded.

They said, 'We can just go over to the pub and use the facilities over there.' That pub is not open full-time anymore so they do have a need. They are trying to attract more members and, in particular, trying to bring in more women. Rightly they say, 'We can't bring people to this facility, especially women, without having a toilet.' It was a pleasure to be there and also to offer some money to upgrade it.

Within our sporting clubs, too, we want to get more people active and volunteers, coaching volunteers, administrators, team managers and first-aid people are so important, so a big thankyou to all those people right across the board. We know that our \$100 sports voucher is getting more primary school kids active and into sporting clubs, and that means our volunteers are doing more work. When I go to my local clubs, they are forever grateful. They love the extra work because it means more people are getting active and getting involved in their passion. These volunteers then are showing the way and leading the way.

Again, I commend the motion to the house. I thank all our volunteers right across the state for the wonderful work they do. I know on this side of the house in particular through the city and the regions we thank them so much. We cannot repay them dollar for dollar, but we can take every opportunity to thank them for the great work they do. Again, I commend the motion to the house.

#### *Matter of Privilege*

### **MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The SPEAKER (12:20):** Before I call the next speaker, I refer to a statement I made in the house yesterday concerning a matter of privilege raised by the member for West Torrens in respect of the Premier allegedly misleading the house in relation to an answer concerning funding to Brand SA. As part of the statement, I said the following:

The fact that Mr Joy chose to disseminate correspondence he had received concerning the government's movements on Brand SA funding cannot, in my opinion, be considered sufficient enough to be regarded as the government's announcement in relation to Brand SA's funding.

I would like to qualify those remarks by saying that I did not intend to assert that Mr Joy was the source of any leak but, rather, that correspondence addressed to Mr Joy found its way into the public forum. So I retract that assertion and I apologise for any inconvenience this may have caused Mr Joy.

*Motions***NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK**

Debate resumed.

**Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (12:20):** I stand in support of the motion moved by the member for Hurtle Vale:

That this house—

- (a) recognises National Volunteer Week 2019 from 20 to 26 May;
- (b) acknowledges the valuable contribution that volunteers make to the economic and social wellbeing of local communities; and
- (c) calls upon all South Australians to thank and show their appreciation to all volunteers in our community.

I also wish to acknowledge the wonderful work and valuable contribution of volunteers in our community, and I particularly want to acknowledge the wonderful volunteers in the electorate of Enfield. We have a number of fantastic groups that make a wonderful contribution to our community.

I particularly want to acknowledge a number of sporting groups that I have had the opportunity of visiting in the last month or so. I want to thank their coaches, their committee members, the barbecue chefs and a number of other volunteers who help around the various clubs, in particular the Broadview Football Club, the Kilburn Football and Cricket Club, the Ghan soccer club, the Enfield Tennis Club, the Enfield Harriers Athletics Club and of course the Little Athletics club—and they have a number of wonderful volunteers at Little Athletics.

I want to thank all the other sporting clubs that I will no doubt visit in the next few months with various presentations, particularly those that I have built a very good connection with already. I want to thank various other volunteers in my local electorate. We have fantastic church volunteers, school helpers, mums and dads who go to canteens and do reading at classes, RSL volunteers and a number of Neighbourhood Watch groups in my electorate as well, and they do wonderful work.

I want to particularly mention the Kilburn Community Centre and, in particular, a group of people there who run the Experience Cafe. The Experience Cafe won an Australia Day award in January. It is set up as a cafe to train people, so volunteers go there and get trained as baristas, chefs and waiters or waitresses, and it gives them an opportunity to learn skills to make them job ready. The fact that that cafe exists and is aimed at breaking the cycle of unemployment through volunteering I think is a fantastic thing for them to achieve. I want to thank Sophie, who is down there leading that group, and all the volunteers who are involved in the Experience Cafe.

I have personally been volunteering for many years in a number of organisations, mostly as a director or committee member, using my legal skills, in a number of not-for-profits. One I want to mention is Fearless Theatre, who do wonderful work teaching theatre to our youth, in particular migrants. Our last program was actually at the Cavan youth detention centre, and it was a huge success. That is a fantastic organisation, and I want to thank everyone else who volunteers with that organisation.

I am also a proud ambassador for Catherine House. Catherine House does fantastic work in providing accommodation and, more importantly, support services for women who find themselves homeless. Unfortunately, that organisation will be significantly impacted by the mental health funding cuts that will be announced in the 18 June budget by the Marshall Liberal government. However, there are a number of fantastic volunteers helping through Catherine House, and I am glad to be a part of that.

I stand here wholeheartedly supporting the motion by the member for Hurtle Vale. I wish to thank all the volunteers in my local community and more broadly. I support the motion.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (12:25):** I rise to support this very worthwhile motion. As they say, if you want to get a volunteer job done, ask a busy volunteer. That really does speak mountains about what volunteers

are about. I can attest to volunteering over a number of years as a young fellow in my sporting clubs and with my kids, volunteering, coaching and working behind the bar as part of the support team.

Obviously, we know that volunteers are the backbone of all communities, whether they be metropolitan or regional. Volunteers are the fabric of what regional communities are, and regional communities rely on them. Volunteers almost breathe life support into many areas of our regional communities. By and large, we are small pockets of people who rely on the goodwill and generosity of those volunteers and the skills they learn and create along their journey. They are mentors, they are generous with their time and they are normally respected and given the title of 'good Samaritan'. As a regional person, it is no more evident.

I do not like to put values on what volunteering hours mean to society because volunteers do not do it for the money. Volunteers do it because they care. Volunteers do it because they want to and because they are part of a progressive community. I acknowledge we have a group of volunteers in the gallery today. They are here to be acknowledged, to have some form of acknowledgement for the kudos that they present to their communities or to their groups.

We know that, particularly in the regions, many sporting groups and sporting clubs would not exist without the goodwill of volunteers. The reason all our large service clubs—Lions, Rotary, Apex, and I do not want to exclude any—are so successful is because of the goodwill and volunteering. There are community clubs. I have to mention the Men's Sheds. They are a great institution. Men's Sheds are more of a modern-day institution, and they are very successful.

They are not just there to volunteer their time: they are there to provide a service, whether it is helping in communities or being a sounding board and listening to issues, such as health concerns and mental health concerns of many. Some people are just lonely and need a group of people to come along and listen to them, or they need to be a part of a group of people so that they can contribute to their communities.

We know that hospitals rely on volunteers and schools rely on volunteers. The hospitality industry, particularly in regional community events, relies on the goodwill of those volunteers. Many of our commemorative events—whether it be ANZAC Day, Australia Day, Easter or just a gathering of the community—are surrounded by volunteers that make these events as good as they are, as great as they are and as memorable as they are.

Of course, we have to acknowledge the Fishwatch volunteers, who keep an eye on our oceans, making sure that they are there to help people who need advice or information so that people do the right thing and comply. We know environmental groups are keeping an eye on our environment, in regard not only to clean-ups and walking the roads but also cleaning up the waterways and some of our beautiful environmental assets. They are there cleaning up. Not only do they clean up but they do bird counts, fish counts and tree monitoring. They do all sorts of things that keep an eye on some of our environmental groups.

Of course, we cannot forget the sausage sizzlers, the people at our supermarkets, Bunnings hardware stores and sporting clubs, who give up their time to cook sausages to raise money for charity, sporting groups or community groups. We have to acknowledge the great work that volunteers do for charity because charities rely on volunteers to be successful. There are many volunteers in the great electorate of Chaffey, and I want to acknowledge some of them. There are a number of them: young, middle aged and some very elderly, but they are all there making a contribution to the electorate.

David Lodge was awarded the Premier's Certificate of Recognition for Outstanding Volunteer Service. This certificate rewards and recognises excellence and the significant achievements of volunteers. David was also awarded for his service to the South Australian Ambulance Service. Great work by David. Samantha Hauptman is a young woman who has dedicated many years of her life to volunteering and yet she is only 20 years of age. She is an outstanding Riverlander and was presented the 2019 Seven News Young Achiever Award in South Australia. She was a semifinalist in the Santos Regional Service Award, which recognises rural and regional young achievers who are helping to reshape and inspire their community. Samantha was also nominated for her volunteer work at the Renmark general hospital and her involvement in local medical research. Great work by Samantha.

John Pick is one of the Riverland's stalwarts, particularly in volunteering. He is a schoolteacher, but he volunteers countless hours at the Renmark Tintra Lawn Tennis Club. He was recently awarded the Volunteer Achievement Award at the Australian Tennis Awards. For over 25 years, John has devoted his time to a variety of roles within the Riverland Lawn Tennis Association and the Tintra Lawn Tennis Club would not be what it is today without the efforts of John. It makes him a very deserving winner of the Volunteer Achievement Award. John was also awarded a win after putting his own teaching career on hold and volunteering countless hours to ensure that children are given the opportunity of his tennis coaching skills. My children have received coaching from John. He is an outstanding community person. Thank you, John.

Christopher Ylia was recently recognised for 40 years of volunteering with the SES. Ian Jennings was recognised for 10 years of volunteering with the SES. Lesley Baldock and Allan 'Red' Johns, were both recently recognised for five years of volunteering with the SES. Beverley Gartery has been a long-time committed Riverlander volunteering for over 45 years at the Renmark Meals on Wheels. I know Bev personally and she is a great lady giving countless hours of her time to volunteering.

Helen Cenko is the 2019 Renmark Paringa Citizen of the Year. She is a life member of the Renmark Netball Club and the Renmark Tintra Lawn Tennis Club. Helen has volunteered for 15 years at Meals on Wheels, and the list goes on. She really is an outstanding contributor. Ellen Traeger received the Order of Australia Medal 2019. She volunteered as secretary of the Riverland seniors tennis. She was also a volunteer, co-founding the Caroline Bristow Wig Library in 2014. She has chaired the pastoral support program as well as information centres and many of the local sporting clubs.

Kym Manning, Berri Barmera Citizen of the Year 2019, has volunteered many hours to community work. William Gillett is 2019 Loxton Young Citizen of the Year. Great work by William. Howard Hendrick received the Order of Australia Medal 2019, and he volunteered at St Albert's Catholic School. He is a returned serviceman, a pilot, who has done outstanding work—a true representative.

Lorraine Fielke has also done great work as Loxton Citizen of the Year 2019. Celeste Newbery is the 2019 Renmark Paringa Young Citizen of the Year. Margaret Thiel has contributed 50 years of active volunteer work with the Ramco Football Club. Well done, Margaret. How could I forget Rosemary Gower? Rosemary has committed 20 years-plus to the Riverland Country Music Festival. Richard Coote, Coach of the Year, is an outstanding mentor. There are many more volunteers, too many to talk about. I thank all our volunteers for the great work they do, their dedication and community service.

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:35):** Those who volunteer in our community give something of themselves that is precious. They give their time, hours of it. Some give dozens, others give hundreds of hours of their time over months and years of their lives. They give each and every hour freely, often making personal sacrifices to do so. It is important to acknowledge the generosity of our volunteers and their value to our community. I support the motion moved today by the member for Hurtle Vale:

That this house—

- (a) recognises National Volunteer Week 2019 from 20 to 26 May;
- (b) acknowledges the valuable contribution that volunteers make to the economic and social wellbeing of local communities; and
- (c) calls upon all South Australians to thank and show their appreciation to all volunteers in our community.

I acknowledge those in my electorate of Torrens who give so generously of their time in a voluntary capacity. Of course, I will only be able to mention a handful because of time constraints today, but I will acknowledge them as future opportunities arise.

To begin, I acknowledge all those who volunteer in our schools in classrooms, libraries, on working bees and in supporting sports teams and the many other jobs that they carry out; the parents who serve on our school governing councils at Dernancourt R-7, Hillcrest Primary, Klemzig Primary,

Hampstead Primary, Vale Park Primary, Wandana Primary, Avenues College B-12, and Wiltja; also, the parent committees at Gilles Plains Children's Centre, Klemzig, Hampstead and Holden Hill kindergartens; and our Catholic and Independent schools, namely Kildare College, St Paul's College, St Pius X School, St Martin's, Pinnacle College, and Heritage College.

I acknowledge the Northfield Meals on Wheels team, some of whom have been preparing and delivering meals in our community for decades. I have volunteered with these amazing people, many in their 70s and 80s, who volunteer regularly on a weekly basis. I also acknowledge the many dedicated parents, grandparents and other members of our community who coach and umpire our local sports teams; those at Gaza Sports and Community Club, North Eastern MetroStars Soccer Club, North Adelaide Rockets Basketball Club, Adelaide City Football Club, Greenacres Tennis Club, North Eastern Knights Cricket Club, Northgate Community and Sports Club, Windsor Calisthenics, Eastern Districts Netball, Adelaide Warriors Cricket Club, Mega Courts Indoor Sports, and Matt Owens Tennis School; and all who volunteer in their clubs, canteens, on their committees, cooking barbecues and fundraising.

Thank you also to the North East Community House where the volunteers provide a range of programs and services to the community such as weekly Hi-noon lunches, regular bus trips, craft activities, computer club, yoga, tai chi and exercise programs for seniors. Thank you to Wandana Community Centre where respecting people from a diversity of backgrounds, cultures and genders is high on their agenda. The centre encourages personal growth and lifelong learning.

The Lions Club of Gilles Plains' motto is 'We serve.' The Gilles Plains Lions Club, of which I am a member, shares a desire to make our community better. They fundraise, sponsor two children through World Vision in Tanzania and Sri Lanka, and are also life members of the Australian Cranio-Maxillo Facial Foundation, having sponsored a child from Malaysia for a full facial reconstruction. The Gilles Plains and Hampstead RSL has a long history of serving our defence community and provides meals and recreational activities for returned service members and their families, as well as other community members.

The many volunteers at Technology for Ageing and Disability (TADSA) use their skills creating, modifying or repairing devices where there is no other solution readily available, and aim to improve the quality of life for people with disabilities. They also provide the Freedom Wheels program, where bicycles are modified for children with a disability who are unable to ride a regular bicycle.

Our Neighbourhood Watch programs include the Klemzig Neighbourhood Watch, Windsor Gardens, Dernancourt and Walkerville. These organisations bring neighbours and police together to resolve local issues, help create connected community, reduce crime and build safer streets. We have Dernancourt Community Garden, which is a unique community sharing a passion for gardening and the environment and growing some of the best vegetables—and I have to say some of the largest vegetables and fruit—I have come across.

Vale Park Our Patch is a community-based volunteer native revegetation and environmental education project along the banks of the River Torrens. Since 2000, Vale Park Our Patch has planted more than 30,000 locally native plants of at least 200 different species. They also develop educational biodiversity resources for Vale Park Primary School. Hillcrest Scouts are helping young people develop lifelong skills, grow in confidence and gain valuable leadership and team skills.

Then there is Holden Hill Community Centre, where the Holden Hill Men's Shed operates, solely run by volunteers who give their time to make everyone feel welcome and safe, often inviting new people to have a cuppa and a chat. Men's Sheds—and I have to say ours also includes days when women participate and hold their own classes—are so important in our communities to support people coming together to share activities and common interests, often helping support men's mental health.

The Molinara Social and Sport Club is a place where families can meet and where the traditions and customs of Molinara can be taught to their children. There is always something happening at the Molinara club, including pizza and pasta nights, New Year's Eve dinners, concerts, Mother's Day dances and other activities, and they are working very hard to encourage young people to continue.



We have the Nimble Fingers craft group, who meet at the Greenacres library and have been doing so for more than two decades. These ladies volunteer their time to knit, crochet and sew. They make clothing and cards, and they spend quality time together. They donate the things that they make to women and children fleeing domestic violence situations.

Then there is the Enfield Horticultural Society, who have made me their very proud patron and are bringing together members of our community who have a love of gardening. They really are amazing green thumbs. Their autumn and spring shows are not to be missed, nor are the tea, coffee and cakes that they serve. I never walk away without purchasing a selection of plants for my garden, usually those that are hardy and need very little attention.

We have the Northgate Oakden Residents Association (NORA), which provides a voice for local residents, and the North East Community Assistance Project (NECAP), which provides financial and material support to families and individuals in hardship. They also operate a volunteer-run low-cost op shop with clothes, furniture and household goods.

There are many more organisations in my electorate of Torrens, but because today time does not permit and I know that there are others who want to speak, I will address and acknowledge those when the opportunity arises.

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (12:43):** It gives me great pleasure to rise in support of this wonderful motion from the member for Hurtle Vale that shines a deserving spotlight on the vital contribution volunteers make to the economic and social wellbeing of communities, most especially in regional communities, where residents particularly rely on the help of each other for services more populated areas take for granted.

Last night, I had the great pleasure of hosting a dinner here in Parliament House for 17 of my fellow members of the Kadina Apex club. They are all proactive members of the community who give up their free time to assist individuals and groups in the Copper Coast. It is with great pleasure that I can be part of that wonderful group that does so much for our local area.

At the recent Kernewek Lowender, which is an event I talked about in here recently—another major event on Yorke Peninsula run by volunteers—we were kept busy dismantling and setting up stages, shifting chairs at events and marshalling for the cavalcade of over 500 cars and motorcycles. The support the club gives at multiple events is particularly noteworthy, that being just one example.

Apex also upgrades local playgrounds and last year constructed a tree-climbing feature in the Kadina town square. That has been an immense hit with the local kids in the area, who spend a great deal of time climbing up and down that wonderful new playground in our local town square. It was a tremendous fundraising effort by the Apex club to make that sizeable playground a reality for the local area and to continue to upgrade our local town square, which is becoming quite the focal point in the Kadina CBD.

The Apex club also awards incentive scholarships to local young people to help them study and raises money for other deserving causes. Last year, the president of the club, Adam May, led the charge to raise over \$15,000 worth of hay to send over to drought-affected farmers in New South Wales. They drove a big flatbed truck all the way to New South Wales full of locally sourced hay funded by donations from local people. It really was a tremendous effort to help support farmers doing it tough in some difficult times.

Another major project that has been running for a number of years and is supported by the Apex club of Kadina is the Copper Coast Retreat. This was another mammoth job to tackle, but it is all running smoothly. The Copper Coast Retreat is a facility that helps people suffering cancer to have a free holiday at Wallaroo on the beachfront or to have somewhere to stay when they are doing tough. They have now built three of these wonderful retreat villas.

They are partially funded by the Apex Outback Postie Bike Ride, an initiative set up by the Apex club. This year, it crossed over the \$1 million mark in funds raised over 10 or 11 Postie Bike Ride events. It is a three-day ride up and around the Flinders Ranges on quite a number of old postie bikes, which do not necessarily have the suspension or the gears one would normally expect would be required for a ride up and around the Flinders Ranges.

Nonetheless, they spend three days riding up around there, and each person raises as much money as they can. It costs a minimum of \$500 per rider in order to qualify to be part of the Postie Bike Ride. I have to make special mention of Andrew Venning, a local Kadina Apex club member. In his 10 years of the Postie Bike Ride he has raised in excess of \$100,000 by himself. It is truly a mammoth effort.

The Copper Coast Retreat is a wonderful initiative that is really appreciated by those who are doing it tough with cancer and cancer treatment. They need all the support they can get. It is a wonderful project that the Kadina Apex club has been involved in. They do a wonderful job, and it was wonderful to host them here for dinner last night, and I know that they send unanimous and strong compliments to the chef for the food they were served. It really went over well. So well done to all Apexians in the Narungga electorate and across the state, as well as to all community groups, such as Lions and Rotary. The value of your contribution cannot be measured.

National Volunteer Week is a good opportunity to thank our hardworking volunteers. Last week, I was pleased to join a morning tea gathering of volunteers hosted at Minlaton by the Yorke Peninsula Council. The Yorke Peninsula Council invites all volunteers from around the council area for morning tea and coffee as a way of saying thank you for the contribution they make. Representatives from the coast guard, ambulance volunteers, progress associations and a whole raft of different volunteer groups were there, and I was pleased to be able to join them, to have a chat and say thank you for all the work they do, so thank you to the YP Council for inviting me along.

I also got the opportunity to attend a volunteers thankyou event at the SOS Copper Coast at the Kadina youth centre. I had the great honour of presenting a Premier's Certificate of Recognition for Outstanding Volunteer Service to SOS Copper Coast Chair, David Boots, who has done so much for the cause of preventing suicide, as have the other volunteer committee members in the Copper Coast Suicide Prevention Network and all equally committed volunteers associated with the SOS Yorke Suicide Prevention Network.

These networks are achieving great things to highlight the services and help available to local people and families struggling with mental health issues. They are teams of volunteers who provide on-the-ground support for the sadly rising number of people impacted by suicide. It was wonderful to present David Boots with that certificate, as he has done so much for that area.

So many services across the electorate could not be provided to rural communities without volunteers who care for the people who live in their town and district and who sacrifice many hours of personal home time to try to make the world they live in a better place for fellow community members. I presented David with his award at the Kadina Youth Centre, a centre that SOS Copper Coast members have worked hard advocating for, raising funds for and creating from the ground up.

It officially opened last year, and I am told that it is going from strength to strength, with increasing numbers of youth using the centre every week. It is obviously filling a needs gap and changing the lives of young people on the Copper Coast. As I mentioned earlier, David is indeed a special volunteer who combines his hours of service for SOS Copper Coast with paid employment as a teacher and a considerable commitment of hours as a regional coordinator for volunteer ambulance services—another substantial and critical role, particularly in regional South Australia.

Moonta National Trust branch members were also recognised during National Volunteer Week with a Premier's Certificate for Outstanding Volunteer Service. I congratulate Peter Ferguson, Barbara Bagshaw and Stephen Stock, who received their certificates at a volunteers' barbecue at Moonta on 23 May. Mr Ferguson has been a volunteer with the branch for 47 years, Mrs Bagshaw for 45 years and Mr Stock for 42 years—all incredible terms of service to the Moonta National Trust. Mr Stock has been chairperson of the committee since 2004 and deservedly received an OAM last year for his volunteer service to the Moonta community. What an outstanding effort by all these people, further demonstrating care for the community they live in and which is a better place because of their amazing contributions.

Friends of Innes and Troubridge Island also received recognition during a visit a couple of weeks ago to Innes National Park from the Minister for Environment and Water, the Hon. David Speirs, for the hard work they do in protecting the natural and cultural heritage on Yorke Peninsula. It was pleasing to join the minister in the hall at Stenhouse Bay to celebrate the work that the Friends

of Innes National Park do and to meet the great volunteers who have propagated and planted thousands and thousands of plants, making previously ugly areas a beautiful part of the natural landscape. It was wonderful to join the minister there and I thank him very much for the time he spent down south.

There are more than 5,000 volunteers across SA who do so much work as friends of parks group members, legwork that is impossible to do without volunteers. On behalf of the Narungga electorate, with all its amazing natural beauty, I thank you all and reassure you that your efforts are appreciated.

There are volunteers across all sectors: firefighters; ambulance crews; nursing home visitors; people who man museums and visitor information centres; drivers of health buses; people who raise money for the disadvantaged and work in charity organisations; those who board our sea rescue vessels; those who are first on the scene at car accidents; progress associations who advocate for projects and see them through; and coaches, administrators, timekeepers and scorers across all our sporting clubs. I pay tribute to you all to mark 2019 National Volunteer Week and commend this wonderful motion to the house.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:52):** It is always great to get up and be in furious agreement, and especially in furious agreement when it comes to some of the country members opposite. That is in no way to undervalue the voluntary efforts that occur the city, but voluntary efforts in country South Australia take on an incredibly special role. As the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development said, they form part of the fabric of country communities. When you get into some of the smaller communities especially, it is not just a case of volunteering but a case of having to do those things that are taken for granted in larger communities, a whole raft of roles that we do not expect people in larger communities or the city to undertake.

Volunteering is incredibly important across a whole range of areas, including health, education, emergency services and various service clubs, such as Lions, Rotary, Apex and others, and sporting organisations. Without voluntary effort, many sporting organisations in country communities and in the city would not exist. I am very mindful that in my community of Whyalla we have a number of football clubs coming up for their 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary. That is 100 years of voluntary effort that has gone into those sporting organisations.

Friends of the parks and Landcare groups have been mentioned, and they perform an incredibly important activity. Men's Sheds are a more recent innovation that play an important role in a number of country communities. We have organisations like the RSL in country communities and in the city who depend upon voluntary effort, as do organisations like Legacy. When you have a vast electorate, it is very hard to start picking out people because there are a lot of people you could pick out in an electorate greater in land mass than Germany, so I will give some concrete examples.

Last week, I was in the community of Kimba. It was a cold day and it was raining, but it was actually great to see the rain. I was there for the opening of the palliative care rooms at the hospital in Kimba. It is a measure of the changing times because those rooms were where the surgery used to take place, but that does not happen in those hospitals these days.

The community got together, along with the staff of the hospital, and the voluntary effort that went in has produced something that the community can be proud of. It is a difficult thing when it comes to palliative care, but they now have a really good space for the community. They were able to get some federal government money, but without that community effort and without that voluntary effort they would not have done so.

I spent Friday, Saturday and Sunday in Cowell, partly on constituency work but partly to get in and support another great voluntary effort. One of the local farmers Francis Beinke died of leukaemia, and the community got together, especially the Beinke family—there are probably more Beinkes in Cowell than there are Smiths; they are an incredibly impressive family—to organise a fundraiser. All the effort put in by the Cowell community, and by Whyalla and other places, to raise money for leukaemia was something to behold.

Darryl Durdin of Whyalla Scaffolding came down with a work crew to do the scaffolding and build the stage at no cost. The Beinkes gathered from far and wide. Some people might know of the

Beinkes, who are an incredibly talented family. They had multiple rock groups on that night, and covered some other genres as well, and the musicians were nearly all Beinkes and their extended family. As a result of that night, over \$16,000 was raised in Cowell for the Leukaemia Foundation.

As the local member, it is always great to go to an event like that and to do your bit in terms of promotion and other support. Even though in some respects it was a sad occasion, out of that sad occasion the voluntary work that went in was fantastic. It is never a hard job to be in a good community at the Commercial Hotel, which was packed, to drink and listen to exceptional music. That is an example of the sort of thing that happens very readily in regional communities.

We had a debate on drugs here earlier today, and I want to mention Karen Harrison of Whyalla, who started the Whyalla Ripples Support Group. She started the Ripples group in Whyalla because her daughter got caught up with ice, but fortunately she came through to the other end. That has been a fantastic support group in Whyalla. They have held forums attended by over a thousand people and they do all sorts of things in the community. But, importantly, they assist people to get through some incredibly difficult times, whether it is parents, grandparents or extended family members who have been exposed to the ice epidemic in regional communities. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

#### *Petitions*

### **STATUTES AMENDMENT (ABORTION LAW REFORM) BILL**

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson):** Presented a petition signed by 107 residents of South Australia requesting the house to vote against the Statutes Amendment (Abortion Law Reform) Bill in any form.

### **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.

### **TOD RESERVOIR**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders):** Presented a petition signed by 366 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to open the Tod Reservoir for the purposes of recreational fishing and general usage by the public on Eyre Peninsula.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today year 6 students from Tatchilla Lutheran College, who have been hosted by the member for Mawson. Welcome to parliament today. I also welcome Brett Hudson MP, a National member of the New Zealand parliament, who is a guest of the Premier. Welcome to you.

### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

### **PAPERS**

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Motor Vehicles—Reduced Registration Fees—Prescribed Amounts

*Parliamentary Committees***LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:05):** I bring up the 20<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time***MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:06):** My question is to you, Mr Speaker. On what basis did you arrive at your initial conclusion that Mr Peter Joy chose to disseminate correspondence from the Premier you referenced in your ruling?

**The SPEAKER (14:06):** I believe that the member for West Torrens is referring to the statement that I made yesterday in the house about the matter of privilege that he raised from the last sitting week. Can I advise members that, since making that statement, I have received correspondence this morning from Karen Raffan. In an email to me, she lists a letter that has been signed by Mr Peter Joy.

I have had time to process that and reflect on the statement that I made yesterday. I consequently made a statement to the house this morning where I in fact apologised to Mr Peter Joy, and I also clarified one of the assertions that I made yesterday. So I will not be making any further comment on that matter, other than to refer the member to the statement that I made in the house this morning. Can I say that I received that letter, I believe, at about 11 o'clock or just after. I was in the chair until near 12, and I responded before 12.30.

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** Fair enough. Very responsible.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I agree, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee, the member for Wright and the Minister for Energy and Mining are called to order.

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:08):** I have another question for you, sir. Did you rely on evidence from the Premier's office for your statement to the house yesterday when you stated that Mr Joy chose to disseminate correspondence from the Premier?

**The SPEAKER (14:08):** I refer the member for West Torrens to my earlier statement.

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:08):** My further question is to you again, sir. Did you contact anyone from Brand SA before making your ruling on the matter of privilege to the parliament on Tuesday?

**The SPEAKER (14:08):** Member for West Torrens, we can do this for 58 minutes if you like. I refer you to my earlier statement.

**Mr Malinauskas:** But that didn't answer those questions.

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition is warned.

**NATIONAL PARKS**

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:09):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is increasing investment in our parks system to create opportunities for both enhanced visitor expectations and conservation?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:09):** I thank the member for Finniss for his question, and happy World Environment Day to all members of this house. What a great day to spend some time reflecting on the incredible environment we have in South Australia, but also the huge responsibility we have as members on both sides of this parliament and across political parties and individuals to care for our natural environment, to invest in it and to nurture it so that it is here to enjoy today and also for future generations.

It is good from time to time to reflect that, while these days might be a bit contrived, I think it is important to actually take a moment to think about what having a healthy, thriving, natural environment means, and why there is so much responsibility for governments and elected representatives to look after our natural environment.

It was fantastic this morning to be with the Premier down at Glenthorne Farm, at the centre of the future Glenthorne National Park, to plant some trees with local primary school students and the Friends of Glenthorne, the group that, like so many friends groups across the state, puts so much of their time and their volunteer hours into caring for the natural environment, and that's a really great thing.

The investment that was announced this morning really is a turning point for national parks and wildlife in this state. After a downward trend and the investment that our national parks have enjoyed in recent years, we have been able to come up with a substantial package of investment that will value these environments and invest in them, no more so than the \$6 million that was pledged this morning as part of the 2019-20 state budget towards the creation of the Great Southern Ocean Walk, which will activate and bring to life the stretch of the Heysen Trail that lies between Cape Jervis, on the tip of the Fleurieu Peninsula, and Victor Harbor, in the electorate of the member for Finniss.

We see an incredible opportunity to replicate what has been a huge success experienced with respect to other walking trails across our nation and in our state. Walking tourism is an important part of our visitor economy, and we know that by attracting walking tourists to South Australia they will be able to enjoy our natural environment, fall in love with it and tell their friends, and experience it at a very intimate level. So the activation of the Heysen Trail between Cape Jervis and Victor Harbor, the creation of this multiday walk, is great for our environment and great for the local Fleurieu economy as well.

As well as that announcement, our package of funding includes \$3.3 million for our Parks Restoration Fund—investing in our national parks and trying to clear some of the asset maintenance backlog which has befallen our national parks in the last decade or so. Looking across the state at those great assets, some 21 per cent of our state is preserved in our reserve system, and we want to make sure that their assets are up to date, that their toilets, their signage, their walking trails and other amenities are at a standard where people will be able to visit them safely, enjoy them and, again, share that experience with their friends and their families, not just in South Australia but across the world.

We also announced a further \$2.5 million towards investment in Glenthorne National Park, that great project in our southern suburbs. Today is about recognising the value of South Australia's environment and saying that it means a huge amount to South Australians. We recognise that, and this government is investing in the value that is our great natural environment.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens.

#### **MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:13):** Thank you, sir. My question is to you. In light of your qualification of your remarks regarding your ruling on the Premier's statement in relation to cutting funding to Brand SA, will you now revisit the question of the privileges motion against the Premier?

**The SPEAKER (14:13):** The short answer is no. Whilst the member for West Torrens is entitled to ask these questions, I referred to a statement that I made in the house yesterday concerning that matter of privilege to which the member is referring, and as part of the initial statement I made some comments and, in quoting my original comments, I said:

The fact that Mr Joy chose to disseminate correspondence that he had received concerning the government's [decision] on Brand SA funding cannot, in my opinion, be considered sufficient enough to be regarded as the government's announcement...

In relation to that dissemination part, I qualified those remarks, and I did say today that I did not intend to assert that Mr Joy was the source of any leak but, rather, that correspondence addressed to Mr Joy found its way into the public forum, which it did. And so I retracted my earlier assertion and I did apologise—it is on the record—for any inconvenience that was caused to Mr Joy. I have nothing further to add. The member for West Torrens.

*Members interjecting:*

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

#### **MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:15):** My question is to you, sir. Were you aware that the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Mr Jim McDowell, advised Brand SA on 8 May—eight days before the Premier's statement to the parliament—that Brand SA's funding would be cut before the Speaker made his ruling?

**The SPEAKER (14:15):** I refer the member for West Torrens to my earlier statements.

#### **BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:15):** My question is to the Premier. Was the Premier aware that his chief executive, Mr Jim McDowell, had informed Brand SA chair, Mr Peter Joy, on 8 May that their funding had been cut?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:15):** Thank you very much to the member for West Torrens for his question. I don't recall dates and times of decisions being made, but the reality is that the decision regarding Brand SA funding—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —is the decision of the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. What had happened for a long period of time was that Brand SA had been funded out of a contingency that sat within DPC. We don't know the reason for that. We don't know the reason why the previous government didn't see fit to fund it via a department, where it logically would have sat. They funded it out of—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the Premier's personal contingency. We gave instruction—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to Brand SA 12 months earlier, when we rolled over that funding, which didn't sit within the previous government's budget—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** No, sorry, it didn't sit within the previous government budget; it sat within an annual contingency arrangement, and we made it very clear that they couldn't rely on that money going forward. Ultimately, a decision was made—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition is warned and the member for Kaurna is called to order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —with regard to Brand SA, and that was conveyed to Peter Joy. On this issue of what is stated in the lead-up to a budget, I would refer this house back to the

precedence, the practice for a long period of time. I remember when I was in opposition, asking plenty of questions to the then government, asking them, 'Will this be a cut?' or, 'Will this be an expenditure?' and I heard time and time again, 'You'll need to wait until the budget.' Then, the next day, on the front page of *The Advertiser*—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —they would be there!

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** This is a very interesting situation.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurana is warned. The member for Reynell is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I referred the question that was given to me to statements made by the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment (Hon. David Ridgway) in the other place, and he said that all will be revealed in the budget. This is common practice. This is absolutely common practice. Of course, it will no doubt continue to be common practice going into the future.

#### **BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier make public statements claiming he wasn't sure if Brand SA had received his correspondence of 16 May when he knew his chief executive, Mr McDowell, had informed Brand SA on 8 May that their funding would be cut?

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, that question is laced with commentary and argument; consequently, I am moving to the member for Waite.

#### **SCHOOLS, YEAR 7 REFORM**

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:19):** Thank you so much, sir. My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the transition of year 7 to high school?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:19):** I'm very pleased to be able to update the house on this. I thank the member for Waite for this question because I know of his interest in his local schools. The member for Waite joined the Premier and I when we visited Mitcham Girls High School recently, which is one of the three schools that are pilot schools. Indeed, I think there are old scholars in the house.

It is a pilot school that is one of our three schools that is not just moving year 7 to high school in 2022, along with the rest of South Australia, but is offering it next year for families who wish their child to take the opportunity that is available to students around Australia, in the Catholic system in South Australia, and in many of our R-12 schools, area schools and a couple of 7-12 schools that we have in our public system already.

The only cohort of students in Australia remaining in year 7 in a primary school setting is basically some of our independent schools and the state public schools. The reason that this is a concern is that our schools offer the Australian curriculum, and year 7 in the Australian Curriculum is designed to have subjects taught by subject specialist teachers in subject specialist environments, such as one receives in a high school. Our students are a year older than they used to be. It's a very 20<sup>th</sup> century model of schooling that the Labor Party in government insisted on maintaining.

How has the community responded, as demonstrated in these three pilot schools? The last time we identified this issue in the house, we were very pleased to announce that these three schools were offering the opportunity for parents to express their interest or not, and that time has now passed. In the member for Frome's electorate, the John Pirie Secondary School received



98 expressions of interest from families in that community. I know the support that the member for Frome has given, and Roger Nottage, the principal at John Pirie, has done great work with his local primary school principals.

In the member for Hurtle Vale's electorate, there is Wirreanda Secondary School. I was at the school with the member quite recently and that school is very excited. Indeed, their social media and their posters will demonstrate the excitement of their students to be receiving year 7s at that school. That school is ready and the families in that area are ready as well, with 112 families in that area seeking the opportunity for their child to do year 7 in a secondary setting at Wirreanda next year.

But the member for Waite knows that that almost pales into insignificance in numbers compared with Mitcham Girls High School, where 161 families are seeking the opportunity for their child to do year 7 in a secondary environment next year. Principals Caroline Fishpool at Wirreanda Secondary School and Linda Baird at Mitcham Girls High School have worked with their school councils and school communities to get their schools ready. The enthusiasm that those staff and those schools have for this project and this pilot is tremendous.

When we were at Mitcham Girls High School, we talked to some of the year 6s who are going to that school next year, which was also great. Whenever we visit primary schools in these areas, there has been the opportunity to also talk to some of the year 6s. These kids are excited about this opportunity. It was wonderful hearing their enthusiasm for it along with that of their parents.

This has been a long time coming. This could have been done years and years ago by the former government, but they preferred to play politics with the issue. They preferred to say this was something that the member for Unley was arguing for and the Liberal Party was arguing for, so they told their senior executives, 'No, we don't want a bar of that.'

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The Marshall Liberal government is now moving on this issue. It is important. It is for the benefit of our students. It is to give our students the best possible start in life, to give them the best possible support to fulfil their potential through their education, to ensure that our education system and all of our schools are delivering a world-class education and to meet the needs of South Australia's students going forward.

#### BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:23):** My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier make public statements claiming he didn't answer a question in the parliament because he was unsure if Brand SA had received his correspondence of 16 May and Brand SA had made public statements saying that they were informed on 8 May?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order: introducing that level of information without seeking the leave of the house is disorderly.

**The SPEAKER:** I'm going to allow the Premier an opportunity to answer the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:23):** I refer the honourable member to the previous statements that I have already made on this topic. They have been well canvassed and well replied to.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left continue to interject. If this continues, members will be departing the chamber. The member for Badcoe is warned for a second and final time. The Leader of the Opposition.

#### BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier decide to cut the funding to Brand SA despite its substantial proven success?

**The SPEAKER:** Proven success? Could that be taken to be argument?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24):** I'm happy to answer this—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has the call. Members on my right, be quiet.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —although it has been well canvassed before, sir. We thank the people of Brand SA, who took over the responsibility from Advantage SA, who took over the responsibility of SA Great here in South Australia, for the work that they have done, but we have formed another opinion on the best way to spend advertising and promotion dollars on behalf of the taxpayers of South Australia. That is a legitimate decision made by an incoming government.

The previous government made an art form of spending a lot of money here in South Australia, mainly in the lead-up to state elections. Nobody can ever forget the millions of dollars the government spent on advertising Adelaide to the people of Adelaide in the lead-up to the—

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, there is a point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The Premier is debating the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —2014 election.

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, one moment. The member for Lee has a point of order.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, sir. The Premier is debating.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for debate. There is a point of order on the point of order.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The member asked why was a decision taken. That gives the Premier extraordinary scope and that was the focus of the—

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. Any member is entitled to raise a point of order. I do believe that the Premier's remarks thus far have been germane to the question; however, I will listen assiduously to ensure that they remain on that path. Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. What I am trying to outline to the parliament is a difference in approach between the former government and the new government. I was giving an example of the way that the previous government loved to spend money in South Australia, and some of the idiotic ways they did it, promoting Adelaide—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to people living in Adelaide in the four weeks leading up to the 2014 election.

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

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It didn't make a lot of sense when you would go to the movies here in Adelaide and they would be flashing up 'Come to Adelaide.' I was thinking while I was looking at my GPS locater, 'I'm here. I'm here.'

**The SPEAKER:** Has the Premier finished? The member for Lee has a point of order. I've got a feeling it is going to be about debate.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It is clearly debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is respectfully starting to deviate, if he can come back to the substance of the question, please.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The point that I am trying to make is that whilst the previous government wanted to spend money, which I would assert was very politically motivated in the lead-up to state elections, we by contrast think, 'What is in the best interest of the taxpayers of South Australia?'

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Is it best to advertise internally in South Australia when you're wanting to grow the size of your economy—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —by bringing more money in from outside the economy, or is it best to actually spend your taxpayer dollars outside the South Australian jurisdiction, aimed at selling the fantastic story about our state, the changed narrative about our state, to those people residing outside South Australia? So we make no apology whatsoever, no apology whatsoever—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —for promoting South Australia in Sydney and Melbourne and Brisbane and Perth and other places because we've got a great story to sell to the rest of the nation. What we heard for 16 years was a terrible negative: blame game, fake fights, sending investment dollars out of our state. Since we've been elected, the people around Australia say it is a changed narrative—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —in South Australia.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** South Australia is open for business. It's a new dawn. It's a new dawn for the people of South Australia and we will work hard every single day that we are on the treasury bench to advance the cause of our South Australia, not the cynical expenditure of hard-earned taxpayer dollars that we saw over the previous 16 years.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Badcoe was on two warnings and continued to interject during the Premier's answer and she can leave for the remainder of question time. When she does, the Leader of the Opposition will have the call.

*The honourable member for Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:*

#### **BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** My question is to the Premier. When did the Premier take the decision to cut the funding from Brand SA?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28):** I don't recall that date.

#### **SOLAR ENERGY**

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:28):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on the development of large solar in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:28):** I thank the member for Elder for that very important question—again, another important question on World Environment Day. Large-scale solar energy, which the member for Elder asked me about, is actually growing very significantly in South Australia. We on this side of the chamber

understand how very important it is to get the generation mix right in South Australia and, in fact, across the nation. The previous government, as we all know, pushed in a real helter-skelter fashion. They saw wind energy and wind energy only as somehow their—

*Mr Duluk interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite said something about diesel. He is called to order.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Somehow they thought that that would be their saviour. The problem is that they were trying to save themselves. They weren't trying to save the plight of South Australian electricity consumers, who were suffering for years and years under their failed energy policies.

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, sir: debate.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for debate. I do not uphold the point of order. I will also point out that the member for Giles continues to interject, and I know he is passionate about this area. I ask that to cease so that I can listen to the minister's answer, and I will be listening to ensure that he does not deviate into debate.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The well-documented failures of the previous Labor government did one thing: they told all of us not to recount their mistakes, not to make those same mistakes over. So we are doing in government what we said we would do from opposition; that is, we would focus on getting the energy generation mix right.

Wind is important. Yes, it's here. We will make the most of it. But gas will be with us for a very long time as well, and solar is taking an ever-growing share of our energy mix in South Australia—a renewable energy source, very importantly. We have heard recently in the media of the 280-megawatt solar farm at Cultana near Whyalla, which GFG Alliance is looking to build. We in government have given them development approval. They have recently just appointed a contractor to proceed with that very important—

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** That is a very important development. As I said, our government has given development approval to that project. The proponent has now chosen a contractor, and we are very optimistic that this important project will proceed.

We have seen the Bungala project, now towards the completion of stage 2. We hope that stage 3 will proceed. There are two projects proposed near Napperby and Nelshaby, so Upper Spencer Gulf is really lifting and carrying the weight in this regard. It's very pleasing from my perspective to have asked and had the member for Hammond accept to do the official opening of a new large-scale solar farm in his electorate at Tailem Bend, and by all accounts he did an absolutely outstanding job in his own electorate opening up a very important new project.

Why are we seeing more of this large-scale solar? Well, as I said before, based on the failures of the previous government, industry, public, everybody knows that we need to get the mix right. This can't be a one-trick pony, as the previous government want it to be. We need a range of generation sources in our state. Another very important aspect is the South Australia and New South Wales interconnector.

Solar farm proponents—in fact, a wide range of large-scale renewable energy generation proponents—are coming out of the woodwork in response to our intention to have a large-scale interconnector between New South Wales and South Australia. The opposition very inaccurately and unfairly characterises that as just an extension cord to New South Wales. We will—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: it is clearly debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Has the minister finished?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We will export far more renewable energy from South Australia into New South Wales than we will import. It will be very successful.

#### BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33):** My question is to the Premier. When the Premier's Chief Executive of DPC informed Mr Peter Joy that Brand SA's funding was cut, did he do so with the Premier's approval?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:33):** I genuinely believe we have canvassed this issue in plenty of detail. There are assertions which have been made in the parliament today which I don't necessarily agree with.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There has been an assertion today by the member for West Torrens—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kurna, Member for Lee and the member for Ramsay, if I see anyone flash what I think is a prop, they will be departing the chamber immediately.

**Mr Picton:** A piece of paper?

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, props.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** I don't know what you did at uni, but that's no prop.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There is an assertion which has been made in the parliament today by the member for West Torrens that there was a decision made and conveyed to Brand SA on a certain date. I have no knowledge of that, so I am happy to go and discuss that with my department, and if there is anything that I need to come back with and update the house on then I will do so. But I hope the assertion made by the member for West Torrens is accurate, otherwise he may have misled the parliament.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: I ask the Premier to withdraw and apologise for that last assertion.

**The SPEAKER:** If the Premier or anyone else starts to say that someone may have or may not have misled the parliament, we are on ground that I don't think we want to get into for the dignity of the house. So I ask members not to put those kinds of remarks on the record. Would the Premier like to withdraw just that final statement?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Happy to withdraw, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

#### BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35):** If the Premier was not aware of any conversation—

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** Is this a question or—

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Yes.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Education can be seated because I am not going to take a point of order until I hear the entirety of the question.

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** We will see if he changes it.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Energy and Mining is warned. The Leader of the Opposition.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question, as I stated, is to the Premier. On whose authority did Mr Jim McDowell inform Mr Peter Joy that Brand SA's funding would be cut if it was not yours?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36):** I refer the honourable member to my previous answer.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurua, and then we will switch to my right.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Leader of the Opposition, be quiet, thank you. The member for Kaurua.

### MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (14:36):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Has the government consulted mental health clinicians or mental health service providers or consumers on the impact of its 25 per cent cut to mental health providers?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:36):** Can I make a comment on this. The Labor Party's continual lies regarding cuts to mental health services is absolutely outrageous and shameful.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, please be seated. The point of order is about lying?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** 'Lies' is an unparliamentary term, sir, and it should be withdrawn.

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

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

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** It is unparliamentary to say that a particular member has lied—

**The SPEAKER:** A member has lied, not a party.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —not a class of members.

**The SPEAKER:** However, I again ask members to reflect on whether this type of language is appropriate to maintain the dignity of the parliament and if we could perhaps rephrase in another way. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I am happy to rephrase it, sir, but what I say to this parliament and the people of South Australia is that there has been no cut whatsoever—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition can leave for 20 minutes under 137A.

*The honourable member for Croydon having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to mental health funding in South Australia. The way that the Labor Party has characterised the transfer of funding from the state jurisdiction to the federal jurisdiction has caused massive—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —anxiety and frustration with some of the most vulnerable people in South Australia. It is nothing short of shameful, and members opposite should hang their heads in shame.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morphet and the member for Wright are called to order. The member for Wright is warned.

### **YAMBA QUARANTINE STATION**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:38):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on the state government's infrastructure upgrades at Yamba quarantine station?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:38):** I thank the member for Hammond for that very important question. He knows as well as I do how important biosecurity is to our horticulture sector here in South Australia. What I can say is that the Marshall Liberal government has further strengthened biosecurity here in South Australia with a further spend of \$1½ million in upgrades to the Yamba quarantine station.

We currently have works underway. There are large amounts of infrastructure improvements up at the quarantine station, roadworks to provide new entry and exit points into the facility, together with truck layover, line marking and signage and the development of new site offices for that facility. There are minor works that are in train as well—lighting upgrades, footpaths, installation of bollards—and a new security system will also be undertaken.

It's imperative that South Australia upholds the strictest biosecurity measures, particularly in combatting the pressures on our borders. Our borders are seeing a continual increase in pressure, not only from the east but also from the west. But when we are talking about the quarantine station at Yamba, we are seeing in anticipation the added pressure on our Queensland fruit fly. We have just eradicated the Queensland fruit fly outbreak at Loxton, but sadly we have had another incursion at Lindsay Point.

Lindsay Point, for those who don't know, is in Victoria. But the 15-kilometre exclusion zone comes into South Australia, and that is now putting more pressure on the horticulture sector. Sadly, the citrus industry has just kicked off, and for some of those horticulturists who are impacted by this fruit fly outbreak it means that they will now have to cold sterilise and fumigate their produce. It also means that logistically none of that produce to be packed can come through the non-exclusion zones.

What it means is that we, as a government, now have to further bolster our biosecurity measures. Not only have we put \$1½ million into the upgrade of Yamba but we have increased the signage. We have increased the number of fruit deposit bins on the Sturt Highway. The zero tolerance approach is working. The culture has been historically that we would have people continually coming into South Australia, continually coming from the west, the east and the south into the Riverland, bringing fruit and vegetables. That culture has to stop. To do that, the zero tolerance approach is what this government has seen best fit to make sure we reduce that pressure.

We are now issuing on-the-spot fines. We are now not being used as fruit deposit bins. We are now making sure that people get the message through the education programs, making sure that the signage is there loud and clear, making sure that there are bins that people can put their fruit into so that they don't put a \$1.2 billion horticulture industry at risk. What I can say is that the eradication at Loxton was successful. The eradication at Lindsay Point is now underway. It's imperative that people coming into South Australia uphold the biosecurity laws that we have in place.

The Marshall Liberal government is serious about keeping biosecurity as an absolute top-of-agenda item. As the minister, I will continue to enforce those biosecurity measures because we know that #RegionsMatter.

### **MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:42):** My question is to the Premier. Premier, will state-based mental health NGO programs be subject to a \$6.8 million, or a 25 per cent reduction, in their funding from July or not?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42):** I have already answered this question. As I said, I find it deeply disturbing that those opposite are not listening to the basic logic of what has occurred.

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurana is interjecting during the Premier's answer and he is warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** So I would like to take this opportunity to make it crystal clear, and then after I have made it crystal clear it will be very interesting to see whether those opposite are prepared to do the honourable thing and to go out and correct the record—

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: imputing improper motive to the opposition every time we ask the Premier a question.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. By the Premier asking whether members will do the honourable thing, the member for West Torrens has taken it to mean that it may be imputing that they may be acting or will act in a way that is inconsistent with the honourable thing.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point. I think it's on the edge. I ask the Premier to come back, however, to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. I will outline to the house in detail what has occurred. I find it almost impossible to believe, though, sir, that those opposite do not understand this, but here we go. First of all, there has been no reduction in funding for disability or mental health services as characterised by the member for Kaurana in his question only moments ago.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Secondly, \$6.8 million has been transferred to the NDIS to cover the services for those clients who are eligible for transfer to the NDIS.

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurana is on two warnings again.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Funding that was previously under the state jurisdiction for these clients—as the clients transfer to the NDIS, so too does the funding. That's precisely what has occurred. I am informed that 25 per cent of clients in the Individual Psychosocial Rehabilitation Support Services (IPRSS) program have been approved for NDIS funding, and state funding for those clients is now being transferred.

**Mr Picton:** The programs are full.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Kaurana can leave for the remainder of the question time.

*The honourable member for Kaurana having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I make that point, sir—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, please be seated; there is a point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The Premier is being provocative in his answer. The shadow minister for health is asking the government questions, and when we do you just punt him, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens not only fails to make a relevant point of order but he continues to make an impromptu speech. He can leave for the remainder of question time.



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

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader can also leave for the remainder of question time.

*The honourable member for Port Adelaide having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond can leave as well, and so can the member for Mawson for the remainder of question time for saying that this is a protection racket.

*The honourable members for Hammond and Mawson having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I have outlined, patients are transferring to the national system. The funding allocated to those patients is transferring to the national system. This is exactly and precisely how the system was designed. This is exactly and precisely how the system is meant to work. This is the system that, by the way, was actually negotiated—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Reynell are warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —by the former federal Labor government with the former Labor state government. Now we have those opposite arguing against the deal that they set up, which we supported—

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

**The SPEAKER:** I am trying to listen to the Premier respectfully, member for Lee. I had the member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Reynell interjecting during the answer. I will listen carefully to the Premier's comments. Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. I go on to say today and assure the people of South Australia that no current mental health clients in SA Health-funded psychosocial programs should be disadvantaged as a result of the NDIS transition arrangements. We are committed to funding these psychosocial services—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale and the member for Reynell are warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —for those people with severe mental health illnesses who are not eligible for the NDIS services.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale can leave for the remainder of question time in silence.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** What the member for Hurtle Vale doesn't understand—

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

*Members*

#### **MEMBER FOR HURTLE VALE, NAMING**

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is named. You are named.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I move that the member be given the opportunity to apologise and/or explain her remarks.

**The SPEAKER:** She is automatically given that opportunity. Member for Hurtle Vale, would you like to do so?

**Ms COOK:** Thank you for the opportunity to address what has just happened while we were sitting here, listening.

*Members interjecting:*

**Ms COOK:** Why don't you just wait. I am explaining what happened and then I will have the chance to apologise. While I was refuting the remarks being made by the Premier, which are not based on any fact that I have heard from people in the community, I was ejected by you. I accept that. But, as I am walking out, if I am going to be provoked by the Premier with my title as I leave the chamber, I am going to turn around and tell him. However, I apologise for doing so and I withdraw that part of the statement.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:48):** I move:

That the apology be accepted.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Sir, as per the standing orders—

**The SPEAKER:** Manager of opposition business, there has been a motion. We can proceed in one of two ways. The member for Lee sprang to his feet. I am in the house's hands. The member for Lee has moved that the apology be accepted. Is that seconded?

**Honourable members:** Yes, sir.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** Sir, there is a 10-minute debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, 10 minutes each side.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Irrespective of who moves, there is a 10-minute debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Would you like to take that opportunity now?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** If you are allowing the member for Lee's motion, then he can speak.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I have allowed the motion. Would the member for Lee like the first opportunity?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, sir. I do not think it will come as any surprise to members that I could characterise this question time as being perhaps a little heightened compared with other question times. I am not sure why. Perhaps that heightened temperature might be the result of a matter that was previously raised before the house that has inflamed some members' anxieties in their approach to question time today. As a result, we have seen a relatively unusual, although not unprecedented, line of questioning to yourself, sir. We have also seen a line of questioning to the Premier about a matter of privilege that was raised. Of course, it was a very grave issue.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: the rules of relevance as to why the member for Hurtle Vale's alleged apology should be accepted surely apply to this. The member's use of this time to make reflections on yourself is utterly obstructive to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask the minister to sit down. I will hear the member for Lee.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Thank you, sir. I will not ask for an extension of time to my 10 minutes. I put it to you, sir, that we have had a level of emotion in this question time that we perhaps have not seen for some time in this place. I note that a number of my colleagues on this side have already been ejected under standing order 137A, perhaps reflecting that heightened sense of tension within this place.

I understand that the member for Kurna, apparently the Premier and certainly, as we have now learned, the member for Hurtle Vale are most sensitive and most concerned about the issue of mental health funding and whether or not it has been reduced. Certainly, the preceding line of questioning and this particular line of questioning have led to some members feeling so passionate about this. We have already had comments made by the Premier. We have had comments made by the member for Kurna—disorderly as they were and ruled as such by you, sir—and subsequently by the member for Hurtle Vale.

Mr Speaker, I do not question your capacity and your ruling to choose to eject the member for Hurtle Vale. It is well within your rights and, as we know on this side, unfortunately not unprecedented for you to exercise your right under standing order 137A to make it clear that you believe that a certain level of behaviour is disorderly to the point where a member should leave the chamber. That is exactly how you ruled for the member for Hurtle Vale. I think it is unfortunate that, as she was leaving the chamber, she was in receipt of some—what should we call them—farewell remarks from those opposite to me in this place, what might be referred to in sporting parlance as a send-off.

I can imagine that that does not excuse the member for Hurtle Vale's outburst. In that light, it certainly does not cast any shadow on your ruling that she be named, but I think you can understand the context under which this situation has occurred and the escalation of the tensions that has occurred during question time today. Within that context, I do not think it is unreasonable that this house considers the conduct of the last 50 or so minutes and understands how this situation came about.

For somebody who is, in comparison with many of us, not completely but relatively new to this place—I might be wrong, but to my recollection this is the first time that she has experienced this certain turn of events, if I can put it so euphemistically—while she might have committed the offence to the house, she has sought, at the first opportunity, to make her explanation an apology to this place. I do not think that it is unreasonable, not just from the perspective of members sitting on this side but from the perspective of members sitting on the other side, that the explanation, the apology, be accepted.

I certainly point out to those sitting opposite, particularly the member for Morialta, who I gather is about to make the contribution on behalf of the government, that there have been occasions both within this session of parliament and the previous session of parliament when members have conducted themselves in a similar vein and the apology has been accepted by the government of an opposition member—not always, of course, because I was on the receiving end of a non-acceptance of an apology, but I took my lumps. I do not think those lumps need to be made here, and I do not think the member for Hurtle Vale needs to be made an example of in this manner, Mr Speaker.

I would call on the Leader of Government Business (member for Morialta) and all those whom he represents, to come to a similar mind in understanding how we have got to this place and that the explanation was valid, the apology worthwhile and worthy of acceptance.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:55):** I oppose the motion for a number of reasons, and I will just go through a couple of them. I want to set out that, when the member for Hurtle Vale interjected continuously, you exercised your right under 137A, having warned her on more than one occasion, as I recall, to ask her to remove herself from the chamber.

She crossed the blood line, which has its own significant traditions, and as per the manner of Speakers across Westminster democracies, and certainly in this parliament, you named her for obstructing the business of the house by interjecting strenuously against the orders and the good order of the house.

Then, as is proper, she was given the opportunity to explain and to apologise. She made an explanation of why she was concerned about the topic. The merits of that notwithstanding, she then did not, in my view, give a real apology. In fact, the clue is that she said that if this matter were to be argued, she would stand up for herself, or words to that effect. She certainly left me with the impression that she would do it again if the same circumstances arose.

An apology to the parliament should be unconditional. It is a matter for the house if the house determines by majority vote to accept an explanation or an apology. In my position here, there was a naming of the member for West Torrens some little while ago, and he gave an explanation which was regarded by some as provocative. Certainly, his behaviour beforehand I do not think anybody objected to or suggested was not worthy of being named, yet I took the view that we would accept his apology.

He did not say in his apology that he would do it again, and that is one key difference. However, even in my nine years in the house, other managers of government business or leaders of the house, in other circumstances which were similar to that, saw members named with their explanations not accepted. That was the lenient end of any government approaching these apologies or explanations for being named.

The member for Hurtle Vale, as the member for Lee says, is new, although I note that there are double-digit members of the house who are newer, who did not conduct themselves in that way, who did listen to the rules when the Clerk explained that you do not not only interject out of your seat but shout across the chamber as you are being ordered by the Speaker to depart. It is an obstruction of the house when you seek to actively undermine the Speaker's authority, and not understanding the rules, for members of parliament who are supposed to be representing their constituencies and holding themselves to a standard as community leaders, is no excuse.

It is certainly not worthy of the non-apology we received from the member for Hurtle Vale being accepted on this occasion. The member for Lee describes this as a suggestion that the member for Hurtle Vale is being made an example of, and I think that it is unfortunate that he suggests that that is the case. There is a simple set of procedures that is followed when any member of this house conducts themselves in the manner that the member for Hurtle Vale did, which I have just outlined, and it is exactly the procedure that is now being followed.

The fact is we all bear upon ourselves the responsibility—the member for King reminded us of this just yesterday in this chamber—to comport ourselves in a manner that our communities can look up to, that schoolchildren who might be visiting in the gallery should not be ashamed of but instead would see us as role models. I think the member for King made an excellent point yesterday. I have a strong sense that across our community all the misbehaviours by people in the conduct of their public duties need to be looked at very seriously. We all need to look at ourselves and do better.

This chamber has a certain robustness that has never accepted the behaviour. Even if we were not thinking that it was appropriate to lift the standard of behaviour in this chamber—which I think we should be seeking to do and which I know, sir, you have been seeking to do—even under the most robust of arguments in this parliament in the past the member for Hurtle Vale's conduct over the past 20 minutes would have resulted in exclusion by a government of any stripe. There is no reason for there to be an exception today.

The member for Lee made further remarks, which again I think were potentially close to the line, about the reasons why members of the opposition had, in his view, been removed from the chamber. The fact is that members of the opposition and a member of the government continued to interject, and in some instances, it is arguable, they undermined rulings made by the Speaker. You cannot do that.

The Speaker has the authority to enforce the rules of this parliament, and he has the support of this parliament to do so. He certainly has my support in his endeavours to lift the standard of behaviour in this chamber. I certainly argue that the member for Hurtle Vale's explanation—I would not characterise it as an apology—not be accepted.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:01):** I thank the member for Morialta for his comments. He is right, in part, in characterising the member for Hurtle Vale's behaviour as unacceptable and not in accordance with standing orders; hence, you ruled. He cast our minds back to the historical keeping of order in this place, making reference to the fact that the member for Hurtle Vale had committed such a grave offence in crossing the blood line while making these comments. I point out to the member for Morialta that she did so without sword drawn or worn.

That perhaps casts us back to the present day and another comment made by the member for Morialta—that this is a robust place. This is a robust place for the hour of question time, I am pleased to say, not during the other hours of the conduct of our business. It is a robust place because when questions are being asked, and when questions are being answered, there tends to be interjection and there does tend to be byplay on both sides.

I am not in the position that you are, Mr Speaker. I cannot make the same fair judgement about whether there was more byplay on one side and less on another. All we can do is reflect on the fact that you have made your rulings, one of which was to require the member for Hurtle Vale to

remove herself from the chamber and then to name her for unfortunately continuing those remarks. Just because she made further remarks after you ejected her under standing order 137A does not automatically mean that she should be named or that when the member for Hurtle Vale seeks to explain, and to apologise for that conduct, the house should not accept it.

I think the member for Morialta, and those opposite who have been around long enough, would remember several instances in this place when a member has been ejected under standing order 137A. If memory serves me correctly, I can remember at least two members in the last session of parliament who were ejected under the auspices of standing order 137A and who made further remarks as they left the chamber. They were not named by the former Speaker (Hon. Michael Atkinson). I am not referring to your conduct; I am referring to the precedent arguably set by the rulings of your predecessor.

One member was the previous member for Morphett. I know that I will face fierce objection in naming the second member, but my recollection is that the member for Bragg was removed from the service of the chamber and deigned to utter some words on the way out that we were all able to hear. In those cases, we did not arrive at the same situation that we are now in.

If it is the government's view that there will be the full imposition of the effect of the letter of the standing orders to be visited on the opposition, and if it is the view of the government that the full effect of the standing orders in this case are to be visited on the member for Hurtle Vale, that is most unfortunate. I have to say that it will likely inform the conduct of this place going forward.

Mr Speaker, you would also be aware that we are in the situation at the moment where we do not have the granting of pairs and we do not have a situation where the opposition—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —will let it stand that this place will conduct business without a necessary quorum for very long, and the reason why—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —is the attempt by this government to assert the dead hand and the full weight of the standing orders out of context and out of convention. If that is the view of the member for Morialta and the view of the government, so be it. The discord and the hardship, which will be inflicted on those opposite who rely on this place to get most of the conduct of government done, I am sure they will find a little rockier than usual. If you want to prove the point—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —member for Morialta and those opposite—fine, absolutely fine. We know how much they enjoy, or should I say do not enjoy, staying after 6 o'clock. We would be more than happy to do that. We would be more than happy to debate your bills, every clause and every letter, if you choose to make such a tepid example of the member for Hurtle Vale.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Lee's time has expired. The question before the Chair is that the member for Hurtle Vale's apology be accepted.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 17  
 Noes ..... 24  
 Majority ..... 7

AYES

Bettison, Z.L.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Boyer, B.I.

## AYES

Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Gee, J.P.	Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.
Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.	Michaels, A.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Picton, C.J.
Stinson, J.M.	Wortley, D.	

## NOES

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

Motion thus negatived.

**The SPEAKER:** There being 17 ayes and 24 noes, there is a majority of seven for the noes. The noes have it. The apology of the member for Hurtle Vale is not accepted and the member for Hurtle Vale will depart immediately.

*The honourable member for Hurtle Vale having withdrawn from the chamber:*

#### MEMBER FOR HURTLE VALE, SUSPENSION

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:12):** In accordance with standing order 139, I move:

That the member be suspended from the service of the house.

Motion carried.

**The SPEAKER:** We will resume question time with, I believe, 19 minutes left.

#### Question Time

#### WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE ANNIVERSARY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:12):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney inform the house about recent initiatives to promote the upcoming 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the granting of dual suffrage for women?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:13):** What an excellent question. I thank the honourable member for her question and her longstanding interest in matters relating to the history of women's suffrage. This year will celebrate the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the granting of women's suffrage in South Australia. The Adult Suffrage Bill was passed on 18 December 1894, awarding South Australian women the right to vote in general elections and to stand for parliament—the first time anywhere in Australia.

We know our history well of Mrs Jessie Cooper being sworn into the Legislative Council in 1959 and, within the hour—

*Ms Bedford interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —in the lovely Versace blue, our very own Mrs Joyce Steele, the member for Burnside, who adorns our chamber, was sworn in.

The theme of this year's anniversary is 'Their triumph, our motivation'. It recognises how the extraordinary efforts of the suffragettes of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries drive our continued efforts in working towards gender equality. I am very pleased to inform the house that, to

commemorate this milestone, the Parliament Research Library has offered to scan and digitise the original hard copies of the various petitions submitted to state parliament, one of which is woven into the historical tapestry that adorns our chamber.

The scanned copies will be made available to both the library and the House of Assembly for separate storage and can be used for both non-profit and non-commercial purposes. The purpose of this is to promote public access to these historical documents, which have been instrumental in gaining the right to vote for the women of South Australia. It is just one way in which we honour the incredible achievement that followed years of campaigning and lobbying by men and women of South Australia.

This initiative will help commemorate their tireless campaign and pays homage to everyone who provided their signatures on these petitions for change. They put their passion into action, and we are indebted to them. I take this opportunity to express my appreciation to you, Mr Speaker—as our Speaker of the House of Assembly, your approval was required and given for actioning this publication protocol—and also to the staff of the parliamentary library, led by Dr John Weste, for implementing it.

Other initiatives that will take place later this year include a competition for schools and students, undertaken by the Department for Education, as well as a state dinner that is being organised by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, with the support of the Office for Women. Lastly, I encourage all members to visit the website of the Office for Women to see what events are available in their electorates to commemorate this historic achievement. I thank again the member for Florey for her continued interest in this matter.

#### MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:16):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier guarantee that every person currently receiving mental health services from state government-funded programs will continue to receive the same level of service?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:16):** As I previously outlined to the house, funding for clients who were previously covered by state services transferring over to the NDIS will move over to the NDIS, so we will no longer be covering them. But it is our intention to provide continuing support to those people with psychosocial needs here in South Australia.

I just remind the house very clearly that, since coming into government, we have put an additional \$900 million back into the health budget in South Australia. The budget and the arrangements that we inherited from those opposite were not providing for the people of South Australia, whether they be mental health patients or patients in other aspects of SA Health's jurisdiction.

We have acted swiftly to address some of the problems and deficiencies that we inherited, and mental health is an absolute priority. Again, I reiterate to this house that funding for patients previously covered by the state system, who have had approval to move to the federal system, will have that state money transferred to the federal system. There is no cut whatsoever to the budget here in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I understand that the opposition has been out there, and some people from the NGO sector have raised concerns about this, but that is the design—

**An honourable member:** The Mental Health Commission.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There is some anxiety within the NGO sector in South Australia, and I will tell you the reason why. Because, under the previous arrangements, before the NDIS was put into place by the former Labor government here in South Australia and the former Labor government in Canberra, the reality was that that funding went to the individual organisation. But the essence of the reform, which is the NDIS, is that the money goes with the client. This will cause some organisations some anxiety because there is greater—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —discretion in the hands of those people who are living with a disability. This is a reform that was, by the way, supported right across the political spectrum, and it is one that we continue to support here in South Australia. Quite frankly, it is almost extraordinary for those opposite to now be arguing—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —against this scheme which they had been advocating for so passionately for such a long period of time.

### NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:19):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister please update the house about National Volunteer Week?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:19):** I thank the member for her question and of course we acknowledge that Monday 20 May until Friday 26 May was National Volunteer Week. In part of my role, I know, getting out into the community and thanking our volunteers, there really aren't enough hours in the day. It was with great pleasure just recently that I was out with the member of King visiting the CFS station in her local community, the Salisbury CFS station and the para group that is based there as well. We met some wonderful people. Mike Gordon, of course, was great to show us around.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** These are volunteers who we on this side of the house truly appreciate. I am not sure about the comments coming from the other side of the house, but we do truly appreciate our volunteers—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —on this side of the house. We also went to the SES and the member for King had beaten me there when we went to catch up—

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —with the SES. She had been there the week before, she is such a keen advocate for those wonderful people in her community. On national volunteers day, on the Monday, I was very pleased to join the Governor. I think the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Hurtle Vale were there as well. We had the chance to thank all the volunteers in South Australia. We had the parade to recognise our volunteers. The weather was a bit inclement, but it was great to see so many people come out for that.

Only South Australia and only Adelaide give a parade for our volunteers, so that was fantastic. We had a number of people there cooking a barbecue. There was food. They were enjoying the day and it was fantastic to get around and thank all the different volunteer groups that were there. I was representing Michelle Lensink, the member from other place. I actually whisked out of cabinet to make sure I got there on time because that's how much we appreciate our volunteers here in South Australia, across the city and the country regions.

The theme this year was 'Making a world of difference', and volunteers really do. Again, on this side of the house, and I would like to think on the other side as well, we do appreciate the volunteers. The hours and the figures are quite phenomenal: 1.7 million hours equates to 107,400 full-time jobs and about \$5 million put back into the economy. No government can ever pay



for that sort of service but what we can do is take our time and say thank you to each and every one of them who go over and above to help in our community.

It has been a great pleasure as well to get out in the regions as part of our Project Renew through the CFS. I know I have been out with a number of members on this side of the house to thank the volunteers there and just give a little back. Unfortunately, whilst we were in opposition and the previous government was in place, a number of our CFS brigades had been neglected somewhat with their facilities around their local service areas.

So it was with great pleasure that we were able to go and help them out and put back into their communities, be it just helping maybe reclad the kitchen or put a new kitchen in, so that when they are there giving their time in service, in particular through the summer months, they have the facilities and the amenities of a decent standard. Again, it was a little way to say thank you. That is a \$5 million project over two years as well.

Our surf lifesaving groups, as well, I have mentioned in this house many times before, but they are great volunteers. Again, I know on this side of the house we can't thank our surf lifesavers enough and I think can speak for those on the other side to say thank you for what they do—22 surf clubs, I note. The member for Flinders will be keen to know that Port Lincoln are pushing to establish a surf club over there, too, so we hope that can come to fruition. I know that the member for Flinders will be very supportive of that as well.

We thank all our surf lifesaving volunteers and as a show of appreciation—again we can't pay them for all the hours they put in, but they do an outstanding job—we did make a commitment when we formed government to give each club \$5,000 over the four years to make sure they can keep providing the services they do to keep our communities safe. We are very happy to support them as well.

During Volunteer Week, again, I spent a lot of time getting out into the communities. I know I was in the member for Stuart's electorate, as well, speaking to a lot of people up there, but I went right across the state, and it was great to visit our country regions as always. I apologise, I don't have enough time to thank everyone, but it is wonderful to get out in the community and thank our volunteers for the marvellous work they do, especially during Volunteer Week.

#### **MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:23):** My question is to the Premier. What will happen to people on waiting lists of state-based mental health programs from state-based NGOs following the \$6.8 million cut to their funding?

**The SPEAKER:** What will happen?

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

**The SPEAKER:** Is it hypothetical?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The member continues to characterise as a cut what has clearly been explained in previous answers. It therefore contains argument and is disorderly, and even if it weren't argument, if he were saying it was fact, he introduced it without leave.

**The SPEAKER:** I am going to allow the word 'cut' to be part of the political argy-bargy relating to what a government may or may not be doing. I am going to allow that and I am going to allow the Premier a chance to respond.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:24):** There has been no cut.

#### **MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:24):** My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier informing the house that no state-based NGO has had a reduction in their funding in the mental health sector?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:24):** I have explained this on multiple occasions.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The money, which is currently going to NGOs for the provision of services to some clients, as those clients transfer to the NDIS as per the original design of the NDIS—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —transfers to the federal jurisdiction. If NGOs think that they are going to essentially lose clients and retain the funding, well, unfortunately, that is not going to occur. But the reality is this is the design of the program which we inherited and, I might say, inherited very happily. We think this is a very important reform.

I make the point that the Chief Psychiatrist has now written to the NGOs, and he has talked about the impact to them of transferring from the state system to the federal system, and he specifically requested that he be advised of any client-related continuity of support issues that may have arisen. He has also—very helpfully, I think—set up a transition task force, which we are also very pleased about. But in any way, shape or form to characterise this transfer of funding as a cut is misleading. It actually undermines the confidence in our mental health services in South Australia.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I make this point very strenuously. This is a disgraceful action taken by some people who have gone out to undermine the confidence in our mental health service—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —increasing the level of anxiety and frustration for some of our most vulnerable people in South Australia and also increasing the anxiety of the people who are on the front line of some of the toughest areas of public policy in this state.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I condemn this behaviour and I think it is absolutely disgraceful.

#### FLINDERS LINK

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (15:27):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house on how the Marshall government is optimising the best location for a future bus interchange in the Flinders and Tonsley precinct?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: the question contains debate.

**The SPEAKER:** Can I have that question again, member for Davenport?

**Mr MURRAY:** The question is: can the minister inform the house on how the Marshall government is optimising the best location for a future bus interchange in the Flinders and Tonsley precinct?

**The SPEAKER:** I will allow that question. Minister.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:28):** Can I thank the member for Davenport for his question, especially on this day of all days, World Environment Day. The work that this government is undertaking to get people out of their cars and into public transport—

**Mr Malinauskas:** This is funny.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr Malinauskas:** Come on! Now, seriously. This is funny.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —is extremely important, and I look forward to our record of service in this area coming to the fore as part of what is quite clearly a heated public debate. We took a decision to ensure that the Flinders Link extension of the Tonsley train line out to Flinders University continued. I know that it was something that some members derided at the time, especially in relation to the \$125 million cost. I have said in this chamber, and will continue to say, that when the experts tell me what the best design is we don't take the cheapest option; we take the best option to make sure that through the design process we take every precaution to get the right bit of infrastructure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —lest we have issues down the track that call into question the design process in the first place. That was why I was extremely comfortable and confident to make sure that we got all the money necessary to properly build the Flinders Link extension.

In doing that, we need to go one step further, and that is that we have said very clearly that we want to see improved integration of our public transport services. It was something that the former government had in their integrated land use plan document. It is obviously something they don't want to talk about anymore since they have gone into opposition, but we have the worst level of integration of public transport services in the country. What we need to do is improve that.

The best way to do that is that, off the back of the Flinders Link extension out to Flinders University, we need to make sure that we are interchanging our bus services as efficiently and as seamlessly as possible. This is something about which the member for Davenport and I have had many discussions. I know that he is a very strong and passionate advocate for this because this is an important way for members of his community to get improved access to public transport services.

This also builds off the fact that we are out there at the moment—and I know that the member for Elder is extremely passionate about this section of the line, which sneaks into her electorate—dealing with the fact that we are losing the Tonsley train station as part of this redevelopment. We are going out and having a structured and well-resourced conversation with the community to really talk through what the options are for the future for that train station.

The announcement that we have made in the past couple of days in relation to the bus interchange is made all the more important because of the announcement that was made in the last few days around the Flinders University expansion. It is \$1½ billion worth of private sector investment not only to enhance what is a fantastic university but also to help realise this government's dream to improve international education and student visitation numbers here to South Australia, not only to improve upon the jobs growth and the housing development growth that is going to come but also to help improve the public transport outcomes for people in the southern suburbs.

This is a very important component to driving our public transport network forward so that we can see this integrated approach that delivers benefits well beyond just the bus or train service that is being delivered. It is to make our communities more connected, to encourage people from right across the globe to come and study here and hopefully stay here to help grow our economy and create jobs that are going to sustain our state well into the future.

*Grievance Debate*

## **BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:32):** Today, an extraordinary letter was delivered to the opposition by Mr Peter Joy, chair of Brand SA. In that letter, there are some serious accusations and questions that the Premier needs to answer. Mr Speaker, I congratulate you on your earlier statement. The opposition made statements prior to question time congratulating you on your statement, despite the feelings in the house afterwards. However, there is one person who has made no apology, one person who has made no retraction, and that is the Premier.

We are told in this letter by Mr Peter Joy, the chair of Brand SA, whose reputation is impeccable, that he can categorically rule out that neither he, his board nor the chief executive released a letter from the Premier to anyone, as the Speaker confirmed today. We have subsequently found out today that the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, the one public servant in that agency who answers directly to an elected official, whose contract is with that elected official—the only public servant in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet who can have his contract terminated by the Premier—told Mr Joy eight days before 16 May that their funding would be cut.

Yet the Premier in this parliament referred us to an answer to a question in the Legislative Council. The next day, at a media conference, which you were at, sir, the Premier told the assembled media that he did not want to answer that question in parliament because he was not sure whether or not Brand SA had received that email that was sent at 12:36 or so. What we now know is that the government had informed Brand SA. They did know that their funding was being cut. They had been told by the most senior public servant in South Australia that their funding would not commence.

In that letter from Mr Joy he makes it very clear that his view is that the parliament has been misled. There can be no more serious accusation made. I have to say that it is courageous that Mr Joy has done this, and I bet that it is with regret rather than anger that he has had to do this. But when a senior business leader in South Australia has to put pen to paper and put his signature to a document that says that the Premier of this state has misled this parliament, all of us should pay attention. All of us should be concerned.

Mr Speaker, on receipt of this letter, you immediately acted. You are to be congratulated. The Premier has not; the Premier doubled down. The Premier cannot even tell us if he knew whether his chief executive had told Brand SA whether or not their funding had been cut. We are to assume that the head of government, the Premier, in cabinet was not aware that Brand SA had had its funding cut, despite having signed a letter to Brand SA telling them that their funding had been cut and despite the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet eight days earlier telling Brand SA that their funding had been cut.

We are meant to believe that no announcement will be made until the budget. It is clear that the Legislative Council informed the House of Assembly that indeed an announcement had been made. How do we know that? By their telling us that no announcement will be made until budget day, yet we have a letter from the Premier and a letter from Mr Joy confirming that they had been told earlier. That is the announcement, yet we are meant to believe that the Premier has nothing to answer.

Well, I am sorry, but the house has been wronged. The question for us now is: what do we do about it? Do we use a majority in the parliament to just silence the truth? Do we let the majority just say, 'Well, regardless of what the facts are, we are going to ignore it all and move on,' and the train and the caravan move on? If the Premier cannot tell the truth in here, who can?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: I know that you have already given an earlier warning about these statements in relation to untruths, lies and the like. I ask you to bring the member to order.

**The SPEAKER:** I again ask that members maintain some civility in here. Today, I appreciate, has had a level of volatility not seen before. I ask the member for West Torrens not to reflect on the Premier's conduct. He is finished?

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Yes, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, you have the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We are in grieves.

#### MOOROOK ANNIVERSARY

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:38):** Today, I rise to speak about a historic event in the electorate of Chaffey—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** It has been a long day. Order! The minister has the call.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —albeit those on the other side do not really care for the history of what the Riverland has to present to South Australia; we on this side do.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** The history of river communities is very important. A fantastic little township named Moorook has celebrated its 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary. Moorook is a very small river town that has a beautiful aspect on the river. It was established 125 years ago when we had people who were using paddle-steamers along the River Murray. They came on the paddle-steamer, the *PS Gem*, in 1894 looking for a beginning, a new life for themselves on the banks of the beautiful River Murray.

I was lucky enough to attend the anniversary celebrations, and what I would say is that Moorook was a short-lived prisoner of war camp during World War II, and the Japanese people living in Australia were sent there along with other internment camps in the region: Loveday, Katarapko and Woolenook as we know them today. They were employed as woodcutters for the allied war effort. Their task was to harvest firewood to supply fuel needed by industries in the region. The Moorook internment camp was part of the Loveday prisoner of war camp complex and was officially closed on 21 February 1943.

The recent anniversary celebrations included a range of events across two days, including the formal opening of the riverfront, where attendees were welcomed by the Moorook Primary School students, and a tour of the Moorook community hall. Walking into that hall really did display some of the great yesteryear hardships that many of the pioneers into the Riverland used to experience: the hardship of the rising and falling of river levels and what they had to do just to survive and to remain as a community.

What we saw was the unveiling of the time capsule, the cutting of an anniversary cake and, of course, the authentic dinner at the KM packing shed at the heights of Moorook. A crowd of about 250 attended the unveiling, and it really was a high level of celebration. The unveiling of the capsule saw a mix of the old and the new: the people who are currently living as part of the Moorook community as well as past residents, or people who have an affection or an affiliation with the history of what Moorook meant to them, what it meant to their family.

When we opened the capsule we saw many letters from community members, and we saw a local newspaper in its entirety, the *Murray Pioneer* from 1994. What we saw was that the *Murray Pioneer* has not changed too much in all that time. It really is a credit to the Taylor Group of Newspapers. They are a strong family, they are a strong community-based newspaper, and they still present great articles and great newsworthy communication to the Riverland at large.

Rob Cordy and organising committee chair, Steve Munn, were joined by Jeff Battams, who, at 88, is the oldest historian. He is Moorook's oldest current resident, and he had the honour of cutting the anniversary cake. I really want to congratulate the organisers of this great event. I want to congratulate the people who made the time to come to Moorook and enjoy the hospitality. As I said, Moorook is a great little community and, for those who do not know, Moorook is home to Nippy's. We all know that Nippy's is an iconic fruit juice drink, and the company produces all sorts of beverages that sit in many of our shop refrigerators. It is an absolute stablemate for the people of the Riverland.

I would also like to acknowledge that Moorook is part of the Riverland history. I am hoping that it will become a permanent fixture to commemorate the legacy of Moorook. I would also like to thank the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary organising committee for their fantastic effort to bring together the collage of history, photographs and all the sporting memorabilia. The Kingston Moorook footy club sadly is no longer in existence, but the memories of the Green and Gold Eagles continue to live on.

Really, what Moorook has now done is to set itself in the history books of the Riverland, and I look forward to being around to celebrate the 150 years of the Moorook township.

## GOVERNMENT POLICIES

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:43):** I rise today to speak about cuts, privatisations and closures that are being announced daily by this Marshall Liberal government. It is now obvious that the Liberal government's promises of more jobs, lower costs and better services are nothing but hot air.

With unemployment on the rise, the cost of living increasing, additional fees and charges from tradies' licences to bus tickets and registration, and the reduction of services across a range of departments, the people in my electorate of Ramsay and across South Australia have every reason to feel that they were misled.

In the past two weeks, within my shadow portfolio of trade, tourism and investment, the following cuts have been exposed. Firstly, the iconic Brand SA has been axed, and it is only through advocacy that the state logo and well-supported campaigns such as I Choose SA have been saved. They have been saved and brought in-house, but we do not know how much money will be dedicated to the running of those programs or their promotion.

Many people reached out to the opposition in shock, anger and disappointment. Brand SA brought value to South Australia. It was supported by government funding of \$1.6 million, but it was also supported by members and sponsors with almost double that investment. It was active participation for a not-for-profit to go out and support our businesses. Thousands of South Australian businesses raised their voice in protest and people felt so strongly about this bad decision that they launched a petition on Change.org.

When Brand SA announced its closure, they received more than 2,500 reactions on Facebook. The post was shared over 700 times and nearly 1,000 people left comments. Nearly 1,000 people felt so strongly about the closure of Brand SA that they put their names to their comments and shared their frustration and anger. Perhaps most shameful of all is that, despite approaching the state government many, many times over the past six months seeking advice about their future, the decision to close Brand SA was only uncovered during questioning by the Labor opposition on a parliamentary sitting day.

Today, we found out they were told on 8 May and were advised they could not tell anyone. They were not told by the Premier, they were told by the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. I find that very disappointing because Brand SA was very well supported. More than 8,000 people proudly chose to use the state brand and logo. Around 4,800 people were part of the I Choose SA campaign and many other programs that were launched recently, such as Hello From SA, which encouraged ex-pats to reconnect with South Australia.

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** They still can.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** No, they cannot; it is not funded. Of course, we also saw Fast Movers SA and the Regional Showcase. An expression of interest went out in a very short period of time and there is no funding attached to that.

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** That is not true; the funding came out of my department.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** That's a lie.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Minister, be quiet.

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON:** The Marshall government has also axed the Adelaide Fashion Festival, which has been the major platform for South Australia's established and emerging fashion talent for over a decade. For a cost of some \$500,000 per year, the Adelaide Fashion Festival—again, paired with funding from corporate sponsors; I am feeling a repetition here—showcased collections from internationally recognised South Australian brands such as Paolo Sebastian, Acler, C/MEO Collective, Flinders, Coutoure+Love+Madness and Tiff Manuell. People were very disappointed because of the loss of exposure that came with the Adelaide Fashion Festival.

Let us not forget the Motorsport Festival. It was confirmed last Monday that the 2019 event would be cancelled following a reduction in funding. We had seen growth on growth on growth, with the attendance of 47,000 people last year.

Time expired.

### COASTLINE PROTECTION

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:49):** It is with great pleasure that I rise today to speak about the once-in-a-lifetime \$48.4 million announcement made by the Marshall Liberal government earlier this week to secure the future of our precious coastline. This announcement could not be more warmly welcomed than it was in my seat of Colton, where the beach from Glenelg North to West Beach and all the way to Henley Beach has been eroding to the point where local roads and infrastructure had almost been compromised.

The erosion of our metropolitan coast has been a problem that has plagued our community and our area for too long. The previous government had 16 years to act, but instead they let the degradation continue and implemented a series of bandaid fixes that were only temporary. I made it a priority of mine to deliver a change for our community and to deliver a long-term fix, and that is exactly what our government is doing.

Adelaide's sandy beaches essentially cover 28 kilometres of coastline, from Kingston Park to Outer Harbor. Our beaches are constantly changing and sand is naturally moved northward by the wind and the waves, which causes sand to build up on our northern beaches, such as Semaphore, and also causes erosion along our southern and central beaches, such as Seacliff, Brighton and Henley Beach.

West Beach has suffered serious and ongoing erosion for a number of years, while Henley South has started to suffer more recently. At present, the beach levels at West Beach and Henley Beach South are lower than at any other time since records began. The erosion at West Beach has had a number of impacts. Immediately north of the boat harbour, the dunes have receded many metres, relying on regular trucking to sustain the small amount of sand that was left. Further north, the beach at the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club has been mostly lost and the clubhouse, Coast Park and car park rely on a seawall for protection.

The \$48.4 million commitment to our metropolitan coasts is based on investigations made by independent, expert environmental consultants Danish Hydraulic Institute. The package will include \$20 million for additional sand, including approximately 500,000 cubic metres of newly sourced sand for a large-scale replenishment and \$28.4 million for the completion of a sand recycling pipeline from Semaphore to West Beach, as well as sand dune restoration and revegetation to be undertaken in partnership with local councils and coastal community groups. These activities will coincide with the government's already announced seagrass restoration programs.

The pipeline will complement the existing one, which runs from Glenelg to Kingston Park, which successfully pumps approximately 100,000 cubic metres of sand each year to stabilise and maintain our southern beaches and is credited with the bounce back of South Brighton, Seacliff and Kingston beaches, having not looked too dissimilar to West Beach just a short number of years ago.

The pipeline extension will also see the existing infrastructure at West Beach operate as originally intended, running from the breakwater at Semaphore, where sufficient volumes of sand build up, all the way to West Beach. The new sand and infrastructure will reinforce and secure our coastline for future generations.

Since making the announcement, I have received a significant amount of positive feedback from the community, who are grateful that our government has made this commitment to fix the problem for the long term. Residents had grown weary and frustrated with the constant inaction and bandaid fixes that had been implemented by the previous government. It did not take a scientist to work out that the approach taken towards our beaches north of Glenelg was not working.

From day one in my role as the local MP, I started my campaign to deliver a fix for West Beach, Henley Beach and Henley Beach South, or, as the Minister for Environment said yesterday, the start of my constant pestering. I do not mind that characterisation at all. I am happy to be called

a pest when it comes to this issue because I know that it was one my community desperately needed a fix for.

Another aspect of this commitment that I am pleased to see is that sand dune restoration and revegetation will be undertaken in partnership with local councils and coastal community groups. I know that many in my community would like to be involved in this project. Already the Henley Dunes Care Group, with the support of the City of Charles Sturt, does a wonderful job in holding regular planting sessions along the Henley Beach dune network.

I would like to especially thank the Premier and the Minister for Environment for their tireless work in finding a solution to address the ongoing erosion problems facing the metropolitan coastline. After 16 long years of being ignored, the Marshall Liberal government's announcement of \$48.4 million for our precious coastline is certainly welcomed by my community and I am sure by many other communities across our entire state who frequent our magnificent beaches.

### WORLD ENVIRONMENT DAY

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:54):** I rise today to talk about World Environment Day. It is my view that every day should be World Environment Day. We have a habit of compartmentalising issues and giving them a particular day and, when it comes to government, putting them into silos. We have departments around the state and nationally dedicated to the environment, yet we see other agencies and other departments operating in a manner counter to what needs to be done.

This World Environment Day comes after a series of deeply concerning reports: the IPCC report and reports on species extinction and various other environmental crises that we are facing. When it comes to species extinction, the record here in Australia is not great. Currently, we have 1,800 plant, animal and ecological communities under direct threat and facing the real potential of extinction because of the lack of political will to effectively address this issue.

On a global level, we are entering into the age of a great extinction—the sixth great extinction. We have lost 90 per cent of top order species in the marine environment. Half the marine population has been essentially wiped out over the last 40 years. As a species, humanity represents 0.01 per cent of all life on this planet, but we are responsible for the loss of 83 per cent of the wild mammals that used to roam this planet. We are fundamentally altering the nature of life on this planet, so it is good to hear initiatives in relation to Adelaide beaches. I noticed that nearly all the money has been spent in Adelaide and not much out in the regions when it comes to our beaches.

*The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Environment and Water is called to order.

**Mr HUGHES:** But let's say this: when it comes to our beaches, if other governments around the world were to replicate what our government is doing nationally to address emissions, the work that we are doing here in South Australia to protect our beaches is going to be short lived. The projections now for sea-level rises—and scientists are collectively indicating that they have underestimated the likely sea-level rises—are going to have a major impact on the work that is being done and is going to be done.

Today, the Minister for Energy and Mining talked about solar projects that are on the way in South Australia. There is this rebadging going on, this sleight of hand, to state that these solar projects are somehow initiatives that started under the current government. These projects have long lead times and there is a whole raft of these projects. In fact, the overwhelming majority of them started during the term of the last government because we did have a welcome mat when it came to renewables.

Reference was made to wind and to the investment in wind resources in this country. It is the nature of technological evolution that it is not all happening at an even pace. The reason that wind made such an earlier penetration is that the costs of wind had come down significantly. Hot on the heels of that, the cost of solar photovoltaic especially has come down. It has come down massively over recent years, to the point where nearly all the agencies—national agencies, global agencies, even organisations like Greenpeace—seriously underestimated the cost falls in renewables.



We are seeing a whole range of solar projects starting to get off the ground in South Australia. Reference was made to the Bungala project, a project started under the previous Labor government. Reference has been made to the contract that has just been entered into with Shanghai Electric. Sanjeev Gupta arrived in South Australia, when there was a state Labor government, with confidence in investing in this state and in renewables as part of the energy and industrial pathway he was mapping out.

### BARNGARLA LANGUAGE BOOK

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:59):** Today, I want to talk about a significant and exciting event I attended in Port Lincoln on 25 May: the launch of the Barngarla alphabet and picture book, entitled *Barngarlidhi Manoo: Speaking Barngarla Together*.

The traditional people of Eyre Peninsula are the Barngarla. The language map produced by Wilhelm Schmidt in 1914 clearly shows that the Barngarla language was spoken in the Port Lincoln, Whyalla and Port Augusta areas and the townships around them. Pastor Schürmann recorded the Barngarla language, starting in the 1840s, when he was assigned by the government to Port Lincoln to engage with and convert the original inhabitants to make relationships more amicable with the authorities.

He also opened a native school located just outside Port Lincoln, which only Barngarla people attended. Aside from recording much of the language of the local people, Pastor Schürmann established a mission known as the Poonindie Mission and, although it is now defunct, the Poonindie Mission has been the recipient of a government grant to reinstate some of the heritage buildings, so that is a good result.

Pastor Schürmann published a vocabulary of the Barngarla language 170 years ago, and that work provided the foundation for what is now the Barngarla language book. The Barngarla language has been dormant for a long time, and the last Barngarla person recorded speaking it fluently was a senior elder named Moonie Davis back in the 1960s. He was also the last known Barngarla person to sing a special song in the Barngarla language that would call the sharks and dolphins to chase the fish into the shallows to the waiting Barngarla people on the shoreline.

Like many Aboriginal languages around this great continent, the language was eroded and became dormant, but awakening the Barngarla language means different things to different people. To some, it means reconnecting to your country and ancestors; to others, it means developing a sense of pride in self and identity or strengthening what you already know in your heart. To others, still, it gives a sense of belonging to family, community and country. One thing is for certain: the Barngarla people of Eyre Peninsula are wholeheartedly embracing the awakening of the ancient language of their ancestors, and this can only be positive.

The Barngarla community strives to continue to reclaim its ancient language and hopes that the publication of the alphabet book and other educational resources—an app was launched two or three years ago, which is available for those researching online and is currently free and available to all—will lead to more members of the Barngarla community embedding the language into their daily lives and developing fluent speakers within the younger generations.

A committee known as the Barngarla Language Advisory Committee was founded some years ago. It currently consists of four people, and they are very much to be congratulated, and most were in attendance the other day. Stephen Atkinson is the chairperson, and the committee members are Emma Richards, Harold Dare and Jenna Richards. Since 2012, the committee has consistently worked with the revivalist-linguist Professor Ghil'ad Zuckermann.

Professor Ghil'ad Zuckermann is Israeli by birth and resident at Flinders University here in Adelaide. He speaks 12 languages and also has a doctorate from both Oxford and Cambridge, so we are very fortunate here in South Australia to have such a talented, gifted and generous man. I have met Ghil'ad on a number of occasions. Certainly, the launch of the book the other day was a very exciting time for him; many contributed, but ultimately it was Professor Zuckermann who was able to pull it together.

The role of the committee was to provide advice to Ghil'ad and other guests on how to engage with the Barngarla community respectfully and to ensure that the ancient language of the

Barngarla ancestors remains with the community as a whole. It was a very exciting time, and I congratulate all those who have done work on this. Without the original work of Pastor Schürmann in the 1840s and without the consistent work of the local Barngarla community and also Professor Zuckermann, this would not have been possible. On page 2 of the book is a quote by Nelson Mandela that I am going to contribute today. He said:

If you talk to a man in a language he understands, that goes to his head. If you talk to him in his language, that goes to his heart.

### *Bills*

## **CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ASSAULTS ON PRESCRIBED EMERGENCY WORKERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 June 2019.)

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:04):** I am pleased to rise to speak on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Assaults on Prescribed Emergency Workers) Amendment Bill introduced into this place by the honourable Attorney-General on 2 May 2019. The bill is incredibly important to provide assurance to all our front-line emergency service workers and volunteers across the state.

Simply put, the bill seeks to better protect the state's police, emergency services, front-line medical officers and other law enforcement officers and volunteers from assaults. Unfortunately, we currently see that assault is too common an occurrence for front-line police and emergency service workers and volunteers. Not only physical assault, but across the state instances of spitting, blood exposure, urine and faeces being used to injure and cause harm to police and other emergency service workers and volunteers whilst in the line of duty are occurring. It sounds abhorrent, but that is what is happening out there.

Let us be absolutely clear: the assault of any person in our community is totally unacceptable. The assault of any police or emergency service worker or volunteer who is simply doing their job cannot continue. This government has listened to and considered the concerns raised by the Police Association with the Attorney-General in January this year about the instances of police officers subjected to assaults when carrying out their duties.

Since that time, significant work has been undertaken with PASA, SAPOL and other related stakeholders to determine the issues leading to assaults, the charging process, the prosecution processes and the court sentencing processes and, in turn, identifying potential gaps that could be rectified by legislative change. One of the key areas that stands out in the statistics is assaults from bodily fluid and biological material.

As a result, the government bill proposes to introduce a standalone offence for assaults on prescribed persons from bodily fluid and biological material, including blood, saliva, vomit, faeces and urine. Prescribed persons will include not just police but also prison officers, community correction officers, youth training officers, youth justice officers, the Metropolitan Fire Service and members of the SA Ambulance Service, as well as others prescribed by regulations, including nurses, doctors, protective security officers, unsworn officers at police stations, community correction workers, Sheriff's officers and bailiffs.

The bill covers not only our paid emergency service officers but also, vitally, our volunteers from the Country Fire Service, State Emergency Service, St John Ambulance, Surf Life Saving SA, and Royal Flying Doctor Service. This group is often forgotten, yet they play a crucial role as front-line volunteers. This government is sending a clear message to those who are disorderly, disrespectful or violent towards our emergency service workers and volunteers: this behaviour is totally unacceptable and will be treated as a criminal offence.

The maximum penalty for this new offence will be five years' imprisonment, or seven years' imprisonment if harm is caused to the victim. This reflects the penalties currently in place in New

South Wales and proposed by PASA within their submission. This government has an acute interest in the safety and wellbeing of all emergency service workers and volunteers. In line with the requests of PASA, the bill also amends the Sentencing Act 2007 so that, when a court is sentencing an offender for an offence, the court must take into account in setting a penalty the need to protect the police and other emergency service workers and volunteers.

The amendment is supported by SAPOL as a positive step in the right direction towards recognising police and emergency service workers and volunteers when sentencing offenders. Further, the bill removes the ability for assaults against police to be charged under the Summary Offences Act. This change will ensure that all assaults against police will be charged and prosecuted under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act with more appropriate and higher penalties.

The Criminal Law Consolidation Act currently recognises assaults on police, prison officers, other law enforcement officers, emergency workers and hospital-based medical practitioners, nurses, midwives and their support staff as an aggravated offence exclusively on the operation of section 5AA of the act. These are the toughest laws for offences against any emergency worker and volunteer this state has ever seen.

But, as we know, the parliament is only one cog in the wheel of justice. The parliament can make the laws as strong and as tough as possible. From here, it is up to the assessment and decision-making of the prosecution services, be they SAPOL or the Director of Public Prosecutions, to present the matters to the court. The sentencing of offenders then rests with the courts.

I assume that everybody in this place agrees that judicial independence is one of the crucial elements of our justice system. Whilst we acknowledge there are a number of competing factors in the court process, one thing that was made clear from the consultation process during the drafting of this bill is that the community expects those who commit serious assaults on our police, emergency service workers and volunteers will go to prison.

At the same time, this needs to be balanced against the broad range of offending which falls under common assault on police. This may range from shoving a police officer to much more violent crimes with or without a weapon. As such, it is integral that courts have an appropriate level of discretion to sentence appropriately, given the circumstances. I remain committed to continuing to work together with the Attorney-General, the Police Association of South Australia and other stakeholders to finalise the bill to ensure that we are protecting our community, our front-line emergency service workers and volunteers.

Unfortunately, this is not a new issue. This is yet another example of those opposite failing to do anything about the issue in their 16 years of government. Whilst one would have hoped to see a bipartisan approach to the bill, yet again those opposite are playing catch-up and trying to play cheap parlour tricks for a quick grab on the nightly news. Assaults on our front-line emergency service workers and volunteers should be taken as seriously by those opposite as they are by the Marshall Liberal government. Assaults on our police, emergency service workers and volunteers are not tolerated by the community. They will not be tolerated by this government.

**Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (16:11):** I rise to speak on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Assaults on Prescribed Emergency Workers) Amendment Bill 2019 with considerable pleasure. It was introduced by the Attorney on Thursday 2 May of this year, and this bill shows a government desperately playing catch-up with the opposition, who have been considering and publicly debating these issues for months now, but this bill falls way short of the mark.

The Police Association of South Australia has been calling for tougher penalties and stricter sentencing guidelines to make sure that these criminals are properly punished and more likely to be imprisoned, particularly when an emergency worker is injured as a result of their actions. Indeed, new 12-monthly crime statistics out this week show that assaults against South Australia Police officers have increased by 8 per cent to more than 770 since May last year.

It is worth reading a personal story by Brett Williams from the April edition of the Police Association's journal of one of these attacks:

Sergeant Andrew 'Goldy' Goldsmith took the phone call at work. It was a police prosecutor with news of the outcome of an assault case. Goldsmith had been the victim in the matter. Two brothers had bashed and seriously injured the lone patrol officer in a late-night attack on a Hindley St footpath in 2017.

Repeated punches they threw at his head might have knocked him out but, by good fortune, left only bruising and soreness. Even the force with which, in their rage, they gripped his arms left bruising and pain, too.

But worse than that was a major whiplash-type injury one attacker caused by trying repeatedly to yank Goldsmith off his (the attacker's) accomplice. That aggression resulted in soft-tissue damage, which was to require six months of physiotherapy to heal.

So, now, what Goldsmith expected to hear over the phone was that the court had, among other things, delivered justice for him. He hoped that it would be evident through strong, meaningful sentences for his attackers.

The reality, however, was to leave him not just disappointed but enraged. The presiding magistrate had that day, in March 2018, allowed the offending brothers to walk from court with good behaviour bonds.

And Goldsmith took as another affront the decision of the magistrate to record no conviction against either defendant.

'I was so angry,' he recalls. 'I'd had this belief, this core belief, that the courts were there to back us up, to protect us from this sort of thing.'

My world was shattered because I was out there trying to protect the public, trying to do the right thing by everybody else. I thought: 'Who's going to protect us (if not the courts)? Who's going to look after our needs?'

Over the last six months, the Police Association of South Australia and others have been asking the parliament to consider changes to the law which achieve some of the following things:

- removing the assault police, hindering police and resisting arrest provisions entirely from the Summary Offences Act;
- creating specific offences in the CLCA to deal with assaults against police and prescribed emergency workers, which carry tougher penalties;
- amending the Sentencing Act to make assaults against police and emergency workers a designated offence, ensuring that anyone who has received a suspended sentence cannot have their sentence suspended again; and
- further amending the Sentencing Act to make deterrence against these types of offences a secondary sentencing purpose.

The Attorney's bill partly satisfies the first concern of the Police Association in that it deletes assault police from the summary law, but it leaves the resisting arrest and hindering police provisions untouched. It is unclear why the Attorney has approached the bill this way. The association, whose members have to interact with the law every day of their working lives, have made it abundantly clear that they believe that the 'resist' and 'hinder' provisions should be included in the criminal law.

The association and we on this side of the house have very serious concerns that police officers are often injured, sometimes quite seriously, in the course of arresting someone, and there is no adequate remedy for this injury when the elements of an assault cannot be established. This bill does also include a change to the Sentencing Act, which makes the deterrence of these particular offences a secondary sentencing purpose, and this on its own is commendable. It is something I have been talking publicly about for months. However, it is not enough.

The other concerns of the Police Association—that is, the need for specific offences in the CLCA to deal with assaults against police and other emergency workers, which carry tougher penalties, and the declaration of assaults against police and emergency services workers as designated offences to ensure anyone who has received a suspended sentence cannot have their sentence suspended again—have been dismissed out of hand by the Attorney.

As a result, this bill is a weak and inadequate response to the very genuine concerns of our police and emergency workers. These are people who go out every day—willingly go into danger, willingly go into situations knowing they may well be dangerous—in order to protect people, to protect property, to protect the community or to administer medical treatment. They deserve our protection, and the bill before us today does not give it.

We know what this bill does not do. I will go through my understanding of what it does. First, as has been outlined, it creates the new offence of spitting or throwing or otherwise applying blood, saliva, semen, faeces or urine on a prescribed emergency worker in the course of their duties. It establishes a maximum penalty for this new offence at four years, or five years if harm is caused to the victim. It then makes consequential amendments to the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act.

I understand this new provision came out of discussions with SAPOL. The inclusion of a standalone offence is not necessarily a bad thing, but it is my understanding that these types of behaviours already constitute an assault under the existing provisions of this CLCA—there will obviously be questions about that in the committee stage—and that harm resulting from these behaviours already does constitute harm. More importantly, however, it does not address the sentencing for these types of assaults.

Next, the bill includes employees in youth training centres in the existing aggravated offence provisions. Given the narrow parameters of the bill, that is fine. I am sure we can leave that untouched, unless it becomes redundant by some of my amendments. As I said before, the bill also amends section 4 of the Sentencing Act so that, when a court is sentencing an offender, it must be a secondary sentencing principle and all that entails. I am happy to support that. The bill, as I have stated before, also repeals the assault police offence of section 6 of the Summary Offences Act, but it leaves hinder and resist arrest untouched.

The crux of this bill's failure, its inherent weakness, is that, rather than create standalone specific offences for assaults on cops and prescribed workers, it merely increases the maximum penalties for certain unlawful threat and assault offences in which the victim is a prescribed worker by a mere one year—one year, with no mention of any sentencing guidelines to ensure that repeat offenders are locked up beyond the amendment of section 4.

This is self-evidently a weak bill. It is inadequate. It was roundly condemned on the day it was introduced by some of the very people it purports to protect. Mark Carroll, the President of the Police Association of South Australia, was unequivocal in his condemnation of the bill. He said:

This new bill is weak, and nowhere near fit for purpose. Maximum penalties rising by only a year will hardly change the way offenders are punished by the courts, nor will it act as a sufficient deterrent. It's also inferior to the legislation in NSW, QLD, Victoria and WA. Those states have acted appropriately to protect emergency services workers.

He goes on to say:

The government is aware of what we want—a specific, dedicated offence written into the law which deals with assaults on police and other emergency services workers.

Police, ambos and emergency workers need a clear and unequivocal statement from the parliament and from the government that criminals who injure police officers, ambulance workers and other front-line emergency workers when they are trying to do their job of protecting, serving, helping and treating members of the public should feel the full force of the law. Sentencing should be appropriate to punish those offenders and deter others who think they will just get away with a slap on the wrist. The bill in its current form simply does not do that.

I want to flag amendments that I will move in this place, and we reserve our right to seek further amendments in the other place if that becomes necessary. I do not intend to amend, in this house at least, the rather simple amendments to section 5AA, which essentially do two things: they slightly change the definition of workers captured by the act and they increase the penalties for those offences slightly.

As I said, I will not attempt to interfere with those provisions here, though I note that my essential and first substantial amendment will make most of those provisions redundant. I will leave them, anticipating that the government will use its numbers to vote against my substantial amendments, and I will then be left opposing measures that make the laws marginally tougher on offenders. So, within the narrow parameters of the bill before us, I will support those.

I will attempt to amend clause 7 so that it creates specific offences around the assault and injury of police, ambulance officers and emergency workers. The offences themselves, in this amended section, are as follows:

- causing harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of their official duties intending to cause harm, with a maximum penalty of 15 years;
- causing harm to a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of their official duties through a reckless act, with a maximum penalty of 10 years;
- assaulting a prescribed emergency worker acting in the course of their official duties, with a maximum penalty of five years; and
- hindering or resisting a police officer in the course of their official duties, with a maximum penalty of two years; however, if harm is caused to that police officer it carries a maximum penalty of 10 years, which brings it into line with the 'recklessly causing harm' provision previously mentioned.

It should also be noted at this point, and I think the Attorney made this point, too, that the provisions in the CLCA around serious harm, where the maximum penalty is 25 years, are deemed sufficient and will remain unchanged by this side of the house. I will attempt, as part of these amendments, to incorporate a clarification that throwing or using human biological material to assault and/or injure a prescribed emergency worker constitutes assault and/or harm within the meanings of the CLCA. In my amendment to clause 7, there is less prescription about who is to be included in the definition of a 'prescribed emergency worker'. I will get to that in the committee stage.

I will also introduce an amendment that will attempt to make the new offences listed above designated offences for the purposes of sentencing when they result in harm or injury. This means that a sentence of imprisonment imposed by a court cannot be suspended if, during the five-year period immediately preceding the date on which the relevant offence was committed, a court has suspended a sentence of imprisonment or period of detention imposed on the defendant for a designated offence. In short, this ensures that anyone who has received a suspended sentence cannot have a custodial sentence suspended again within that five-year period.

As with other designated offences under section 96 of the Sentencing Act, the court retains the discretion not to impose custodial sentences where it is not deemed appropriate. In this sense, it is not, as some commentators have tried to paint it, a mandatory minimum sentencing regime. It is not that: it simply means that anyone who has received a suspended sentence cannot have a suspended sentence again, assuming that the court has seen that second offending as sufficiently serious to warrant a custodial sentence.

This works in concert with the provision that makes the deterrence of assaults against emergency workers a secondary sentencing principle, a provision that I will amend slightly but not substantially to make it very clear that the intention is to punish this type of conduct, particularly when it involves repeat offenders, with the harshness that it deserves. I want to make it clear again that this does not constitute mandatory minimum sentencing.

Judicial discretion is maintained, as the minister said. It is a cornerstone of our judicial system, and it will be maintained as it should be. But it is parliament's job to reflect the will of the people and to give expression to community expectations. Let's be clear about this: it is the expectation of the community that criminals who assault and injure police, ambos and emergency workers, particularly repeat offenders, should be treated very seriously by our courts.

Finally, my amendments will seek to entirely remove section 6 from the Summary Offences Act—that is, the provisions for assaulting police, hindering police and resisting arrest—and place it entirely in the criminal code. The removal of the assault provisions in section 6, outlined by the Attorney in her second reading explanation, is self-explanatory; it makes the offence more serious and places higher penalties on offenders.

But concerns remain amongst police that police officers are often injured, sometimes quite seriously, in the course of arresting someone, and that there is no adequate remedy when the elements of an assault cannot be established. This amendment will address that by placing the entire section in the criminal code, and substantially increasing the penalty for instances when police are harmed during the commission of an offence.

Some of the issues raised in this debate have been around for a long time, but they were revived by the Police Association in October last year, and this is when Labor engaged with the Police Association and others and we on this side of the house got to work drafting legislation. By contrast, the Minister for Police until today has been completely silent on the matter despite the fact that it is largely the workforce he is responsible for which will be affected by these changes. Indeed, it is members of his workforce who have been asking for these changes.

*The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:*

**Mr ODENWALDER:** It's untrue that members of your workforce have been asking for these changes? The Minister for Health has been silent when in fact ambulance officers are also a key target of this legislation. In the course of my consultation, the body representing ambulance officers and paramedics made it perfectly clear to me that legislative change in this area was long overdue.

The Attorney-General herself was almost entirely silent up until very recently. She has rushed to play catch-up on this issue after months of inaction and disinterest and has introduced the bill which is weak and not fit for purpose. We can and we should do better than this to protect the people who protect us, and I look forward to the committee stage of the bill.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:26):** The government has introduced important legislation to deal with requests from the Commissioner of Police and the Police Association of South Australia regarding police assaults, and specifically assaults on police and other emergency service workers from bodily fluids. The bill is incredibly important in providing assurance to our front-line emergency workers by better protecting the state's police, emergency service workers, front-line medical officers and other law enforcement officers from assaults.

The major purpose of this bill is to create a new offence in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 where a person spits or throws or otherwise applies blood, saliva, semen, faeces, urine or vomit on a prescribed emergency worker in the course of their duties. Assaults on police officers have been increasing. Police officers were attacked 771 times, and on average there were 15 assaults a week in the last 12 months up to 30 April this year.

We really must protect our police. All assaults are unacceptable, and such assaults, as with spitting and attacking police officers with bodily fluids, are all too common for our front-line police and emergency service workers, with spit, blood, urine and faeces being used to harm police and other officers while in their line of duty. I thank the Commissioner of Police for raising this unattended concern with the Attorney-General for action, and welcome the standalone offence being created in this bill.

Whilst our courts do see assaults using bodily fluids and appropriately sentence in line with the seriousness of these actions, it has been vital to create an offence that stands apart from assaults and assaults causing harm in the criminal law. This government is sending a clear message to those who are disorderly, disrespectful and violent towards our police, ambulance workers, doctors, nurses, firefighters and front-line officers that this behaviour is unacceptable and should be treated as such in the criminal law.

Labor's amendments do not immediately cover all front-line emergency service workers, which is the strength of our government's legislation. Our government's bill does the following. It creates a standalone offence in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act for causing harm using human biological material against a prescribed person. 'Biological material' means blood, saliva, semen, vomit, faeces or urine. 'Prescribed person' means police officer, prison officer, emergency service worker, law enforcement officer, volunteers in the SES, CFS and St John, and others prescribed by regulations, likely to include nurses, doctors, unsworn officers at police stations, Community Corrections workers, Sheriff's officers, bailiffs, etc., upon consultation.

Taking into account the role of police and emergency service workers when sentencing, the bill will require a sentencing judge to consider the need to protect police as a secondary sentencing consideration beyond community safety generally. SAPOL agreed that this would be a positive step in recognising police and allied workers when sentencing for the above charges. This was the result of a request by PASA.

There is a repeal of lower level assault charges. It removes the ability for assaults against police to be charged under the Summary Offences Act and therefore ensures that all assaults against police occur in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which has higher penalties. Following extensive consultation, the Attorney has filed further amendments in the House of Assembly. These amendments do the following to increase in maximum penalties for assault against police officers.

In submissions to the Attorney, PASA requested an increase in penalties across the board to offences relating to police. Following consultation, the government has increased the penalties for the assault of police to seven years, if harm is caused to police, and five years to police otherwise. A broad range of offending falls under 'common assault on police'. This could range from shoving a police officer to a much more violent crime. As such, it is integral that the courts have an appropriate level of discretion to sentence appropriately, given the circumstances. Notably, this is not a new issue, and Labor failed to do anything about this during their 16 years in government.

Ensuring Community Corrections officers are included: amendments Nos 1 and 4 bring Community Corrections officers and Community Youth Justice officers into the biological materials offence and aggravated offences generally. This ensures that these workers have the same protection from assaults as prison officers and youth training centre officers. Expansion of the list of biological material: amendment No. 3 adds vomit to the list of biological materials. The AMA considers that this should be included in the list and has anecdotal experience of this being used to harm front-line doctors and nurses.

Greater coverage of doctors and nurses in regional areas and attending roadside incidents: amendments Nos 2, 5, 6 and 7 extend the biological materials offence to workers in a hospital emergency department, a person engaged in retrieval medicine and rural doctors in emergency scenarios. These amendments were raised by both the AMA and the nursing federation due to many attending front-line incidents outside emergency department boundaries. For doctors and nurses in regional areas, this is particularly important.

Biological assault offence for everyday people: amendment No. 8 creates a new standalone offence for throwing biological material at an ordinary individual with a maximum penalty of two years or, if harm is caused, three years.

I commend the Attorney-General for acting swiftly when, in January 2019, she was contacted by the Police Association of South Australia regarding changes they would like to see relating to assaults on police. Since that time, work was undertaken with PASA and SAPOL to determine the issues around police assaults, the court sentencing process and gaps that could be rectified by legislative change. Excellent consultation has taken place. The Attorney-General has circulated this bill to the Police Association of South Australia, SAPOL, the United Fire Fighters Union of South Australia, the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, the PSA and the Australian Medical Association.

Thank you to everyone who has taken time to support and speak on this bill, thereby supporting our South Australian front-line emergency workers by better protecting the state's police, emergency service workers, front-line medical officers and other law enforcement officers from assaults. I know that these changes will be supported by my electorate, and it is exciting that together, as a community, through speaking up and acting we will create a safer South Australian community and greater consequences for hurting the people who protect and serve us.

Last week, I was fortunate to visit the Golden Grove MFS, the Salisbury MFS, the Salisbury SES, the Salisbury CFS, the Golden Grove Police Station and the Elizabeth Police Station with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services, who cares deeply about having feedback directly from these workers and volunteers. These volunteers, staff and officers across our emergency and policing do a terrific job keeping our community safe and certainly deserve our government's full support to be kept safe, too, just as every citizen of South Australia deserves to be safe at home, school, work and in our community.

The police officers told me that they are often spat on, which is despicable and not okay. They must be respected, or there must be strong consequences. People who assault our emergency service workers must feel the full force of the law. I commend this bill.



**Mr BROWN (Playford) (16:35):** I rise to speak on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Assaults on Prescribed Emergency Workers) Amendment Bill. The government bill's primary purpose is to create new offences for people who intentionally cause human biological material to come into contact with another person or threaten to do so. The bill also amends aggravated offences within the act to include offending made against CFS workers and volunteers, as well as those who supervise youths in a training centre. Existing aggravated offences are increased, although only by a single year.

Providing strong robust legislation that protects police and emergency workers should be a high priority of any state government. The Police Association report that more than 700 officers are assaulted each year, so the government needs to legislate to provide a strong level of deterrence. Labor has a proud history when it comes to reforming the criminal law, providing for offences that either protect the public or the police and emergency services.

In fact, in 2015 the then Labor government passed the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) (Blood Testing for Diseases) Amendment Act. This law delivered on an election commitment to require offenders who bite or spit at police officers to undertake blood tests for infectious diseases. It became apparent that these laws were necessary when several cases arose of offenders spitting at or biting SAPOL officers, resulting in communicable diseases being transmitted.

This includes the story of Senior Constable Alison Coad, who was attempting to arrest an offender in Whitmore Square a number of years ago. The woman spat in the constable's face, causing her to contract a communicable disease that continues to have a detrimental effect upon her life. Following instances like this, both the Police Association and the public more broadly called for the then Labor government to act, and it did just that.

Fast-forward to 2019 and the Police Association have mounted a worthy campaign for tougher laws for offenders who assault police and emergency service workers in the line of duty. What is the difference? This time we have a Liberal government and a Liberal Attorney-General who has introduced legislation that has been described as woefully inadequate.

The bill simply does not address what has been asked of the government, namely, that specific offences be created to deal with assaults against police and emergency service workers and that criminals who reoffend, after previously receiving a suspended sentence, will be sent to prison. It is clear that the government simply are not consulting adequately and listening to what the community is asking for.

On this side of the house, we have introduced amendments to create specific offences, with tougher penalties for assaults against emergency workers. This includes tough maximum penalties, including 15 years' imprisonment for those who intentionally cause harm to an emergency worker, 10 years' imprisonment for those who recklessly cause harm and five years' imprisonment for those who assault an emergency worker. Furthermore, the amendments ensure that anyone who has received a suspended sentence will serve gaol time if they assault a police officer or emergency worker again.

These are the amendments that the Police Association are asking for. They are the experts in this field. They know what police officers in South Australia want and need so that they can carry out their duties knowing that the law protects them and deters offenders. They have described Labor's amendments as the changes that will 'deliver for all stakeholders'. The government should take on board our amendments and consider whether they are truly committed to protecting our police and emergency service workers.

As it stands, the government bill that has been introduced is a weak response to a growing and concerning problem. I endorse Labor's amendments and ask all members of the house to consider them favourably.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:38):** I also take the opportunity today to speak on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Assaults on Prescribed Emergency Workers) Amendment Bill. As others have mentioned in the house, assaults on police, ambulance workers, doctors, nurses and other front-line workers should certainly be treated with the highest regard, and as a community we should not tolerate the daily abuse, assault and harm caused to these workers. This bill, which has been

introduced by the Attorney, seeks to introduce a new offence into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 to protect our state's emergency service workers and punish those who spit, throw or apply blood, saliva, semen, faeces or urine on those workers in the course of their duties.

Front-line emergency workers such as police officers, members of the South Australian Ambulance Service, Correctional Services workers, members of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service and Country Fire Service, nurses and doctors working in emergency departments in our hospitals are essential in keeping South Australians safe and caring for those who may be injured. However, they are unable to do so if they are being assaulted while performing these crucial duties. Disturbingly, these incidents are becoming far too commonplace and, as a state, we have an obligation to ensure that those emergency workers are able to undertake their essential work safely.

The Attorney-General, in consultation with the Police Association of South Australia, South Australia Police, the United Firefighters Union of South Australia, the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, the Public Service Association and the Australian Medical Association, has put together a bill to toughen up the laws around assaults against emergency service workers. Under the bill, stronger penalties will be in place for offenders who cause harm to police and also other emergency service workers.

One of the amendments that is achieved by this bill is to further add to offences that constitute an aggravated offence in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. The act as it stands provides that some offences have a basic form and also an aggravated form, and the maximum penalty becomes significantly greater for an aggravated form than it does for a basic form of the offence.

Section 5AA of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act sets out the circumstances that would lead to an offence being classified as aggravated. At present, an aggravated offence has one of the circumstances to be considered as an aggravated offence outlined in section 5AA(1)(c):

- (c) the offender committed the offence against a police officer, prison officer or other law enforcement officer—

Clause 7 of the bill inserts after '(b) a prison officer; or' the following:

- (c) an employee in a training centre (within the meaning of the Youth Justice Administration Act 2016);

This comes about because, while they are not technically prison officers, they are also front-line workers nonetheless, so this change will help to protect them. Further, a new paragraph is added to section 5AA(1) after paragraph (k), which provides:

- (ka) in the case of an offence against the person—the victim was, at the time of the offence, engaged in a prescribed occupation or employment (whether on a paid or volunteer basis) and the offender committed the offence knowing the victim to be acting in the course of the victim's official duties;

That is also outlined as an aggravated offence. Importantly, this enables the regulations to extend to people who are either in paid employment or volunteers. The Attorney-General gave as an example the protection under law this will provide to two different people who work for the CFS: a paid employee and a volunteer. This is certainly an important initiative to protect our emergency service workers and is welcomed by those organisations that have volunteers who are serving in an emergency person's role.

The bill also increases the maximum penalties under various sections for offences of making unlawful threats to cause harm under section 19, offences of assault under section 20, offences of recklessly causing harm under section 24, and offences relating to acts likely to cause harm under section 29 of the act. That adds on a maximum penalty for an aggravated offence, in the circumstances that I have previously referred to outlined in section 5AA(1)(c), which relate to aggravated offences against police officers and law enforcement officers, but also offences under section 5AA(1)(ka), offences against the victim when they are engaged in a prescribed occupation, whether they are paid or a volunteer.

That extends the maximum penalty in those cases under section 19 to eight years. Section 20, in dealing with assault, looks at various provisions as well. In addition, section 24, recklessly causing harm, and section 29, reckless acts, increase the penalties of imprisonment up to eight years.

One of the substantive amendments to this bill is the addition of section 20AA, which creates a standalone offence in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act for causing harm using human biological material against a prescribed emergency worker, whether acting in a paid or voluntary capacity. In this bill, section 20AA(5) defines human biological material as blood, saliva, semen, faeces or urine. It is also worth noting that the Attorney has foreshadowed some amendments, which will include vomit also being defined as human biological material.

This section also describes a 'prescribed emergency worker' as meaning a police officer, prison officer, an employee in a training centre, a member of the SA Ambulance Service, a member of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service, the South Australian Country Fire Service or South Australian State Emergency Service, a law enforcement officer or any other person engaged in an occupation or employment prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of section 5AA(1)(ka)—which is an addition to this bill—and also any other person prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this paragraph.

I should also note that the Attorney-General has foreshadowed that community correction officers will also be included in this going forward as part of further amendments. It is important to note that a prescribed emergency worker specifies:

whether acting in a paid or voluntary capacity, but does not include a person...declared by the regulations to be excluded from the ambit of this definition.

It really outlines who these prescribed persons are and, as prescribed in the regulations, it is likely to include nurses, doctors, unsworn officers at police stations, Community Corrections officers, Sheriff's officers and bailiffs.

Subsection (4) of section 20AA provides that a person is committing an offence if they cause human biological material to come into contact with a victim, either by applying it directly to the victim via means such as spitting or throwing, or deliberately applying biological material. The other option is that they deliberately apply the biological material to themselves, knowing that the victim could come into contact with them or is likely to. So it covers the circumstance of someone applying blood to themselves and then trying to assault the victim by that means.

In the bill before us, those found guilty of committing these new criminal offences will face a maximum penalty of five years under this new aggravated assault offence and, in any other case, of up to four years' imprisonment. It is worth noting again that the Attorney has foreshadowed amendments that would escalate this so that harm caused to the prescribed emergency worker would have a maximum penalty of up to seven years and, in other cases, a penalty of five years' imprisonment. So the government is certainly taking this offence very seriously.

The offences outlined in the bill will certainly help better protect police and other emergency service workers, whilst also complementing existing laws that capture offences against police and broader assault laws, including shooting at police for which there is a maximum penalty of 10 years in gaol at the present time. The offence of shooting at police and causing serious harm to an officer incurs a maximum penalty of up to 25 years in gaol. The act of endangering the life of another incurs a maximum penalty of 18 years' imprisonment when it is an aggravated offence against a police officer, and the act of endangering the life of another has a maximum penalty of 18 years' imprisonment.

The Marshall Liberal government certainly will always stand up for those who want to keep our state safe. This is a crucial piece of legislation not just across the state but also certainly within my electorate of Morphett. In Morphett, we are fortunate to not only have the Glenelg Police Station on Sussex Street that runs into Jetty Road, Glenelg, which is a prime tourist spot, but there is also the Glengowrie Ambulance Station on Morphett Road, which is opposite the Morphettville Racecourse, and also the Camden Park Fire Station, which is also on Morphett Road but on the northern side of Anzac Highway.

I would like to take a bit of time to talk a little bit more about the Glengowrie Ambulance Station. It is a \$6.4 million ambulance station and was opened very recently, in August 2018. It is certainly a major success for the electorate of Morphett and really the western suburbs as a whole. The ambulance station is in operation 24 hours a day, seven days a week and it is perfectly

positioned to enhance SA Ambulance Service's emergency response capability in the western metropolitan region.

Being on Morphett Road, the position of the station enables easy access to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre. It is certainly essential to the growing population of the western suburbs and will lead to improved response times in the western suburbs. The station itself caters for seven ambulances and two light fleet vehicles that are based there at the facility. It is also built in such a way that it provides for the expansion to meet the future needs of the Morphett community as it grows and also the western metropolitan community.

At the time I opened the Glengowrie Ambulance Station, I spoke of looking forward to the local community benefiting from having hardworking paramedics and ambulance officers based there. Unfortunately, while these officers and other paramedics are out in our community trying to save lives, they are being attacked, preventing them from tending to those in desperate need of emergency care. When on the job, sometimes ambulance officers face being spat on, aggressive behaviour, sometimes with a weapon, threats of violence and also physical assault, which includes kicking, biting and punching.

I mention that because, really, a paramedic's main focus is to care for the patients they are sent to. They are there to help, but under this crisis situation it becomes easy for other family, friends or even bystanders to feel they need to vent their frustrations against the ambulance crew. Unfortunately, this can manifest itself into the very aggressive and violent forms of unacceptable behaviour that I have just described.

To counter this and to try to educate the public, an education campaign designed to protect ambulance officers quite rightly states, 'I can't fight for your mate's life while I'm fighting for mine.' Really, I think if we can hit that home along with the bill itself, it reinforces that this government certainly wants to stand by those emergency service workers and protect them while they are trying to help keep our society safe. It is clearly unacceptable that this sort of violence occurs against emergency workers. It should not be seen as an occupational hazard and it is only fair therefore that those same paramedics and ambulance officers should be supported and protected because they are working hard for the community to save lives.

The bill before us seeks to provide a firm statement that this government and the broader South Australian community does not accept aggressive behaviour or threats towards our emergency workers by putting in place tough laws to provide protection for these emergency service workers. Similarly, attacks on firefighters are equally unacceptable. In Morphett, as I mentioned, we also have the Camden Park Fire Station, which is also staffed 24 hours a day by 20 full-time firefighters safeguarding the lives and property of those in our community.

Last year, I delivered on an election commitment to have a strong police presence in Morphett, which included securing extended operating hours at the Glenelg Police Station during the peak summer months. This is certainly one aspect of a strong police presence. But in addition to this, it is also important to have mobile and foot patrols that are highly visible to ensure safety in our community. Police officers, especially on foot, however, are exposed to these forms of attacks I have previously described, including the human biological material. The bill will act as a strong deterrent to those wishing to cause harm to those police officers and will bring harsher penalties upon those who do.

It is not only emergency service workers who should be protected from offences involving blood, saliva, vomit and other human biological materials. Understandably, threats or actual harm to members of the community from human biological materials is a cause for considerable alarm to many in our community. I should mention that the Attorney-General has foreshadowed adding a further section to section 20 which will create a new standalone offence which will also be legislated for throwing human biological material at an ordinary individual with maximum penalties of two years' imprisonment or, if harm is caused, three years' imprisonment. This would be an important protection for all people in the South Australian community and welcomed by many, I am certain.

Beyond the additions to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, the bill also makes changes to the Sentencing Act 2017 by adding to the secondary sentencing purposes in section 4(1) so that

when a court is sentencing an offender for an offence, the court must take into account in setting that penalty the need to protect the police and other emergency service workers. Currently, the courts must consider the safety of the community as paramount to other sentencing considerations. This is done in section 3 of the Sentencing Act and this aspect will not change.

In terms of other changes to acts, currently assaults against police can be charged under section 6 of the Summary Offences Act, and this comes with a maximum penalty for the offence of assault as either a \$10,000 fine or imprisonment for two years. Other more serious assaults against police officers can be charged under section 20 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

This amendment bill of the Attorney repeals section 6(1) of the Summary Offences Act which then removes the ability for assaults against police to be charged under the Summary Offences Act and, therefore, ensures that all assaults against police in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act have higher penalties. This removal from the Summary Offences Act will act as a strong deterrent because no longer could a fine potentially be a possible outcome for an assault against police. The outcomes will be gaol time with maximum sentences as prescribed in this bill.

The bill is another example of the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to our state's emergency service workers. Our government will always work to protect South Australia's emergency service workers from various forms of assaults. We have clearly outlined the harsh penalties for breaking this law. It sends a clear message to those who are disrespectful and violent towards our police, ambulance workers, doctors, nurses, firefighters and other front-line officers that this behaviour is unacceptable and should be treated as such in the criminal law.

I also take this opportunity to thank our police officers, firefighters, ambulance officers, paramedics, nurses and doctors for their tireless efforts to keep our community safe and in good health. I commend this bill to the house.

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (16:57):** I am very pleased today to rise in support of the Criminal Law Consolidation (Assaults on Prescribed Emergency Workers) Amendment Bill 2019. This bill is yet another example of a sensible bill from the Marshall Liberal government. It acts on requests from the Commissioner of Police and the Police Association of South Australia and reflects the respect that most South Australians have for our emergency services workers.

This bill inserts into the Criminal Law Consolidation Act a new standalone offence for causing harm using human biological material against police officers, prison officers, emergency services workers, law enforcement officers, SES, CFS, St John volunteers and other persons who are prescribed by regulation.

The proposed maximum penalty for this offence is seven years' imprisonment where harm is caused and five years' imprisonment in circumstances where no harm is caused. These sorts of shameful acts are completely unacceptable and have no place in our community. Emergency workers perform a vital public service, ensuring that the rest of us are safe on the streets, safe from natural disasters and receive world-class treatment when we are hurt.

Needless to say, the vast majority of South Australians have a commendable level of respect for these workers and appreciate their efforts to keep us safe. Unfortunately, though, there are some in our community who not only fail to show respect for our emergency workers but actively impede their work and infringe on their right to safety. These people must have a clear message sent to them that their behaviour is not welcome in our community.

The bill highlights how seriously this government considers offences against emergency workers. In addition to the creation of the new standalone offence for causing harm to emergency workers using bodily fluids, the bill amends the aggravated offences provisions of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to include as an aggravated offence a circumstance where a person commits an offence against an emergency worker knowing that the victim is acting in the course of their official duties or as retribution for something the victim may have done whilst acting in their official duties.

Importantly, this bill also amends the Sentencing Act so that the need to protect emergency workers is taken into account when an offender is being sentenced and removes from the Summary Offences Act the offence of assaulting a police officer. This will ensure that, rather than being charged

under the Summary Offences Act, those who assault police officers will be charged under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, leaving them open to more severe penalties.

Though I have been fortunate to have had virtually no contact with police undertaking their official duties, the police officers I do know through the local Neighbourhood Watch groups, particularly those in my local community, are thoroughly decent people whose aim in their careers is to help to make sure that our communities are as safe as possible. Even the fact that I am meeting them through Neighbourhood Watch groups demonstrates how much they are willing to go above and beyond their official duties to work with and to engage with the community.

Certainly, the stories you hear from some of those officers about the sorts of things they deal with on a daily basis are quite incredible for someone like me to consider. I have had obviously very different jobs, where I was not dealing with the sorts of situations they deal with on a daily basis. You really have to have a great deal of respect for the important job they do and the very real impact that the situations they find themselves in have on them and their family.

The decency of police officers is certainly very true for all other front-line workers I have encountered, and ambulances officers are an example. I know a number of people who work as paramedics, who are frequently dealing with very difficult people—in fact, it seems that quite a large number of the people they deal with are difficult—and so we certainly need to do everything we can to protect them.

I would also like to make particular mention of the fact that this bill includes provisions that extend to volunteers in the Country Fire Service and the State Emergency Service. The thought that a person would seek to commit an offence against some of the most selfless people in our community is really quite sickening. We all know how hard our CFS and SES volunteers work. The fact that they are often obviously employed in another area and commit a great deal of their free time to keeping the rest of us safe and to protecting us during incidents of natural disasters is why the majority of us hold these volunteers in high regard.

The CFS and SES are very important to my own electorate. The Tea Tree Gully SES is located in St Agnes within Newland. It is very, very good brigade. As an aside, I think it is worth mentioning that just recently they won the 2019 South Australian State Rescue Challenge. I believe it was for the 13<sup>th</sup> year in a row, which is quite incredible. They will then be competing later on this year in the national championships. It really goes to show that we are very fortunate in our part of our Adelaide to have such a professional and highly committed team.

I understand that a lot of their training for the Rescue Challenge is above and beyond their ordinary training. Their unit coordinator, Phil Tann, did not allow them to use their normal training nights to train for the competition. Moreover, they obviously could not allow it to affect any of their responses to incidents. So these people were contributing above and beyond and really demonstrating not only Phil's leadership but the leadership that exists within his team and the commitment of his team has to excellence. As a local member, I and the rest of our community in the north-east are very proud of the work these volunteers do.

The CFS is very important to my electorate, where there are a number of CFS brigades: Tea Tree Gully, Hermitage, Paracombe, Kersbrook, Forreston and Cudlee Creek, which is just over the border but is partly in Newland. I was very fortunate to visit the Hermitage and Paracombe brigades the other week with the Minister for Police and Emergency Services. They are a great group of people who are highly committed to what they do.

It is also worth mentioning that a lot of those brigades, as well as many others, were heavily involved with some natural disasters within Newland in recent years. The Sampson Flat bushfire was a particularly notable event, and it still has a very real impact on many of the volunteers in the area. In fact, in the Hermitage brigade, a number of volunteers and local community members are involved in putting together a book about the history of the fire in that area. They are fundraising in support of producing the book, which will support the brigade as well.

These are incredible people within our community who are doing a really important job looking after the rest of us so that, when there is a disaster, we can run away from it while these guys run towards it and keep us and our properties as safe as they possibly can be. There is never really

a bad time to reiterate our appreciation for these volunteers, and this bill shows that this government will not tolerate disrespectful behaviour towards them.

Like all South Australians, emergency workers deserve to feel safe and respected at work. The work that all emergency workers perform is a vital public service and crucial to the maintenance of our cohesive society. This bill also creates a new standalone offence for throwing biological material at an ordinary individual, which would attract a maximum penalty of two years' imprisonment or three years if harm is caused to the victim.

Whilst all forms of assault are disgraceful, there is something particularly repugnant about the idea that a person would use their own bodily fluids to cause harm to another human being. This is a sensible amendment. The disparity in the maximum penalties for the new standalone offences for throwing biological material at ordinary people and emergency services workers respectively recognises that particular protection should be afforded to those who work to keep the rest of us safe. In fact, they are often the people on the wrong end of that kind of behaviour.

As a father of young children, I know that one of the most important lessons we can teach our kids is to respect all those around them. It is truly not a difficult concept to understand and practise. If my children know that they should not spit on another person, for example, then I think it is quite reasonable that we expect that adults should not either. If there are people in our community who think that they can act with such blatant disrespect for others, the law must send a strong signal that our community will not tolerate that behaviour. This bill sends that message.

I would like to offer my congratulations to the Deputy Premier on her work to bring this bill to the house and implement this reform after a relatively short time in office. Whereas those opposite spent 16 years deafened by their own spin, the Marshall Liberal government has listened to the concerns and requests of emergency workers and is making real changes so that they can carry out their work without being subject to attacks.

The Marshall Liberal government listens to the concerns of the community and then acts on those concerns. It is a government that prioritises making real changes to improve the lives of South Australians, rather than focusing on being in the headlines and winning the media cycle. We will continue to implement sensible reforms that bring the law into line with community expectations. I commend this bill to the house.

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:08):** I rise to support the Criminal Law Consolidation (Assaults on Prescribed Emergency Workers) Amendment Bill. I want to acknowledge all our emergency workers and the fantastic work they do, whether they are paid or volunteers. Many thousands of these workers, no matter whether they are paid or volunteers, essentially put their lives on the line.

I have heard and seen on either TV reports or radio the horrifying accounts of people, especially police officers, being spat at and then told they have probably caught HIV or some other nasty disease when they were just going about their job to protect their communities, to help their communities. It is abhorrent that we even need to get to the stage of enacting legislation like this, but, sadly, it appears to be the way of the world.

What we are doing with this legislation is dealing with requests from the police commissioner and the Police Association of South Australia regarding these police assaults, and specifically assaults on police and other emergency service workers, with bodily fluids. Where the bill addresses these issues, there is a new offence for bodily fluid assaults, and it creates a standalone offence in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act for causing harm using human biological material against a prescribed person.

'Biological material' means blood, saliva, semen, faeces or urine. A 'prescribed person' means a police officer, prison officer, emergency service worker, law enforcement officer, volunteers in the SES, CFS and St John and others prescribed by regulations, which is most likely to include nurses, doctors, unsworn officers at police stations, Community Corrections workers, Sheriff's officers, bailiffs and others upon consultation.

This legislation will take into account the role of police and emergency service people when sentencing criminals. The bill will require a sentencing judge to consider the need to protect police

as a secondary sentencing consideration beyond community safety generally. South Australia Police have agreed that this would be a positive step in recognising police and allied workers when sentencing for the above charges, and this was a specific request of the Police Association of South Australia.

The lower level assault charges will be repealed, and so this removes the ability for assaults against police to be charged under the Summary Offences Act, and therefore ensures that all assaults against police occur in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, which has higher penalties. The Attorney has put forward some amendments, and they have been filed—this is after extensive consultation with affected people and bodies—which increase the maximum penalties for assaults against police officers.

Certainly, in submissions to the Attorney-General, the Police Association of South Australia requested an increase in penalties across the board for offences relating to police. Following consultation, this government has increased the penalties for assault on police to seven years if harm is caused and five years for police otherwise. This reflects the New South Wales legislation, as provided by the Police Association of South Australia.

There certainly is a broad range of offending that falls under common assault on police, and this could range from shoving a police officer to a much more violent crime. As such, it is integral that the courts have an appropriate level of discretion to sentence appropriately given the circumstances. Notably, this is not a new issue. We note that the opposition had 16 years and they did not do anything about it, and this was not progressed as a reform.

In regard to Community Corrections officers, we are ensuring that they are included, and there are amendments that bring Community Corrections officers and Community Youth Justice officers into the biological materials offence and aggravated offences generally. This is to ensure that these workers have the same protection as prison officers and youth training centre officers in relation to assaults.

The list of biological material will be expanded to include vomit. The Australian Medical Association considers that this should be included in the list and has anecdotal experience of this being used to harm front-line doctors and nurses. Greater coverage of doctors and nurses in regional areas and attending roadside incidents is really important.

Quite often, there are accidents throughout regional areas, especially where I live in Coomandook. Sadly, we have too many accidents 20 kilometres either way of my place. A lot of the time, an off-duty doctor, nurse or other medical professional will call in and help volunteers from the Coomandook Country Fire Service, of which I am a member, or the Coonalpyn Country Fire Service, which is also a road crash crew, or the local ambulance volunteers. They have to put up with some horrific sights. Friends have told me that they have taken a 12-month rest from attending road crash rescues because they have been traumatised. I salute their service to the community.

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** Hear, hear!

**Mr PEDERICK:** Absolutely. What happens out there is traumatic. Sadly, these crashes happen for a range of reasons. Some are just plain accidents, a lot are related to fatigue and a lot occur when people decide to end their lives. In many cases, they forget that when they steer themselves under a truck, they are causing impact not just to a truck driver but also to emergency service workers who have to attend the scene.

Sometimes it is hard for major crash investigators to determine whether the accident was a suicide but, either way, there is nothing pretty about hitting traffic head on while driving at least 100 km/h or 110 km/h. I commend everyone who has to deal with the aftermath of these accidents. Recently, we have seen far too high a road toll, certainly with regard to motorbike accidents. Many of these crashes have been attributed to speeding. It is very ugly when something goes wrong, especially on a motorbike, where there is virtually no protection other than some leathers or a helmet.

People have to deal with these incidents. My thoughts are with those involved in the emergency services throughout my electorate. There are Country Fire Service units right across from Pinnaroo through to Mount Barker and Tungkillio, down towards Clayton and Milang. In Murray Bridge, we have Metropolitan Fire Service, Country Fire Service and State Emergency Service



volunteers. They all do tremendous work in this field and have to witness many things that a lot of other people do not have to see, and I salute them all. I also salute the police officers, doctors and nurses who attend these scenes or have to deal with the carnage when they reach the emergency centres throughout Adelaide and the regions.

In regard to other amendments, they extend the biological materials offence to workers in a hospital's emergency department, persons engaged in retrieval medicine and rural doctors in emergency scenarios. Certainly, the Attorney would like these workers to also be brought into the scheme for aggravated offences, which will be done via regulations under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act in due course, as we are doing with bailiffs, sheriffs and others, or as amendments to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act itself.

This is very important because of the life-saving work of the Royal Flying Doctor Service, which services a lot of my community. People think that the Royal Flying Doctor Service just services the outback. They do a fantastic job. I note that they have a new plane which, from what I understand, can do retrievals nearly twice as quickly as other planes they have had and can land on dirt strips, which obviously it has to in order to function in the bush with the bush strips—

**The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan:** And shorter strips, too.

**Mr PEDERICK:** —and shorter strips. That is a great boon for people wherever they live. There are retrievals done right throughout South Australia, including throughout my electorate at Lameroo and Pinnaroo. The retrieval teams in the rescue choppers who come out our way do great work. The beauty of it is that they can land right on the road. Obviously, the road is closed if there has been a terrible accident.

I have heard many cases where people owe their lives to those retrieval teams turning up in excellent time because they have landed right at the scene. They can get them to the city in double-quick time, so they can get that badly needed life-saving care. It is very unfair that these very people who are saving lives right across the state are the ones we have to protect with this legislation, but sadly it is a fact of life. Sometimes people are not in a state of mind to appreciate that people are just trying to help.

In regard to the amendments being looked at for workers in hospital emergency departments, this issue has been raised by both the Australian Medical Association and the nurses federation due to many attending front-line incidents outside of emergency department boundaries. Certainly, in a regional seat like mine, the seat of Hammond, this is particularly important, as I have just indicated. There is also another amendment that deals with biological assault offences for everyday people. It creates a new standalone offence for throwing biological material at an ordinary individual, with maximum penalties of two years or, if harm is caused, three years.

The background to this legislation goes back to when the Police Association wanted more changes relating to assaults on police. Work has been undertaken with both the Police Association of South Australia and South Australia Police to determine where we needed to get to and the issues around police assaults, the court sentencing processes and gaps that could be rectified by legislative change.

With those few words, I would like to extend my support for this legislation and salute all our people who do such good work in supporting all the other citizens with their emergency and front-line work. Let's get this legislation through so we can do more to protect their vital work.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:24):** I rise to speak on the Criminal Law Consolidation (Assaults on Prescribed Emergency Workers) Amendment Bill 2019, brought in by the Attorney-General. It will not be a surprise to many of you to hear that I echo many of the sentiments that have been expressed by members of both sides of the chamber about the need to provide greater protections for our emergency services workers, including South Australia Police, those who work in other emergency services and those who work in our hospitals, from any violent or antisocial behaviour, in particular, assaults.

This has been an issue of significant public discussion, particularly in the last nine to 12 months, coinciding with a campaign that the Police Association of South Australia has been running to try to have the parliament strengthen the laws around those people who are found guilty

of assaulting police. It is another area on top of an area for which I had previous responsibility, and that was how the laws protect those people who work in our public transport networks.

Some members, those who were in this place before the last state election, may recall that via regulatory instrument we were able to increase the penalties for those who are found guilty of assaulting public transport workers by ensuring that the treatment of those offences was to be as aggravated offences and hence able to attract significantly higher penalties for when people were convicted.

There has been some commentary both in the contributions made to this place and in the media about how challenging it can be to legislate in this area, not just because there is a strong desire to adhere to the principles which most of us agree on—and the concept of mandatory sentencing has been raised here and how far can and should a parliament go when it comes to requiring the judiciary to act in a particular manner in the sentencing of individuals—but also, perhaps canvassed more on talkback radio rather than in here, in regard to the willingness of the judiciary to mete out punishments to people found guilty of these offences and those punishments aligning with the expectations of the community.

In various instances, it has been a great frustration to some that the parliament has done what it would regard to be its job in passing laws to ensure that there are tough penalties on these sorts of perpetrators the police have done their job in tracking down and arresting, and with the DPP, for example, prosecuting these people who are alleged to have committed these offences, and then to get to that final stage of sentencing in the judicial process and see that sometimes all of that work that has preceded it might be, if I could go so far as to say, perhaps undone, or not completed might be a more generous way to put it, in the dispensing of a significant sentence, if it is a custodial sentence and a period of imprisonment.

This issue has not only emerged recently. The Deputy Premier made comments on radio this morning that she feels a bit frustrated. From her perspective, perhaps understandably, she feels a bit frustrated that some of the media focus has only been on the level of assaults in the last 12 months, and she has pointed out that this is not a brand-new issue. This has unfortunately been bedevilling the community for some time.

She pointed to some figures that are six or seven years old. While that precedes my time in this place, I suspect this is an issue of people being prosecuted and found guilty for assaulting police that has been happening for many, many years, but it has now got to the point where the police representatives, the Police Association of South Australia, feel that something far more substantial needs to be done legislatively. Preferably, after that is done, we need to see these new penalties carried through to the courts and those people who are found guilty of assaulting police feeling the fullest extent of the law that they should.

It does not just stop at police, and the member for Hammond is the most recent speaker to make reference to the vital work that emergency services and health services workers provide in our community. They are amongst those who also need our protections from this sort of behaviour, but if this behaviour does occur then there should be appropriate penalties for them. I do not think that anyone disagrees with any of that.

We can all agree that here we are with a bill in front of us and a bill that needs support, and the question is: does the bill have everything in it that the community would expect of a bill to be passed through this place? That is where there is a difference of opinion between the government and the opposition. It is not the first time we have been in this situation, particularly since the last state election.

There has been a call for the parliament to do more in relation to the issue of penalties or the requirement to try to keep people in prison who have been found guilty of various types of offences. There have been calls in the media, there has been the announcement of action by the opposition, there has been some delay and, finally, we have seen a bill from the government to try to address this.

When the bill has come, welcome though it is otherwise, unfortunately the provisions are not what have been called for by either the opposition or the community. Let's hope that does not mean in this instance that we are not able to work out our differences and arrive at a bill that meets the

purpose and requirements of not just members on this side but also those people who have been active in the community about this—most notably, the Police Association of South Australia.

I notice that in some of the Deputy Premier's comments, particularly in the media, she has pointed to the fact that she and her government have consulted with groups beyond the Police Association. Of course, that is right and proper. She is to be commended for speaking to other organisations, such as doctors' representatives, the Australian Medical Association, and the Metropolitan Fire Service and other emergency services groups. From that, she has determined that on balance she has got the bill in the right form which should be supported.

Despite the AMA, the MFS and other groups having a difference of opinion with what the Police Association of South Australia is putting forward, I do not think that is sufficient reason for us not to accept the advice of the Police Association. They are certainly not the representatives of only those workers who are being assaulted. It is clear that, unfortunately, doctors, nurses and other emergency services workers are being assaulted.

If the representatives of those other types of workers beyond police are happy with the Deputy Premier's bill, of itself there is nothing wrong with that. But if we have another group of emergency services workers, like police, who are calling for something more significant, then there is nothing wrong with falling to the highest common denominator when it comes to this legislation, rather than to the average or the lowest common denominator, and what these other groups are calling for.

I do not know specifically what the AMA and the MFS have called for—perhaps we will get some of that information from the Deputy Premier during the committee stage of the bill—or how far away it is from what the Police Association is proposing. But I do think we need this two-pronged go, if I can put it so clumsily, at amending the provisions of the Sentencing Act to provide as much guidance as we possibly can without perhaps potentially overstepping the line into what could reasonably be called imposing mandatory sentencing on the judiciary.

We do need to give them that guidance, and we do need to do so in concert with significantly ramping up these penalties. I am sure the Deputy Premier will argue that she feels that the way in which she is seeking to amend the various legislation is appropriate and strikes the right balance, but that does not accord with our view, which is perhaps not unexpected, but it does not accord with the Police Association's view.

I do not really understand what is lost for the government by adopting the more stringent multifaceted approach that the Police Association is seeking. Surely, it is not for a reason of politics that the government solution is better than the opposition's and hence we can claim credit (to use the personal pronoun) or the government can claim credit for being responsible for changing the law in the most effective way. I hope it is not that.

I really genuinely hope that there is an opportunity here, which can be grasped by both members on our side and members on the government side, to come up with some sort of compromise that goes much further towards what the Police Association is asking for. After all, it is the police, commonly, who are on the end of more of these instances at a severity that is causing them to agitate publicly for this change in the law.

The timing was remarkable, in that this morning and today we see reports of the assault of an off-duty police officer, who had declared himself to be a police officer. If I am correct in the reports I have seen in the media, of the three individuals who were charged in relation to that incident one was convicted and sentenced for 18 months, I think, one was acquitted and I think for the third the charges were withdrawn. I might be wrong about that last instance, but that was my recollection from the media. Anyone who sees the footage of that assault is horrified not only that it happened and that it could happen to a police officer who had declared themselves to be so but also by the severity of the incident.

This was not some one-off clip around the ear: this was a severe beating, at the hands of three men, of an unarmed, unprotected police officer. That attracted a penalty that I think most people in the community would think was manifestly inadequate. That is the most recent example we have to inform our deliberations today; it is not the only example. It is up to us to reset the bar for the

police, for the DPP and for the judiciary in making sure that we have a suite of laws across these different acts that are amended in a way that ensures that these sorts of incidents do not attract such a sentence from a court.

Those people who are detractors of making legislative change in this area in response to these sorts of incidents quite commonly say, 'Well, if you don't like the sentence, appeal it.' There is enough case law now, I would argue, that makes it pretty clear to the police and pretty clear to the DPP that, even if they were to appeal these particular matters, they can have no confidence that they will be treated any differently when it comes to sentencing through appeal. That means that the law has to change, and that means that law has to change substantially.

I really do not think that the bill we have here from the Attorney changes the law substantially enough. The Police Association, the representative of the nearly 5,000 police we have in South Australia, the ones who, along with our other emergency services workers, are commonly on the front line, do not believe that it is enough.

While it is abhorrent to all of us that this type of behaviour is imposed on doctors, nurses, other hospital workers and other emergency services workers, I would put it that it is more likely to be the police who are on the end of this. It is more likely to be the police who place themselves in a situation where they are breaking up hostile situations, where they are intervening in live assaults and putting themselves in harm's way.

They are not the only ones. I stress, of course, the doctors, nurses, hospital workers and the other emergency services workers. But it is the police who perhaps provide very good information to us about what is exactly required in the laws and how they need to be changed. I do not think it is an onerous ask of the Police Association for them to seek their own specific provisions around police and emergency services workers. It is not giving them their own act or their own law, as the Deputy Premier put it this morning, much to the offence of the secretary of the Police Association. All they are asking for is an offence within the law that particularly contemplates police and emergency services workers.

I would hope that we can move past any sort of partisan posturing or politicking or move past any issue of pride to make sure that we can ensure we find the right judgement in toughening up these laws. If we do not, and if we only seek to change the legislation in the way that the Attorney-General has put it in her bill, then I am deeply fearful that we will continue to see the sorts of sentences meted out to these offenders that were reported in the media today. That, frankly, is not good enough. It is up to us to prescribe in law and set the expectations for the judiciary about what constitutes a breach of the law and how people should be punished for it. I do not think we should resile from that.

It is with those brief remarks that I implore the government to work with the opposition here to try to find some common ground much closer to the position of the Police Association so that all 47 of us can put our hand on our heart and say that we have done everything we possibly can to ensure that these laws will see convicted offenders face much stricter sentences from now on.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:42):** I wish to acknowledge and thank all members who have made a contribution to the debate on this bill to date. That includes the member for Elizabeth, who is the opposition spokesperson on police matters, our own Minister for Police and the members for Heysen, Newland, Hammond, Lee, King and Morphett.

I have to acknowledge that I was a little bit distracted during the latter part of the debate because I received a submission earlier this afternoon during the course of this debate from the Law Society of South Australia. I will refer to that a little later. I indicate that, having received the submission—and I have provided a copy of it to the opposition—whilst we will not complete this debate today, we can both have a good look at it overnight, I am sure. I will be addressing some aspects in it that I have been able to quickly peruse.

The general tenor of the submission from the Law Society of South Australia will probably not be very surprising to many people. They have received our bill and proposed amendments. On a quick read, I do not think they have actually received the amendments of Mr Odenwalder. I am not sure but—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** No, the Law Society. In considering their submission, I think the general tenor I can paraphrase is to say they do not consider the aspects covered by this bill either necessary or appropriate. But, as I say, to give them justice I will refer to a number of their matters in due course.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Mr Deputy Speaker, it is my sad duty to draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I will return to the Law Society's submission shortly, but I wish to thank the opposition for indicating that they will support the bill, although it has been made very clear that they take the view that their amendments would strengthen its benefit and operation and they will be seeking the house's support of them. However, in default, as I understand it, they will support the legislation.

Can I just identify a couple of matters that I think need some clarification. I accept that the member for Elizabeth, in his prior life as a police officer, has had some hands-on experience. I do not doubt he is a member of the Police Association. As the union representative body for the police force, it is important that the Police Association's position be considered, and it has been by the government—in fact, so much so that amendments have been foreshadowed and tabled to accommodate further consideration of matters raised by the Police Association.

In recent times, some police statistics have been presented in respect of the numbers of police assaults. It does concern me to note that, whilst the opposition have indicated an increase in police assaults over the last 12 months, they have failed to take into account the police assaults over the last seven years, which have remained consistently high but have been a lot higher. I think it is important that we place on the record that, although last year's data suggests that it is now at some 771, in fact in 2012-13 the number was 880. In 2015-16, it was 784, and in 2016-17 it was 773.

No-one accepts that any of these matters should be tolerated as an acceptable number, but I make the point because there has been an increase in the previous 12 months from the preceding year; it is a monumental reduction from what happened in the years preceding it. Perhaps that is why the former government did nothing about increasing and strengthening the penalties applicable to assaults on police generally during their term in office. I do not know why they did not. I do not know why they did not strengthen this further, given the data that has been raised by the member for Elizabeth as recently as the last 24 hours.

I do not know why we have not heard from the Leader of the Opposition, who was a former police minister, in relation to what he did or did not do, why he did not take any action or, if he took any action to the cabinet, why they did not accept it. Why is this suddenly a problem that we have to clean up? I do not know the answer to that, but I do know this: we are a responsible government, we are acting to clean this up and we are proceeding with a bill to take into account a very wide spectrum of people we see are on the front line and deserve to have some further consideration.

In looking at this issue, it is very important for us that we do not just look at the police as the emergency front-line workers that they are—we recognise that—and that we do not just look at increasing penalties. It is really important that we look more broadly, and we have. The work that we have undertaken with stakeholders regarding the legislation unsurprisingly has included the police commissioner as the head of SAPOL; PASA, of course, which has been referred to; the Australian Medical Association, SA division; the Country Fire Service; ANMF; and volunteer groups, all of whom support our bill.

In our view, it is clear that the Labor Party have not gone to the extent of considering the spectrum of those views; otherwise, I suggest that they would not just be making public statements to support 100 per cent of what the police union wants. I might add that we have accepted most of that. It is incorporated in the bill that we have presented and even more with the amendments. Another thing that concerns me is that I think the opposition have been attempting to present an argument to the public that their support of the PASA position will ensure that, somehow or other,

there is a commitment that people who assault police will go to gaol and that there will be some imposition of this.

Even the member for Elizabeth concedes that his proposal in respect of the second suspended sentence is not mandatory sentencing. It is quite clear that both major parties are not supporting mandatory sentencing, but the impression is being presented that the proposed legislation will ensure that; that is, there will be no suspended sentences for a second offence within five years for a person who assaults a police officer. Let me just explain what happens in the real world.

In the real world, a charge of assault can be laid under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act. A judge can look at what his obligations might be if the Labor amendment were to pass and say, 'I can't give this person a suspended sentence. I might elect not to give them a prison term at all.' In which case, the assertion that people who commit an offence against a police officer will go to gaol is actually a complete myth. It should not be out there being perpetuated as the necessary answer to ensure that occurs because it is just not going to translate to that.

If the Labor Party as the opposition had consulted with a number of other parties, they may have felt that their consideration of accepting the government's position on this had merit, but it is disappointing to note that that appears to have escaped their attention. They have been prepared to perpetuate the union's position and only the union's position. Let me highlight the position in relation to police when one takes into account the police commissioner as well.

Let's look at the removal of section 6, assaults, from the Summary Offences Act. That is essentially what we are proposing. We are not going as far as the opposition wants, which is to remove hinder police as well. We say that this proposal to remove assaults from the Summary Offences Act and leaving only the Criminal Law Consolidation Act charges is probably unnecessary. Nevertheless, we have accepted the request by the Police Association to remove the assault of police from the Summary Offences Act. The police commissioner supports that proposal and states that it would provide:

...a clear policy position to set a deterrent to members of the public regarding assaults on police (and other like worker) and removes the potential default position to a lesser offence in the [Summary Offences Act].

As we have said, strictly speaking, no change is necessary as it is already open to the prosecutor to charge an offender with the section 20 Criminal Law Consolidation Act offence instead of the section 6 Summary Offences Act offence where they consider it necessary or appropriate to do so under the circumstances. For example, the prosecutor may consider that a higher penalty should be sought for the particular offending, or that a summary offence, under section 6 of the Summary Offences Act, should be charged rather than a minor offence, such as in section 20 of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Despite no change being necessary, the government accept the advice from SAPOL and PASA to provide a clear policy position and deterrent to those who assault police. This further removes the potential default position to a lesser offence in the Summary Offences Act. We must be aware of the broader considerations here, particularly the ability of police prosecutors to agree to a reduction in circumstances.

Overcharging as a way to recognise the gravity of assaulting a police officer does not benefit anyone, least of all the police officer offended against, particularly if the facts will simply not stand up to a robust contest. SAPOL's prosecutions branch undertakes a decision-making process when considering a plea of a lower level charge. Consultation also occurs with affected members. SAPOL appreciates that withdrawal and reduction of charges in circumstances presents an element of the justice system working as it should. Facts like this are often not reported in the media.

The charging of offences against police must meet the same standards as charges against members of the general public. In respect of the retaining of section 6, hindering police, I will canvass that on the next occasion. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.*

**FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (VOLUNTEER CHARTERS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 18:03 the house adjourned until Thursday 6 June 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***PAYROLL TAX**

**790 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How many employers are estimated to be liable for payroll tax in the 2018-19 financial year with taxable payrolls between:

1. \$600,000 and \$1,000,000;
2. \$1,000,001 and \$1,100,000;
3. \$1,100,001, and \$1,200,000;
4. \$1,200,001 and \$1,300,000;
5. \$1,300,001 and \$1,400,000;
6. \$1,400,001 and \$1,500,000;
7. \$1,500,001 and \$1,600,000;
8. \$1,600,001 and \$1,700,000;
9. \$1,700,001 and \$1,800,000;
10. \$1,800,001 and \$1,900,000;
11. \$1,900,000 and \$2,000,000;
12. \$2,000,001 and \$2,500,000;
13. \$2,500,001 and \$3,000,000;
14. \$3,000,001 and \$3,500,000;
15. \$3,500,001 and \$4,000,000;
16. \$4,000,001 and \$4,500,000;
17. \$4,500,001 and \$5,000,000;
18. \$5,000,001 and above?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The Department of Treasury and Finance does not estimate the number of employers by the taxable payroll ranges in preparing its estimate of payroll tax revenue. Information in the requested format only becomes available following the completion of the relevant financial year, once employers have completed their annual payroll tax reconciliations.

As part of the Liberal government's election commitment to exempt businesses with taxable wages below \$1.5 million from payroll tax, modelling was undertaken on the estimated number of businesses by taxable payroll range to estimate the cost of the measure. The table below provides the estimated number of employers by annual payroll in 2018-19 used as part of this modelling process.

Annual payroll	Employers(a)(approx.)
600,000 to 1,000,000	1,900
1,000,000 to 1,500,000	1,300
1,500,000 to 1,700,000	400
1,700,000 plus	5,600
Total	9,200

(a) Estimated number of grouped employers with taxable annual national wages within the relevant ranges, liable for payroll tax in South Australia.

**PAYROLL TAX**

**791 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How much payroll tax revenue is estimated to be collected in the 2018-19 financial year from employers with taxable payrolls between:

1. \$600,000 and \$1,000,000;
2. \$1,000,001 and \$1,100,000;
3. \$1,100,001, and \$1,200,000;



4. \$1,200,001 and \$1,300,000;
5. \$1,300,001 and \$1,400,000;
6. \$1,400,001 and \$1,500,000;
7. \$1,500,001 and \$1,600,000;
8. \$1,600,001 and \$1,700,000;
9. \$1,700,001 and \$1,800,000;
10. \$1,800,001 and \$1,900,000;
11. \$1,900,000 and \$2,000,000;
12. \$2,000,001 and \$2,500,000;
13. \$2,500,001 and \$3,000,000;
14. \$3,000,001 and \$3,500,000;
15. \$3,500,001 and \$4,000,000;
16. \$4,000,001 and \$4,500,000;
17. \$4,500,001 and \$5,000,000;
18. \$5,000,001 above?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The Department of Treasury and Finance does not estimate payroll tax revenue by employers taxable payroll ranges in preparing its estimate of payroll tax revenue. Information in the requested format only becomes available following the completion of the relevant financial year, once employers have completed their annual payroll tax reconciliations.

#### **PAYROLL TAX**

**792 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How many employers are estimated to be liable for payroll tax in the 2019-20 financial year with taxable payrolls between:

1. \$600,000 and \$1,000,000;
2. \$1,000,001 and \$1,100,000;
3. \$1,100,001, and \$1,200,000;
4. \$1,200,001 and \$1,300,000;
5. \$1,300,001 and \$1,400,000;
6. \$1,400,001 and \$1,500,000;
7. \$1,500,001 and \$1,600,000;
8. \$1,600,001 and \$1,700,000;
9. \$1,700,001 and \$1,800,000;
10. \$1,800,001 and \$1,900,000;
11. \$1,900,000 and \$2,000,000;
12. \$2,000,001 and \$2,500,000;
13. \$2,500,001 and \$3,000,000;
14. \$3,000,001 and \$3,500,000;
15. \$3,500,001 and \$4,000,000;
16. \$4,000,001 and \$4,500,000;
17. \$4,500,001 and \$5,000,000;
18. \$5,000,001 and above?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The Department of Treasury and Finance does not estimate the number of employers by the taxable payroll ranges in preparing its estimate of payroll tax revenue. Information in the requested format only becomes available following the completion of the relevant financial year, once employers have completed their annual payroll tax reconciliations.

**PAYROLL TAX**

**793 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How much payroll tax revenue is estimated to be collected in the 2019-20 financial year from employers with taxable payrolls between:

1. \$600,000 and \$1,000,000;
2. \$1,000,001 and \$1,100,000;
3. \$1,100,001, and \$1,200,000;
4. \$1,200,001 and \$1,300,000;
5. \$1,300,001 and \$1,400,000;
6. \$1,400,001 and \$1,500,000;
7. \$1,500,001 and \$1,600,000;
8. \$1,600,001 and \$1,700,000;
9. \$1,700,001 and \$1,800,000;
10. \$1,800,001 and \$1,900,000;
11. \$1,900,000 and \$2,000,000;
12. \$2,000,001 and \$2,500,000;
13. \$2,500,001 and \$3,000,000;
14. \$3,000,001 and \$3,500,000;
15. \$3,500,001 and \$4,000,000;
16. \$4,000,001 and \$4,500,000;
17. \$4,500,001 and \$5,000,000;
18. \$5,000,001 and above?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The Department of Treasury and Finance does not estimate payroll tax revenue by employers taxable payroll ranges in preparing its estimate of payroll tax revenue. Information in the requested format only becomes available following the completion of the relevant financial year, once employers have completed their annual payroll tax reconciliations.

**PAYROLL TAX**

**794 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (14 May 2019). How many employers are estimated to be liable for payroll tax in the 2020-21 financial year with taxable payrolls between:

1. \$600,000 and \$1,000,000;
2. \$1,000,001 and \$1,100,000;
3. \$1,100,001, and \$1,200,000;
4. \$1,200,001 and \$1,300,000;
5. \$1,300,001 and \$1,400,000;
6. \$1,400,001 and \$1,500,000;
7. \$1,500,001 and \$1,600,000;
8. \$1,600,001 and \$1,700,000;
9. \$1,700,001 and \$1,800,000;
10. \$1,800,001 and \$1,900,000;
11. \$1,900,000 and \$2,000,000;
12. \$2,000,001 and \$2,500,000;
13. \$2,500,001 and \$3,000,000;
14. \$3,000,001 and \$3,500,000;
15. \$3,500,001 and \$4,000,000;
16. \$4,000,001 and \$4,500,000;

17. \$4,500,001 and \$5,000,000;

18. \$5,000,001 and above?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The Department of Treasury and Finance does not estimate the number of employers by taxable payroll ranges in preparing its estimates of payroll tax revenue. Information in the requested format only becomes available following the completion of the relevant financial year, once employers have completed their annual payroll tax reconciliations.

#### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TOURISM COMMISSION

**819 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (15 May 2019). Who were the recipients of any ad hoc grants administered by the South Australian Tourism Commission's 'General Annual Grants Paid'? Can the minister table a list of recipients of these funds in the financial years of 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 and 2019-20 (thus far)?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Recipient	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19
57 Films Pty Ltd	Y	N	N
South Aussie with Cosi Pty. Ltd.	Y	N	N
Adelaide Convention Bureau	Y	Y	Y
City of Port Lincoln	Y	Y	N
South Australian Industry Tourism Council (TICSA)	Y	Y	Y
Tourism Kangaroo Island	Y	Y	N
Adelaide Convention Bureau	Y	Y	Y
Flinders Ports Pty Ltd	N	Y	Y
UWAI	N	Y	N
The Bend Motorsport Park	N	Y	Y
Australian Tourism Export Council	N	N	Y

#### HOSPITAL STAFF

**831 Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (4 June 2019). As at Friday 26 April 2019, how many staff were employed (headcount) at each of the following:

- (a) Royal Adelaide Hospital?
- (b) Lyell McEwin Hospital?
- (c) Flinders Medical Centre?
- (d) Modbury Hospital?
- (e) The Queen Elizabeth Hospital?
- (f) Noarlunga Hospital?
- (g) Women's and Children's Hospital?
- (h) Mount Barker Hospital?
- (i) Whyalla Hospital?
- (j) Riverland Regional Hospital?
- (k) Mount Gambier Hospital?
- (l) Port Lincoln Hospital?
- (m) Gawler Hospital?
- (n) Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre?
- (o) South Australian Ambulance Service?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Staff headcounts are regularly reported including at estimates committees but not on a daily basis.